

The Christadelphian Lamp

“Thy Word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path.” Ps. cxix. 105.

Vol. 2.

JUNE, 1875.

No. 8.

CONTENTS

Page 2.	The Resurrection of Jesus	Editor
Page 7.	Notes on the Psalms - 3 rd article – Ps. II	S.G.Hayes
Page 11.	How to Handle The Word	Editor
Page 12.	The Father and The Son	W. D. J.
Page 15.	Hebrews II. 16	W. Ellis
Page 15.	Dr. Thomas' Niche Forty Questions	
Page 17.	Bro. Farmer's Exhortation	
Page 18.	The 2 nd Part of Mr Paton's Letter & remarks by the	Editor
Page 20.	The Revealed Mystery	Frank Chester
Page 22.	Answers to Correspondents	S.G.Hayes
Page 27.	Letters to The Editor	
Page 28.	Substitution	R. S. S. Powell
Page 29.	Intelligence	
Page 33.	Foreign Intelligence	

A charge frequently brought against our preaching is, that it is too controversial. We are bound to admit that in this particular our addresses do present a strong contrast to pulpit oratory in general. The usual style of preaching may be truly said to be almost free from a controversial spirit. And the absence of controversy from the preaching of this age must, if you read and reflect, make you feel that it is very unlike the teaching of Jesus and of Paul. Controversy is quite consistent with all the graces of religion. There is no discord betwixt controversy and meekness. The deepest charity does not jar with a true and righteous spirit of religious controversy; for no man was ever so distinguished both for love and controversy as the man Christ Jesus. But upon this subject there is, in our day, strange misapprehension. It is a popular sentiment that where benevolence, love, and Christian charity exist and flourish, the tongue of controversy should be still. But if we study the life of Paul we shall find all these dwelling together. It would be difficult to show that any of the apostles were more eminent than Paul in all the virtues which make up the bright and tender side of human nature in its best and loveliest development, and surely, neither among the apostles nor any other class of preachers, was there ever a more persistent controversialist than Paul.

“Wherefore remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called uncircumcision by that which is called circumcision in the flesh made by hands; that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world.”

Ephesians 2:11 & 12.

THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS.

There is no doctrine of greater importance than the doctrine of the resurrection of Jesus. It is the very key-stone of the Christian arch which spans the gulf of death. If that stone is deficient the bridge across the grave is imaginary; it has no more reality than the bridge of Mahomet over the abyss of Hell. If the stone is loose – to preserve the figure – the traveller fears to set his foot upon the structure. He is not fully assured of a safe passage. To be plain, it is desirable for firm faith and abiding peace not only to believe that Jesus rose again, but to have the certainty of the fact. A clear knowledge of the value of the evidence for the resurrection of Christ will do more than any other thing to keep the possessor of it in the path of rectitude, and to stimulate him to walk worthy of the kingdom and glory whereunto he has been called by the Gospel. He will every moment remember that Jesus is alive; that his present existence means his future return; that that return means the raising of the dead and the judgment of the world, when every man will receive according to his works. Hence the balance-pole of the believers life is weighted by just fears of punishment for wrong-doing, while the mark before his eye in the straight line of duty is that bright, unfading life which Jesus has enjoyed since the reanimation of his dead body.

Let us observe the effect of the resurrection of Jesus on His immediate disciples. We gather from the various Gospel narratives that they were ignorant of its significance. “And as they came down from the mountain, He charged them that they should tell no man what things they had seen till the Son of Man were risen from the dead. And they kept that saying with themselves, questioning one with another what the rising from the dead should mean.” Mark ix. 9-10. From this state of ignorance it follows that during the ministry of Christ his disciples had not rested their hopes for the glorious restoration of the kingdom to Israel in an epoch beyond the close of their natural lives. They had not, in fact, connected their rewards with the idea of a resurrection from the grave. There is nothing to cast a doubt upon this as the true state of their minds on the subject; on the contrary, their whole proceedings, both before and after their Master rose again, confirm it. Mark the despondency, fast verging on despair, which seized them immediately after the crucifixion. Not the remembrance of all the miracles they had seen was sufficient to arrest the sudden settling down of this mental anguish of darkness. “The chief priests and our rulers,” said they, “delivered Him to be condemned to death, and have crucified Him, But we trusted that it had been He which should have redeemed Israel: and beside all this, today is the third day since these things were done.” Luke xxiv., 20, 21. The depth of their disappointment is revealed by the simplicity of this testimony. They had no hope; not the faintest ray relieved the midnight gloom that had enwrapped their souls. The failure of the Messianic enterprise is in their estimation only too apparent from the words “beside all this, today is the third day since these things were done.” In a few more days they would have begun to forget their lost Master; each would have repaired to his home and resumed his former avocation; the authorities would have been convinced of the justice of the execution, and the wisdom of destroying and obliterating in the blood of its chief so dangerous a political heresy. All this was the natural course of events in view of the unenlightened condition of the disciples and the rigid unbelief of their enemies. We can easily picture how matters would have gone; the wreck of the movement would have been gradually carried away by the receding tide until no vestige would have remained visible to the eye, and, perhaps, not even a report of the occurrence had been chronicled on the page of history. What is the value of all this? Does it not demonstrate the reality of the facts? Does it not present to us a face on which no line of hypocrisy or imposture can be traced? Whether we regard the friends or the foes of Jesus, their looks and manners betray no sign of craft or deception. His friends “trusted that it had been He who should have redeemed Israel;” they knew not “what the rising of the dead should mean.” His foes discredited entirely his whole mission; ridiculed His claims; hated and despised His professed authority; and, partly through fear of Rome, anxious to rid the land of a pretender and an insurrectionist, they went through what was little better than a mock trial, and inhumanly hurried off the victim to execution. At this point there was, no doubt, in their minds, an end to the whole affair. As a precaution against the dregs of fanaticism, they guarded the tomb until the excitement should have died away. In studying the evidence for the resurrection of Christ, we repeat that these proceedings should not be lightly passed over. They shew us exactly in what aspect His death was viewed by all parties, and, as we shall shortly see, form an important element in the evidence relating to the resurrection.

Let us look at the disciples on the third day. “Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared; and certain others with them. And they found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre. And they entered in and found not the body of the Lord Jesus. And it came to pass, as they were much perplexed there about, behold two men stood by them in shining garments. And as they were afraid, and bowed down their faces to the

earth, they said unto them, Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here; but is risen; remember how He spake unto you when He was yet in Galilee, saying, The Son of man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again. And they remembered His words.” - Luke xxiv, 1-8. There is no sign of cunning here; no indication of plot; and as little of hallucination or delusion. The narrative discloses no attempt to surprise or startle by the mode of describing the scene; not a word is redundant, and every word bears the impress of truth. It was “very early in the morning, the first day of the week.” This is a most important piece of information. It tells us just what we should expect to find in the circumstances of the case. A Jew could not do anything on the Sabbath day: he was strictly prohibited by law. The disciples, therefore, could not go to the sepulchre on Saturday; but “when the Sabbath was past (Mark), as it began to dawn towards the first day of the week (Matthew), Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices that they might come and anoint Him” (Mark). As soon as it was practicable, the heart-broken disciples were there, and first among them the women. Here is exactly the spontaneous flow of affection. But mark how sad it is. This mother, whose soul had been lacerated by the murder of her holy son, had come, attended in her sorrow by others, whose hopes were also stayed in the promises that son had given them – not for a glorious meeting with their resurrected beloved; not to witness His triumph over death and the grave; not to behold his immortality mock his murderers; no, they had come with eyes red and swollen from weeping and loss of sleep; with hearts overwhelmed by despair. That which they carried in their hands was a meet emblem of their condition. No funeral dirge could speak with a voice of woe like those “sweet spices which they had bought that they might come and anoint him.” That they had no knowledge, and consequently no expectation of His resurrection is, by this circumstance, put beyond the possibility of even a doubt. The great perplexity which Luke notices on their not finding Jesus in the sepulchre follows as a matter of course. The first impulse was to hasten back and inform the other disciples of what had happened; but the story did not convince them; they had no thought of the event, and the words of the women “seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not.” But to make sure, “Peter ran unto the sepulchre, and stooping down, he beheld the linen clothes laid by themselves, and departed, wondering in himself at that which was come to pass.” Peter was not satisfied whether Jesus was risen to life, or whether someone had removed the dead body; he did not know; he was confident only of one thing - that Jesus was not there, for both himself and John had entered the vault, and had seen only the linen clothes and the napkin that was about Jesus’ head wrapped together in a place by itself. Upon John this had a different effect: “he saw, and believed.” Nothing could be further from the appearance of fiction or imposture than these incidents. They concur to prove that the disciples of Jesus did not believe that He would rise from the dead; so that they cannot be justly suspected, before the resurrection is alleged to have taken place, either of hallucination or of deliberately spreading that report in order to deceive others.

Let us now change our position, and survey the matter from another point of view. The chief priests and the Pharisees who had procured sentence of death against Jesus were not altogether free from mental inquietude, even after the dead man had been taken down from the cross and laid in Joseph’s tomb. They gave expression to their apprehensions in the following manner: - “The next day, that followed the day of the preparation, they came together unto Pilate, saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again. Command, therefore, that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest His disciples come by night, and steal Him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead; so the last error shall be worse than the first.” Matthew xxvii. 62, 64. It will here be noticed that although the priests and the Pharisees had observed the declaration of Jesus that He should rise again the third day, it had made no more impression upon them as regards believing it than it had upon His disciples. The disciples had “heard and not heard.” But the Pharisees had heard and feared. They had not feared it would come true, but that the disciples would report it to be so, and endeavour to confirm the story by stealing the body and hiding it. In granting their request, “Pilate said unto them, Ye have a watch, go your way; make it as sure as ye can. So they went and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, and setting a watch;” verses 65, 66. Everything was then done that could be done to afford security and to ensure success. In this interval of anxious silence, let us examine the scheme of the betrayers and murderers, that is, the scheme they insinuated against the disciples when they addressed Pilate. Suppose that no watch had been set; that no great stone had been placed across the mouth of the cave; that the disciples had actually stolen the lifeless form. This will give the plan the priests and Pharisees were afraid of all the force of reality; and now let us enquire whether it would have realized their fears; whether the stealing and hiding of the dead body would have been sufficient to establish universal belief in the resurrection of Jesus; would have been sufficient to account for what has been done and suffered for his name? The impartial investigator will at once perceive the weakness of this position. If the disciples falsely affirmed Jesus to be risen, and were in possession of His body, it had been easy for

the rulers to constrain them to deliver it up. There must have been witnesses of the theft; for it is impossible to imagine the guard to have been asleep long enough and fast enough to allow a competent number of persons to roll away the ponderous gate of stone and carry off the corpse. Besides all this, although the report we are now taking for correct was circulated among the Jews, we find no mention of any effort to compel the delinquents to restore the stolen property, which assuredly would have been the case had the authorities credited the guilty charge. While the disciples disbelieved in the resurrection, they manifested nothing but disappointment at the death; and if they knew their Master to be still dead, how shall we discover a reason for the sudden change of sentiment and feeling displayed in their enthusiasm and readiness to suffer in the name of the resurrected Jesus? It is hard to persuade ourselves that one sane man could be found willing to build up so profitless and dangerous an imposition; but the difficulty is almost immeasurably increased when we consider that several hundreds of people would have to be in the same mind. Deception is always carried on for advantage; but what advantage could a few fishermen hope to gain by concealing the dead body of a man and giving it out that He was alive? It is not once hinted that the disciples essayed to make money out of their professed miraculous powers; they are never seen trying to exalt themselves either politically or socially; all they did or endeavoured to do was to travel up and down teaching and proclaiming Jesus to be risen again, to be alive, and that he was the cause of both what they preached and what they performed. If this were deceiving it bears no analogy to any other instance on record. Nothing men covet or desire could possibly be obtained by it, and the greatest risk was incurred; for to urge the claims of the Nazarene, as did the apostles, was high treason against the state, and punishable with death. If we accept the account of the resurrection as true, everything on the part of the disciples and of the Jews and "Romans is intelligible; but if we deny it, no theory can be conceived that will explain the course taken by either friends or enemies.

The angel, Matthew relates, had told the women who came to the sepulchre to direct the rest of the disciples to meet Jesus upon a certain mountain in Galilee where He "had appointed them. And when they saw Him, they worshipped Him, but some doubted." If the object of the narrator had been to palm off a forgery, he would never have written the last sentence. Instead of telling what took place like an honest man, not suspecting that the truth in any shape might militate against the credit of his statement, he would have said they all believed, not that "some doubted." This very doubting gives force to the alleged fact of the resurrection, because it implies that some person assuming to be Jesus stood before them; it further renders conspiracy and fraud impossible, because they were divided among themselves; it also goes to show that they were not, as some have suggested, labouring under an optical or nervous illusion. Their obedience to the command Jesus gave them on this occasion to "go and teach all nations" is proof that though at first some of them did not believe it was Jesus, they were fully persuaded of it before the close of the interview.

It was in the evening of the third day after the crucifixion that Jesus' uncle Cleopas and another disciple were walking from Jerusalem to Emmaus, a village between seven and eight English miles to the north-west. As was perfectly natural their conversation turned upon the recent events in the Holy City, the trial, execution, and burial of Jesus. These men had been told early in the morning before they started that Jesus was risen. "Certain women of their company" - one was Cleopas' own wife, for he was husband to Mary's sister - brought the intelligence. It had only "made them astonished." As they walked "they communed together and reasoned; but they were far from reasoning themselves into the conclusion that Jesus was alive. Were these men in a mood at all favourable to a deception of the senses? Was there anything about their conduct that bore the slightest suspicion of giving currency to a fraudulent tale? From all we can gather of them it is manifest they neither anticipated the death nor had the least expectation of the resurrection. They needed, as much as any other hard hearted unbeliever, to be convinced of the reality of the miracle. How they were convinced Luke simply and graphically relates. "Jesus himself drew near and went with them." He said to them, "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things?" Then as they approached the village Jesus was about to go forward and leave them to reflect on the testimony of the prophets in the light of the actual death and the story of the resurrection they had heard from the women in the morning. "But they constrained Him, saying, abide with us: for it is toward evening, and the day is far spent. And He went in to abide with them. And it came to pass, as He sat at meat with them, He took bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them. And their eyes were opened, and they knew Him; and He vanished out of their sight;" or "ceased to be seen of them." We cannot but remark the artlessness and spontaneity of their action consequent upon their enlightenment. "They rose up the same hour, and returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and they that were with them saying, the Lord hath risen indeed, and hath appeared unto Simon. And they told what things were done in the way, and how he was known of them in the breaking of bread." If we receive Luke's history of this journey as trustworthy, its candour and simplicity, as well as its anxious brevity, commend it to our

judgment and secure its acceptance; but if we suppose it false, a series of problems at once comes forward demanding a reasonable elucidation. Are we prepared to satisfy this demand? Can we explain the perplexity and hopelessness of Cleopas and his fellow traveller? Can we show a good reason for their momentary change of mind; for their immediate rising up and encountering another two hours' walk back to Jerusalem which the same afternoon they had quitted in ignorance and unbelief. Can we propound any rational theory to account for what happened soon after they entered the room where the eleven and others were assembled? The frank enquirer will not endeavour to persuade himself that these queries are irrelevant; but will ask how, denying the resurrection of Jesus, he can satisfy his intellect with answers to them.

The conduct of Jesus, as described by Luke, was just such as would be necessary to convince a number of plain unsophisticated people who were almost frightened out of their senses, not knowing whether what they saw was an apparition or a real person. "And he said unto them, why are ye troubled; And why do not thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have. And when he had thus spoken, he showed them his hands and his feet." Why he particularly invited them to inspect his hands and his feet is too obvious to need comment. The nails had been driven through them, and the scars remained in the healed flesh. These marks were precisely the tokens to identify the possessor, and must ultimately bring conviction to the most obstinate and incredulous. Note the impression they made upon the company present. "They believed not for joy and wondered." This is most touching. A great struggle was going on within; the facts before their eyes and within their grasp were suddenly overcoming their ignorance and unbelief, and the delight of irresistible persuasion of victory over death was bursting through all bounds. While filled with these mingled feelings, "Jesus said unto them, Have ye here any meat? And they gave Him a piece of a broiled fish, and of an honey comb. And He took and did eat before them." These were common articles of food, and the eating of them by Jesus, in addition to His exposure of His hands and feet, could not but confirm the privileged witnesses in the assurance that it was He Himself.

There was another incident which could tend only to corroborate and ratify what had taken place in the presence of the Apostles and those that were with them. "Thomas, one of the twelve, called Didymus, was not with them when Jesus came." The other disciples, therefore, said unto him "We have seen the Lord. But he said unto them, Except I shall see in His hands the print of the nails, and put my finger in the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into His side, I will not believe." John xx. 24, 25. Thomas was no visionary; he was not a man to be carried away by fervent imagination; nor was he to be quieted by the testimony of others. Thomas would have done honour to certain schools of modern scientists who are determined to believe as little as possible at second-hand, and to be satisfied only with their own personal and actual demonstrations. But truth does not suffer from the Didymites; it is rather they themselves who miss some of its benefits. Thomas was not content with the sight of his own eyes; he must "put his finger into the print of the nails, and thrust his hand into His side," else he would "not believe." Our obdurate Apostle had a week in which to nurse his unbelief, and one may infer that as the interval afforded no proof of his error, he would not be more inclined to yield to the testimony of his brethren. But "after eight days, again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them; then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you. Then saith He to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side, and be not faithless but believing. And Thomas answered and said unto Him, My Lord and my God." This Jewish Didymus was an incredulous person, but his incredulity did not equal that of our French Didymus, M. Renan. This learned professor and fascinating scribe "would summon a commission to sit over a dead body; would summon the miracle-worker and witness the raising to life; having taken due precaution to secure the actual death of the subject. And if the dead were raised again in the presence of the scientific commission, what then? Would our French Didymus become a believer in the doctrine of the resurrection? By no means. He would institute a fresh commission and go through a second trial, and if this time the same result followed, would he not then be thoroughly satisfied? Oh! no; and why not? Because these were only two cases, and all he would affirm is that resurrection had taken place in those two! Persons not profoundly versed in the art of quibbling may wonder what use these commissions could possibly be; if the first trial were not conclusive why make a second; and if both failed to settle belief in the doctrine why make any trial at all. What bars the road to truth against these men seems to be their pre-decision of the question. They lay it down that miracle does not and cannot exist. Any investigation, therefore, which should lead to the admission of miracle is stigmatised as insufficient and consequently unreliable. Enquiry and reasoning are practically futile in such a case, for it is already prejudged.

In his last chapter, John mentions other instances in which Jesus appeared to his disciples. On one occasion "there were together Simon Peter, and Thomas, called Didymus, and Nathanael of Cana in

Galilee, and the sons of Zebedee, and two others of his disciples.” This party was out all night fishing in the Sea of Tiberias, but caught nothing. “When the morning was come, Jesus stood on the shore; but the disciples knew not that it was Jesus.” On learning that they had caught nothing Jesus persuaded them to “Cast the net on the right side of the ship. They cast, therefore, and now were not able to draw it for the multitude of fishes. As soon then as they were come to land they saw a fire of coals there, and fish laid thereon, and bread. Jesus saith unto them, Bring of the fish which ye have caught. - - This is now the third time that Jesus shewed himself to his disciples, after that he was risen from the dead.” In this narrative there is a simplicity, an acknowledgment of ignorance at first sight, which has no semblance of fabrication about it. If its truthfulness be denied the consequences are of the gravest; involving nothing less than the mendacity of the Apostle whom Jesus loved.

The course pursued by the twelve after the departure of their Lord is indubitable testimony to their belief in His resurrection to life; it leaves absolutely no ground on which to frame an objection; whether they were mistaken is another point. We can only judge of this by the nature of the evidence furnished. If such evidence would now be considered decisive to establish the resurrection, its value for the same purpose was not less two thousand years ago. As far, then, as we have proceeded, the testimony amounts to this, that a large number of persons, not one of whom believed in, or even had any understanding of, the rising of Jesus from the dead, positively and repeatedly affirmed that they saw Him alive after His death and burial; that a number of them refused to accept the statement of several of their company to whom He first showed Himself; that one, viz., Thomas, averred his utter disbelief of the fact, although it was attended by many of his friends as eye-witnesses of it simultaneously; that Thomas himself was forced to yield credence to it on the evidence of his own sight and touch; that these people, who had known Jesus for some time before His death, ate and drank with Him again and again after He rose; that for forty days they were very much in His company, asking Him questions and hearing Him speak, as before His death, “of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God;” and finally, that “while they beheld, He was taken up, and a cloud received Him out of their sight.” Now let us suppose that the events here detailed had happened in our own day, where could we find a jury of twelve “good men and true,” who would agree to reject the evidence; who would decide that the testimony was false; that the resurrection of Jesus was not established by it? Further, let us assume that such evidence is not trustworthy; a question next presents itself with which we are bound to deal, whether agreeable to us or not; that is, What sort of evidence would be esteemed conclusive? The reply will be either in support of what is called circumstantial evidence, or of ocular demonstration; or of both. But does not the evidence produced answer to all this? Does it not consist of circumstances on the part of the slayers of Jesus, highly favourable to the truth of His resurrection? Why did they not deny it by producing the body? Why did they circulate a rumour which bore its own refutation on the face of it; that a few unarmed peasants had rolled away a “very great” stone, and, in the teeth of the Roman guard, had carried off the dead Jesus? And why, if they really believed that His disciples stole Him, did they not adopt measures to compel them to deliver Him up, and at once to disprove His resurrection? Thus much, in brief, for the circumstantial evidence to the fact. But what shall we say of the evidence of the senses in the case; of sight, touch, hearing; of prolonged intercourse? If this is inadequate, how in the world of humanity would it be possible to find aught worthy of the name of evidence; aught, in fact, which would command belief? What avails it to say, as Renan does, miracle is inadmissible; we do not contend that it is impossible; but we maintain that it is not proved. Very plausible, truly; a good way of evading the troublesome consequences of a plain denial of the possibility of miracle; but what is it worth? If miracle has never been confirmed by evidence: can we trust the experiments of any scientist; can we accept the statements on oath of any witness? Is not the evidence for the resurrection of Jesus equal in clearness, variety, and solidity to any evidence ever adduced? Is it not the very kind of evidence which sets at rest all doubt in events of regular occurrence and great moment?

There yet remains other proof. We allude to the conversion of Saul of Tarsus. There was nothing about Saul which would be likely to render him an easy object of illusion in this matter. He had been well acquainted with the Christians, and was exceeding mad against them. Saul was a remarkably intelligent and zealous Pharisee. It was in the very height of his zeal for the law and determination to crush the new heresy, that the great change came; a change which has made him pre-eminent among Christian apostles, and covered him with unending fame. The honesty of Paul’s conduct is so striking that no writer who has had occasion to notice him has suffered it to escape his eye. If we suppose Paul to have been for a time deceived by some trick of art; by the excitement of his mind; or by alarm at some natural phenomenon, as a thunderstorm; this would not afford satisfactory reason for his protracted and undoubting tenacity. Before the termination of such a career as his, there were abundant causes to lead to the discovery of the error. But we find his faith strengthening; his enthusiasm and certainty heightening and deepening as he

nears the oft far-shadowed ignominious and horrible death. He, who for a long while had disbelieved a number of his fellow countrymen, at last saw the Lord Jesus, and heard His voice; he was also smitten and remained blind for three days. Nothing could ever after this shake the faith of Saul. He joined his own experience to that of the others; that Christ 'was seen of Cephas; then of the twelve; after that, He was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. After that, He was seen of James, then of all the apostles. And, last of all, He was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time." Paul's account of these incidents in his letter to the Galatians carries with it great weight. "Now the things which I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not." To the Corinthians, who seemed to be doubting his authority, he said, "Have I not seen Jesus Christ, Our Lord?" It is not conceivable that the faintest breath of suspicion can rest on Paul's belief in the resurrection of Jesus. It is the most prominent feature in his preaching; the most powerful arm he wields against Platonism; if Jesus did not rise, his whole mission is a lie, and the end of all men is that they perish. Was Paul mad, as Festus affirmed? Was it possible that in all this he was deceived? If so, then no man is, or can be, safe in judging by means of his God-given faculties for judgment, - the sight of his eyes, and the hearing of his ears.

In conclusion, we come to existing facts; to a mountain whose base was laid in the days of Jesus, and whose summit towers aloft in our own view. This is incontestable, and demands an explanation at the mouth of every intelligent man who has no belief in the resurrection of Jesus. Let him not reply that this is no concern of his; with such an answer not even himself can be content. He knows the universally alleged cause of this mighty uprising; of this intellectual, and to a vast extent, moral revolution in the world; he knows that two thousand years backward would place us prior to its birth; and the question presses - it will press - what is the meaning of all this, if I deny that Jesus rose from the dead? Here perplexity sets in; for whether the thing is true or false, the belief of it, and that alone, was the origin and sustaining power of the whole movement. According to some it is of no moment whether Jesus in the body was raised or not; it would suffice to believe that in soul he appeared to his disciples; that in soul he still lives. The futile notion scarce merits a formal confutation. What shall we say to the surprise of His disciples at finding the tomb empty, if such were the foundation of their faith, and the energy of the mission? In this view there would have been no cause of surprise; no ground for rejoicing at victory over death; no motive for faith in a general resurrection of the dead; no sense whatever in hanging their claims upon the resurrection of the crucified body as upon a nail fastened in a sure place. On the contrary the Egyptians and Pythagoras would have been in the right; and the mockery of the Athenians deservedly provoked by Paul's preaching. It will always be difficult, or rather impossible, to satisfy certain thinkers of the utility of the resurrection of the body so long as it is maintained that the soul apart from the body is capable of thousands of years of heavenly felicity. To bliss ineffable and enduring a body could bring no advantage; the reunion must therefore be superfluous. The greatest lights of the Church observed this generations since, and remarked that the inevitable tendency and logical result of belief in the separate and blessed state of the soul is to weaken the force and lead to the ultimate disregard of the actual resurrection of the dead from their graves.

Editor

NOTES ON THE PSALMS.

THIRD ARTICLE. - PS. II.

Jewish commentators, ignoring of course the idea that Jesus of Nazareth is their Messiah, have laboured to prove that the second Psalm relates to David, and is consequently all in the past, and that he is the King referred to in the sixth verse. Thus writes Dr. A. Benisch in the Jewish Chronicle, of January the 29th.

"This Psalm, like Psalm xxi. and cx. and several others, seems to be the production of some court poet or prophet (it must be borne in mind that the two callings were often identical), who speaks in the name of the heaven-appointed King. He, moreover, must have lived after David, but inspired himself with a theme which he borrowed from one of the numerous striking incidents which marked the career of this much-tried and heroic prince. That David was not the author of this Psalm may be inferred from verse six, in which the Lord is introduced as declaring that He had anointed (not "set up," as in the authorised version) His King in Zion, when in reality David was anointed at Hebron (2 Sam. ii. 4), Zion having much later become the royal residence (Ibid vii. 9).

It is conceivable that a poet who lived sometime after David, and to whose mind at the moment was not present the name of the place in which David was anointed, should designate Zion as the place which, in his days, was really the spot on which this rite was performed whenever a new King of Judah ascended the throne. But it is inconceivable that David himself should have forgotten the name of the city in which he was twice anointed, and should ever have introduced the Deity as sharing the same forgetfulness.”

Alas! to what straits are those reduced who, shutting their eyes to New Testament light, attempt to interpret the Psalms by the history of the past, and substitute their own vain imaginings in the place of inspired testimony. To a believer of the Gospel of the Kingdom, nothing can be clearer than that the King referred to in the sixth verse of the second Psalm is Jesus and not David, though the former is not yet an enthroned monarch. If, on the other hand, we are to believe with Dr. Benisch and adopt his supposition that the Psalm was written by someone who lived after David, and who was oblivious of the facts of the case, then we must cast aside the Psalm as altogether unreliable. The objection, however, to the words “set up “ in the text of the authorised version (though it reads anointed in the margin), is not without some force, and calls for a few remarks. The original Hebrew word *nahsach*, so translated, signifies to diffuse, to pour out as a libation, to spread over as a veil or covering, to anoint, and the correct rendering of the word in this place would certainly appear to be anointed, and not “set up.” As a literal fact, neither David nor Jesus were anointed on Zion; the former was anointed with oil at Hebron, and the latter with Holy Spirit, at His baptism in the river Jordan. David has sat on the throne of the Lord in Zion, and reigned as King over Israel, but Jesus, though born a King, and, in the words of the angel to Mary, destined to occupy the same exalted position, has not hitherto answered to the prediction, “He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David. And He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of His kingdom there shall be no end” Luke i. 32, 33. The words “Yet have I set” (or anointed), though in the past tense by no means necessarily imply that the event spoken of has actually taken place, for such a style of writing in relation to things future is frequent in prophecy. For instance, under the influence of the prophetic spirit, Mary the mother of Jesus gave utterance to the following words concerning the child hereafter to be born of her, none of which things are yet come to pass, although spoken of as if realised facts. “He hath shewed strength with His arm; He hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts. He hath put down the mighty from their seats, and exalted them of low degree. He hath filled the hungry with good things, and the rich he hath sent empty away. He hath holpen his servant Israel, in remembrance of His mercy; as He spake to our fathers, to Abraham, and to his seed for ever,” Luke i. 51-55. This manner of using the past tense for the future is peculiar and indicative of the certainty of the events themselves, which are sure to be fulfilled in their season. So the prophet Isaiah says of Jerusalem, “Her warfare is accomplished, her iniquity is pardoned” etc., Is. xl. 2. And again, speaking of the same, “Thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee,” Is. ix. 1. Also in the Psalms, “I have pursued my enemies and overtaken them,” Ps. xviii. 37. Similar instances of this style of speech might easily be multiplied, but these may suffice to establish the point contended for.

The language of the 6th verse of the 2nd Psalm then being in the past tense is no proof of its applicability to David, neither is it any barrier to prevent its application to Jesus. Assuming that it is correct to say anointed and not “set up” in that verse; the next point is to show in what way it applies to Jesus, in view of the fact already mentioned that He was not anointed upon God’s holy hill of Zion. Anointing then was a Jewish ceremony by means of which both persons and things were set apart, marked out or separated for some particular work or purpose. Thus under the Law both Kings and Priests were consecrated to their respective offices, and the different vessels used in divine service were separated from a common to a particular use. The anointing of a person might take place a considerable time before the office was entered upon, as in the case of David, who was anointed by Samuel to be king over Israel several years before he reigned as such; for the anointing took place during Saul’s lifetime, and David reigned seven years in Hebron, over Judah, before he reigned in Jerusalem, over all Israel. After the same analogy a long interval has elapsed since Jesus was anointed with the Holy Spirit and His reign over Israel has not yet even commenced. He has appeared in the character of a Prophet; he now exercises the office of a Priest over his own household, but not until He returns to the earth can He reign as a King. Cyrus, King of Persia, whose name in the Hebrew signifies like the heir, is called in Scripture the Lord’s anointed. See Is. xlv. 1. Though there is no testimony to prove that like the Kings of Israel he was ever actually anointed with oil. He was, however, specially chosen and set apart by the Almighty to perform a work for Him, which Jesus will hereafter accomplish on a more magnificent scale. Of Cyrus it is written, “He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure: even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid. Thus saith the Lord to His anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of Kings, to open before him

the two leaved gates; and the gates shall not be shut; I will go before thee, and make the crooked places straight: I will brake in pieces the gates of brass, and cut in sunder the bars of iron. And I will give thee the treasures of darkness, and hidden riches of secret places, that thou mayest know that I the Lord, which call thee by name, am the God of Israel. For Jacob my servant's sake, and Israel mine elect, I have even called thee by thy name: I have surnamed thee, though thou hast not known me. I have raised him up in righteousness, and I will direct all his ways: he shall build my city and he shall let go all my captives, not for price nor reward, saith the Lord of Hosts." Is. xliv. 28; xiv. 1-4, 13.

These are very remarkable testimonies and have clearly a double fulfilment, firstly in Cyrus and secondly in Christ. Let the expression in the fourth verse of Is. xlv. be particularly noticed, where the Almighty, addressing Cyrus through the Prophet, says, I have surnamed thee. That is to say, I have called thee by a particular name, significant of a special work resembling that which My Son is appointed to perform at a future day. According to Strabo, the original name of Cyrus was Agradates, but in the prophecies of Isaiah it is in the Hebrew Koresh, the surname applied to him by divine command, from the Hebrew letter or particle caph, meaning likeness, and yoraish, an heir. That Jesus is the heir there is no dispute. Now let the reader here call to mind the history of Cyrus, and ask himself the question, did Jesus when on earth perform any exploits resembling those of the great Persian Monarch of antiquity? Did He subdue an empire, raise up another in its stead, and then reign over the subject peoples as a King? Did He issue an edict for the peopling and rebuilding of Jerusalem, or lay the foundation of another temple? Has He in any of these respects resembled Cyrus? Nay, verily, though He has performed many mighty works, they were not of this character. Yet in order for the likeness between Himself and Cyrus to be manifested, and the prophecies to be fulfilled, he must first conquer and then reign over the people, and this is precisely what the second Psalm as well as many other testimonies declare he will do. Concerning His Kingship, when he was before Pilate, and was asked if He were a King, Jesus affirmed in answer, "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice." Jno. xviii. 37.

For this exalted position He was anointed, but when on earth so far from seeking to establish Himself in it, He resisted all overtures of the kind. "When Jesus therefore perceived that they would come and take Him by force to make Him a King, He departed again into a mountain Himself alone." Jno, vi. 15.

This conduct on His part, coupled with the fact which His enemies admitted, that He said He was Christ, a King, proves conclusively, not a denial of His right to reign, but only that the time for exercising it had not then come. At His first appearing He was sent to preach the glad tidings of the Kingdom but not to establish it. Thus He says by the Prophet Isaiah, "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all that mourn; to appoint unto them that mourn in Zion, to give unto them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness; that they might be called trees of righteousness, the planting of the Lord, that He might be glorified." Is. lxi. 1 - 3. In these passages there is a mingling of the fulfilled with the unfulfilled. As recorded by Luke when Jesus stood up in the synagogue at Nazareth on the Sabbath day, and there was delivered unto Him the book of the prophet Esaias, he found the place where the above words were written, but closed the book and sat down when he came to the words "to preach the acceptable year of the Lord," and then stopping short at these words, "He began to say unto them, this day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears." Luke iv. 16-22. Had He read further He could not have spoken thus, for the things that follow will not find their accomplishment until He returns again to the earth.

There are many points of resemblance between the Lord Jesus and Cyrus in the career respectively marked out for them as Jehovah's anointed ones, in the Scriptures of Truth, which are exceedingly interesting to dwell upon in connection with the surname given to the latter; but on the present occasion, we wish to call the reader's attention more particularly to the dealings of the Persian Monarch with the Jews of that day then suffering captivity in Babylon, with the view of comparing them with what is written concerning Jesus when He returns in power and glory to restore the Kingdom again to Israel.

"Now in the first year of Cyrus King of Persia, that the word of the Lord, by the mouth of Jeremiah might be faulted, the Lord stirred up spirit of Cyrus King of Persia, that he made a proclamation throughout all his Kingdom, and put it also in writing, saying, thus saith Cyrus King of Persia, The Lord God of Heaven hath given all the Kingdoms of the earth; and He hath charged me to build Him a house at Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Who is there among you of all His people? His God be with him, and lets him go up to Jerusalem, which is in Judah and build the house of the Lord God of Israel (He is the God) which is in Jerusalem. "Ezra i. 1-3.

From the above and other testimonies in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah, we learn what God accomplished by Cyrus, His anointed. How he caused many of the Jews whom Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, had carried away unto Babylon to come again unto Jerusalem and Judah, every one unto his own city. How the people shouted with a great shout, and praised the Lord, when the foundation of the Lord's house was laid. And though the good work of re-building was interrupted for a time by the adversaries of Judah and Benjamin, yet it was ultimately finished in the sixth year of the reign of Darius, and the dedication of it kept with joy. Thus after the seventy years was accomplished at Babylon, did the Lord visit His people according to His promise, and performed His good word to them in causing them to return to their place. But this was only an earnest and a foretaste of a far greater deliverance to come by the Antitypical Cyrus, the heir of all things, to whom has been given, in the words of the 2nd Psalm, the heathen for an inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession, even the Shiloh, unto whom "shall the gathering of the people be," Gen. xlix 10. In the days of Cyrus the gathering was incomplete and partial; his great Antitype will gather the people not from one province only, but from all the places whither they have been driven, and will leave none of them any more there. "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will perform that good thing which I have promised unto the house of Israel and to the house of Judah. In those days, and at that time, will I cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David; and He shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land. In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely, and this is the name wherewith she shall be called, the Lord our Righteousness. For thus saith the Lord, David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel; neither shall the priests, the Levites, want a man before me to offer burnt offerings, and to kindle meat offerings, and to sacrifice continually," Jer. xxxiii. 14-18. Cyrus laid the foundation of a temple; Jesus also is to build the temple of the Lord, as it is written, "Thus speaketh the Lord of hosts, saying, Behold the man whose name is the Branch, and He shall grow up out of His place, and He shall build the temple of the Lord; even He shall build the temple of the Lord; and He shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon His throne; and He shall be a priest upon His throne," Zec. vi. 12, 13. Cyrus was instrumental in restoring the worship of Jehovah and enabling the Jews to keep their solemn feasts with joy and gladness. How much more will Jesus when, in the words of the prophet Isaiah, "He will make unto all people a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined. And He will destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all people, and the veil that is spread over all nations. He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of His people shall He take away from off all the earth: for the Lord hath spoken it," Is. xxv. 6-8. Cyrus repaired and restored to some extent the city of Jerusalem; Jesus, the Anointed one, whose name is the Branch, will make it the habitation of Deity and the joy of the whole earth; from that day forth, "the name of the city shall be Jehovah-shammah, The Lord is there," Ezek. xlvi. 35. Cyrus greatly befriended the Jews in a time of sore trial and affliction. The Son of God will appear in the darkest time of Jacob's trouble and bring everlasting deliverance. Compared with other great monarchs of antiquity, Cyrus was a "righteous man." Jesus is chief among ten thousand, and altogether lovely. "He will break in pieces the oppressor. He shall come down like rain among the mown grass; as showers that water the earth. In His days shall the righteous flourish; and abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth. All kings shall fall down before Him, all nations shall serve Him and call Him blessed," Ps. lxxii.

Cyrus then, as an anointed of the Lord, has performed all His pleasure, and having served the Lord's purpose in the carrying out of His great plan in the redemption of Israel, has passed into oblivion. He was a fitting instrument for the work which was not destined to be more than temporary. He was God's sword upon the Babylon of that day. Modern Babylon is destined to fall by the hand of Him who is not only a mighty warrior but an everlasting King, as says the prophet Isaiah, "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon His shoulder; and His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God (warrior or conqueror), The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this." Is. 6, 7.

Our conclusion, therefore, is in opposition to that of the writer in the Jewish Chronicle, that the King referred to in the sixth verse of the 2nd Psalm is Jesus, the Messiah, and not David, and that consequently what is written concerning Him is still in the future. That He, Jesus of Nazareth, is the rightful heir to the throne of David, and that He is shortly coming to sit upon it as a King and Priest, and that, moreover, He has been anointed for this very purpose with the Holy Spirit and with power. And so believing and expecting, we heartily join with the Psalmist in exclaiming, "Oh, that the salvation of Israel were come out

of Zion! When God bringeth back the captivity of His people, Jacob shall rejoice, and Israel shall be glad," Ps. liii. 6.

S. G. Hayes.

HOW TO HANDLE THE WORD.

In the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, when the Jews had returned from Babylon to Jerusalem, the priests found the long lost book of the law. And at the eighth verse of the eighth chapter of Nehemiah, we read these words: "So they read in the book of the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading." This is precisely what all men who stand up as teachers of religion should aim to accomplish – to read distinctly, to give the sense, and to cause the people to understand the reading. It is to be feared that this method of handling the oracles of God is not sufficiently practised. If it were, we should hear more of certain grand and cardinal doctrines, about which the old apostles and the older prophets never grew tired of speaking and writing. But many of our religious leaders have become weary of well-doing in this direction; and, instead of reading the Word distinctly, instead of giving the sense, instead of causing the people to understand, they have substituted a kind of light reading, and smooth moralizing, of which it would be hard to say that it often instructs the people or stirs them to a deep sense of their obligations toward God or man. It is our earnest desire, while pointing out the almost universal departure from the good old path, to walk in it ourselves. Truly, my friends, it is a narrow path trodden by few, but those few have the assurance of Christ himself that it leadeth unto life.

Some affirm that our Christianity is too intellectual. By this, we presume, is meant that we demand of our brethren too large a knowledge of the Scriptures; that we should be content with a smaller amount of head work; that we should look less to the brain and more to the heart. We grant the possibility of a mind well informed in Scripture truths and precepts with a heart not subject to their influence. But the common custom is to make too much of the heart, and too little of the head. The design of Christ and His apostles appears to be that the head should be the guide of the heart; in other words, the reason and intellect should control the sentiments and propensities. Paul declares, "For though we walk in the flesh, we do not walk after the flesh. Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ," 2 Cor. x. 3-5. Our readers are familiar, also, with certain sayings of Jesus both to His disciples and to the multitude. To the latter He was wont to say, Hear, and understand; to the former, after teaching them, He would say, Have you understood all these things. Our adversaries think they see in us too great a proneness to the mere letter of the sacred writings, and a neglect of that highest of all morality. Well, let us not be offended, but try by our actions rather than by our words to convince them that they are in error. Certain of the Greek philosophers maintained that a man ought to feel more thankful to his enemies than to his friends; for his friends would hide his faults, but his enemies would expose them. Whilst we are diligent about the letter, let us not be unmindful of the spirit of Christianity,

He that hath ears to hear, let him hear those rich harmonies which still echo from the hill sides around Jerusalem, from the temple, and even from the blood-stained cross. The sublime music rolls upon the ear with every breeze; the burden of it is, "Love thy neighbour as thyself." "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." How simple! How perfect! The world needs no complex system of philosophy and of morals; the balm for all her wounds, the remedy for every ill lies in the practice of this precept, "Do unto others as ye would they should do unto you."

Another charge frequently brought against our preaching is, that it is too controversial. We are bound to admit that in this particular our addresses do present a strong contrast to pulpit oratory in general. The usual style of preaching may be truly said to be almost free from a controversial spirit. And the absence of controversy from the preaching of this age must, if you read and reflect, make you feel that it is very unlike the teaching of Jesus and of Paul. Controversy is quite consistent with all the graces of religion. There is no discord betwixt controversy and meekness. The deepest charity does not jar with a true and righteous spirit of religious controversy; for no man was ever so distinguished both for love and controversy as the man Christ Jesus. But upon this subject there is, in our day, strange misapprehension. It is a popular sentiment that where benevolence, love, and Christian charity exist and flourish, the tongue of controversy should be still. But if we study the life of Paul we shall find all these dwelling together. It would be difficult to show that any of the apostles were more eminent than Paul in all the virtues which make up the bright and tender side of human nature in its best and loveliest development, and surely,

neither among the apostles nor any other class of preachers, was there ever a more persistent controversialist than Paul. It will be sufficient to cite one passage out of numbers under this head. In the first of Thessalonians, second chapter, and second verse, Paul writes, "But even after that we had suffered before, and were shamefully entreated, as we know, at Phillipi; we were bold in our God to speak unto you the gospel of God with much contention." But while Paul contended, and exhorted others to contend earnestly for the faith, he warned them against debate and contention in another spirit. Paul's contentings and disputings were prosecuted from pure and benevolent motives; the gospel demanded such warfare of him; but he was not like some who have been ready to take either side in dispute for the sake of strife; he was not like others who always manifest a spirit of contradiction, whatever subject may come before them. Then let us beware of two things - first, that we do not evade an earnest contention for "the faith once delivered to the saints," with the idea of pleasing men whose practice in relation to this duty is contrary to the example and precept of Christ and His apostles; and, also, that we do not foster that love of debate and strife which Paul denounces, and so give the enemy just ground of complaint.

The last objection we shall notice at present is that we are said to be too precise in doctrine. A full reply to this would open up what we regard as the grand doctrine of the Bible, namely, the personal reign of Christ over all the earth; but upon this theme it is not, now our intention to enter. Our opponents allege that we study doctrine and neglect the love of God and man. They assert that our religion is a religion which passes too lightly over morality. No small responsibility rests with them as judges of us in this matter. But instead of setting up a defence of words against this indictment, let us endeavour to set up one of works. As regards doctrine, we will ask one question, Can you bestow too much attention upon doctrine? We are of opinion that you can no more pay too much heed to Christian doctrines than you can to Christian morals. Christian doctrine, without Christian morals, will never give you life eternal in the kingdom of God, neither will Christian morality, without Christian doctrine, save you from corruption. Paul enjoined Timothy to "give attendance to doctrine." Doctrine was one of those things upon which the Apostle commanded Timothy to "meditate," and to which he added, "give thyself wholly." You will also observe that Paul was very particular about "form of doctrine." On behalf of the believers at Rome, he wrote these emphatic words, "But God be thanked that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you," chap. vi. 17. The tendency of this age, as regards Christian doctrine, is not at all conservative; on the contrary, it is reprehensibly and absurdly liberal. Leaders and people are alike disposed to melt and fuse into one heterogeneous and shapeless mass the silver, the gold, the tin, and the dross. They would fain relieve themselves of the arduous but profitable work of testing, by the searching fire of the word of God, what is presented to them. They wince before the trenchant stroke of that weapon, which is sharper than any two-edged sword, whose edge and point sever and divide betwixt the inmost thoughts and intents of the heart. They prefer bulk to quality. An attenuated gold leaf laid over a large piece of wood is mistaken for a monster nugget of gold; thin layers of corn spread over heaps of sand are supposed to be piles of solid food; in the language of the Revelator, they exclaim, "I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing" - knowing not that they are "wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked." To such we would say listen to the solemn words of the Spirit, "I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire, that thou mayest be rich, and white raiment, that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear; and anoint thine eyes with eyesalve, that thou mayest see." EDITOR.

THE FATHER AND THE SON.

(Continued from March, page 33)

6th. My objectors' notice, that it is an error to suppose that the "Word" and the "Spirit" are interchangeable terms, is not justifiable. It should be convincing enough to all that "The Word" in John i. 14, cannot be explained apart from that in-dwelling of the Holy Spirit with which Jesus was enriched at His baptism, inasmuch as He did not begin to speak the Word until after His baptism, at which time He not only became the fulfilment of the promise or Word of Deity, but the embodiment of that WORD or SPIRIT of Deity, which was with the Deity before the world was.

It is quite true that the term "Word" and the term "Spirit," in an ordinary sense, are not interchangeable, but it is nevertheless there, that the Word of God (not in the sense of the written Word, but) in God's act of commanding, speaking, or communicating is inseparable from His SPIRIT, and they

are, therefore, in this particular sense, interchangeable, as the following passage shows, viz., “By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth.”

7th. His remark that the mission of John the Baptist was not for the purpose of bringing about the change of the Word from spirit into flesh is something I do not understand, as I have nowhere advanced anything calculated to lead one to suppose that the mission of John the Baptist was for such a purpose.

8th. It is quite true that it was the case before transgression as well as after, “that flesh and blood cannot enter the kingdom of God,” but, nevertheless, it is just to remark, as a reason for my use of the statement in the place I put it, that after the transgression, the truth of the matter was by the effects of the transgression rendered intensely vivid. If so apt to the green tree, how much more apt for the dry.

9th. His statement that “a vast amount of unlearned wisdom written about Jesus not suffering the penalty of Adam’s transgression,” as leading to “the conclusion that ‘without shedding of blood’ there could have been remission of sins,” seems to me as if in the much learning that comes necessarily up in contrast with the “vast amount of unlearned wisdom,” there is nothing to be desired, seeing, from what follows, it deranges the ideas. In the objections referred to we have got blood confounded with life, and the blood of Jesus is made to appear as having differed from that which flowed in the veins of His mother, though it is a fact that the babe while in the womb was built up by her blood. Whose blood was shed? inquires my objector, as if the blood of Jesus differed from the blood of the first Adam. I answer, Jesus was of the same flesh and blood as His brethren (Heb. ii. 14-16); but His life was not forfeited as Adam’s was, or as His brethren’s were. The life is in the blood, but the blood is not in the life, save by a figure of speech, as when a cup is used for what it contains. (Such a figure of speech, I believe, is called by the learned a synecdoche.) In Levit, xvii. 11, we are told the life is in the blood, and, in the 14th verse, the blood is for the life, the meaning of which should at least be apparent to the learned, if “unlearned, wisdom” cannot understand it.

Jesus, in possessing a free life, possessed everything belonging to it, and therefore the blood which He poured out was His own. Adam, in forfeiting his life, lost possession of everything belonging to it, and therefore he could not pour out that which was not his own.

10th. Baptism into Moses may be better understood by looking at it from what is understood by Baptism into Jesus Christ. Both mean introduction and then submission to certain forms of doctrine. We are baptised into what Jesus taught, and as He taught concerning Himself, we are therefore necessarily baptised into Himself. Those who were baptised into Moses were also baptised into what Moses taught, but as Moses did not set himself forth as an object of faith, the Israelites were not in him after the same fashion as believers are in Jesus. They were only under him, and were judged by the law he was appointed to give them. Into this condition of things they were introduced by the baptism spoken of, and were thereby individually and nationally put into the like circumstance Adam was put when in the garden of Eden - he was first placed under law, thence, by this means, when they transgressed, they became sinners “after the similitude of Adam’s transgression.” Their baptism cut off their relationship in which they previously stood, in common with all other nations and all other men, to the penalty passed on Adam, and made them amenable to a penalty annexed to their own individual transgressions. Such were in the world all along. Men, all men, were as much individual sinners before the Mosaic law came into force as after it, but, until the law, eternal extinction did not come upon them for those transgressions, but on account of their relationship to Adam, on whom the sentence was first passed. And so it is still with those who know not God, and are alien from the commonwealth of Israel, as, for example, infants, idiots, and the like. These cannot be said to have any transgression of their own, properly so called, and yet when they die they receive the wages of sin, viz., eternal extinction. They pass into their natural inheritance. Born in Adam, they lie down in Adam, to rise no more.

But here we are told, as if it were any argument to the point, that “it is absurd to infer from anything Paul has written, that there was no law from Adam to Moses, because there is no record of any written law.” This seems to imply, that my objector imagines that before the law death, the punishment for sin, came upon all men, not on account of their relationship to Adam, but because of their own individual transgressions, and that, therefore, there must have been a law in the world, the transgression of which was met by the punishment of eternal extinction. Now, it is very easy, in confounding things which differ, to imagine a thousand fallacies where none exist. It certainly would be very absurd to infer from anything Paul has written that there was no law in the world from Adam until Moses. Paul does not say, “until law sin was in the world,” but until the law, and I have nowhere advanced anything to the contrary. The question is not, Was there any law from Adam until Moses? but, Was there such a law to which was annexed, for the transgression thereof, the punishment of eternal death? I say, No. Paul says, “until the law sin was in the world.” He admits that virtually there was transgression of the law all along. But he denies that this was put to account against any man until the law came. And then, to meet the difficulty

which at first sight there appears, namely, that if sin could not be “imputed” while there was no law, why was death the punishment for sin permitted to reign? This he answers by affirming that Adam the first was a type of the second Adam, and thence reasons that before the law judgment came upon all men, not because of their own offences, but by the offence of one. But when the law came it entered that the offence might abound, that is, as I understand it, there might be brought home to every man under the law his own offences and individual responsibility, and so, as he might see it was for his own offences solely, and not for Adam’s, he, if not partaker of the free gift, was condemned to eternal extinction. This line of argument, however, is contradicted in an April production (of which afterwards I hope to give a better account), on the grounds of a false assumption, viz., that, “in a country where forgery and murder are punishable with death, a man is found guilty of both these crimes, and is hung for them, that he suffers death for only one of them;” and that, if he received a reprieve, “the reprieve would be practically useless, if he was reprieved for only one of the crimes.” But this simile is of no value. In the first place human law, such as is common in civilized and educated nations, does not try a man for two crimes at one and the same time, and, if the two crimes are each worthy of death, and the criminal is found guilty of one, it does not proceed to try him again for the other crime in order to pass the sentence of death twice. Such a proceeding as this would never be dreamed of by men of experience, and could only be excused in those who, so far from proving themselves right, are unable to define the position in which they stand.

If the Israelites were guilty by inheritance of Adam’s first sin, and were condemned for it in common with all other men, it was not necessary for them to be condemned a second time for their own offences. It is, however, evident a posteriori that in their baptism into Moses they did receive - if we may so call it according to the simile - a reprieve. And, inasmuch as a reprieve cannot undo the crime so forgiven, nor destroy the moral and physical effects of that crime, so the baptism into Moses, though it did not, nor could not, undo the moral and physical effects of Adam’s sin, it nevertheless altered the position of the Israelites in their inherited relation to it, and transferred them from the penalty annexed thereto to that annexed to the transgression of the Mosaic law. The moral and physical effects of a crime on the criminal are by no means necessarily the moral and physical effects of the punishment judicially annexed to the crime. The sin of Adam would have had its moral and physical effects on him and his posterity though no sentence had been passed. And hence, though death is in our nature, and is physically transmitted, this by no means implies that “the Edenic sentence of death is in our nature,” and so cannot be removed. Adam was sentenced to die and to return to the dust, and Jesus was sentenced to die and not see corruption, are the two sentences identical? If one class, by reason of physical effects, transmitted from a preceding act on the part of one to whom they are physically related, die, and in the process of time by the act of another restored; is this identical with the death of those who, under different circumstances, become for ever extinct? Now, as this was the Edenic sentence of death, who can disprove it? On what ground of justice can it be called “a contradiction” to “believe Christ had the same nature as ourselves,” and yet did not die “under the Edenic sentence of death?”

Then, again, as to the children of the Israelites. It is asked, on the assumption some died before they became responsible to the law, “Whence came their death?” It is here triumphantly affirmed they must have died under the Adamic penalty, but the triumph is short. The Israelitish children were related morally to their parents as well as physically. Until they came of age they were subject to their parents, and the parents had to answer for them (John ix. 21). During this period they were partakers of the effects of their parents’ crimes as well as of their virtues (Deut. xxviii. 4 18, etc). Of what the parents partook, either of blessing or cursing, the children shared. Take, for example, the destruction of the tabernacle of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. In that catastrophe not only the wives, the sons, but the little children all perished. And so I conclude that the little ones which died, died under the Mosaic condemnation, because their parents did.

For this digression to meet the antagonism of a contemporary 1, however, beg to be excused, and reverting to the imagination that I conceived there was no law from Adam until Moses, and to the arguments used to show there was, I now inquire, “To what purpose are the punishments on the Antediluvians and Sodomites set forward? I am told they are testimonies to the existence of Law. True, they are. But are they testimonies to the existence of the law of death common to all men? Are they witnesses to the sentence passed on Adam and his natural posterity? This is the question. Do they explain why the children of the Antediluvians were involved in the general ruin? Does the horrible tempest on the cities of the plain explain why the children who were no partners of their parents’ guilt were made to suffer for their parents’ crime? And do these punishments, which evidently were for sins against the laws of nature and society, explain the reason of eternal death in other circumstances where no such crimes have been committed? Punishments in this life are one thing, and such come from God as

well as from man (Numbers xvi. 29, 30), - the penalty which involves all who know not God, (however good they may be after a kind,) in eternal extinction, is another thing.

11th. The statement “that upon the day of transgression God took Adam out of himself,” etc., is against the whole plan of salvation. God, by His promise and by covering the guilty pair with the skins of slain animals, but pointed to the way opened for Adam’s escape from out of himself, by the exercise of faith. It was the gospel as it were preached to him, which he had first to hear and then believe. And the Israelites’ baptism into Moses had the same purpose for the nation in the numerous sacrifices that were introduced after the first transgression of the law, like as the skins of the slain were for the covering of the first pair. For “until the law” the shedding of blood in sacrifice was not so clearly set forth as to occasion the omission of it on the part of the sons of God, a sin. For before the law, though sacrifices are here and there mentioned, faith seemed in a great measure to stand in the place of shedding of blood, much as it now stands, namely, in the attitude of taking hold of a covenant that had no force save through the shedding of Jesus Christ’s blood. (To be continued.) - W. D. J.

HEBREWS II. 16.

“Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; And deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham. - Hebrews 2:14-16.

The verse in question is an explanation of verse 14, and requires the one who takes hold in both cases to be the same. Death is not that which takes hold in the 14th verse, as that would amount to death took part of flesh and blood, that through (the suffering of) death, he or it might destroy death.

This does not carry conviction to my mind. On the other hand, seeing that flesh and blood is the thing taken hold of, Jesus could not either take hold of actively nor become so passively, as He had no existence either to act or submit to be acted upon.

Why ignore the fact that the Almighty Redeemer took hold of a daughter of Abraham, and by her produced a son? Nothing else will meet the case.

What is death but the legal executioner of the Almighty’s broken law.

Jesus’ brethren were legally dead, but it was not a necessity that He should be like His brethren in this particular, as, instead of destroying death, it would as certainly have destroyed Him, as it did them. So that the phrase, “It behoved Him to be made as or like to His brethren,” simply applies to the fact of being flesh and blood or a man. W. ELLIS.

DR. THOMAS’ NICHE.

To gratify the wishes of a certain section of our readers, we shall print from time to time selections from the writings of our late brother Doctor Thomas, and to give them due prominence and method they will always appear under the heading Dr. Thomas’ Niche. We shall not mutilate or mend the selections we publish; but whether they conflict with anything by the same writer, or with anything we ourselves may have to say, no matter; as they are, so they will re-appear. We make a beginning with :-

FORTY QUESTIONS ON IMMORTALITY.

1. Who is immortal? Ans. - “The King eternal, IMMORTAL, invisible, the ONLY WISE GOD.” 1 Tim. 1:17.
2. Are not all men possessed of immortality? Ans. - “The blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords ; who ONLY HATH IMMORTALITY.” 1 Tim. 1: 16.
3. Are not all men created immortal? Ans. - He “ONLY hath immortality.” 1 Tim. 6 : 16.

- 4.** Is there any way by which men may obtain immortality? Ans. - "To us are given exceeding great and precious PROMISES, that by these ye might be partakers of the Divine Nature having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust." 2 Peter 1 : 4.
- 5.** Is this immortality revealed by Plato or Socrates, or by "familiar" rapping "spirits," or in nature - or is it through Jesus Christ and his Gospel? Ans. - "By the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished DEATH, and hath brought LIFE and IMMORTALITY to light through the GOSPEL." 2 Tim. 1:10.
- 6.** Who hath power to bestow immortality upon man? Ans. - "The Gift of GOD is ETERNAL LIFE through Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 6 : 23.
- 7.** Will God give this gift to all persons, whatever their works may be? Ans. - God will render to every man according to his deeds. Rom. 2 : 6.
- 8.** What will be the portion of those who are contentious and obey not the truth? Ans. - "Indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth EVIL." Rom. 2: 8, 9.
- 9.** To whom will impart immortality? Ans. - "To them who by patient continuance in WELL DOING SEEK for glory and honour and IMMORTALITY." Rom. 2 : 7.
- 10.** What shall be their reward? Ans. - "ETERNAL LIFE." Rom. 2:7.
- 11.** Upon what conditions may we obtain this blessing? Ans. - "FIGHT the good fight of Faith; lay hold on ETERNAL LIFE." 1 Tim'. 6 : 12.
- 12.** When do men obtain immortality? Is it at Death or at the Resurrection? Ans. - "The DEAD shall be raised INCORRUPTIBLE." 1 Cor. 15: 52.
- 13.** How shall those who are not dead become incorruptible ? Ans. - "We shall be CHANGED." 1 Cor. 15 : 52.
- 14.** When shall this change take place? Ans. - "At the last TRUMP." 1 Cor. 15: 52.
- 15.** How suddenly will the change occur? Ans. - "In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed." 1 Cor. 15: 52.
- 16.** Will this be a change of the internal or the external and physical or corruptible man? Ans. - "This corruptible must PUT ON INCORRUPTION." 1 Cor. 15 : 53.
- 17.** What then, becomes immortal? Ans. - "This MORTAL must put on IMMORTALITY." 1 Cor. 15: 53.
- 18.** What Scripture will be fulfilled when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this MORTAL shall have put on IMMORTALITY ? Ans. - "Then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, death is swallowed up in VICTORY." 1 Cor. 15:56. Isaiah 25: 8.
- 19.** Who will be raised from the dead? Ans. - "All that are in the GRAVES shall hear his voice, and shall come forth." John 5 ; 28,29.
- 20.** Will the unburied arise ? Ans. - The sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell (the grave) delivered up the dead which were in them." Rev. 20 : 13.
- 21.** Will different classes of characters arise in the resurrection? Ans. - "There shall be a resurrection of the dead both of the JUST and UNJUST." Acts 24: 15.
- 22.** For what purpose will the good be raised? Ans. - "They that have done good unto the resurrection of LIFE." John 5:29.
- 23.** To what will others be raised? Ans. - "They that have done evil unto the RESURRECTION of DAMNATION."
- 24.** Will a man's destiny at last be in accordance with his previous life? Ans. - "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also REAP." Gal. 6 : 7.
- 25.** What shall be the portion of the ungodly? Ans. - "He that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap CORRUPTION." Gal. 6: 8.
- 26.** What the reward of the saint? Ans - "He that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life EVERLASTING." Gal. 6: 8.
- 27.** Where is now the Christian's life? Ans. - "Your life is hid with Christ in God;" Col. 3 : 3.
- 28.** How then should we live? Ans. - "Let us not be weary in well doing; for in due season ye shall reap if we faint not:" Gal. 6 : 9.
- 29.** What will be the fate of those who by sowing to the flesh reap corruption? Ans. - "These, as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed . . . shall UTTERLY PERISH in their own corruption. 2 Pet. 2: 12.
- 30.** Is it possible for man to be utterly destroyed? Ans. - "Fear Him which is able to destroy both SOUL and BODY in hell:" Matt. 10: 28.
- 31.** What is the wages of sin? Ans. - "The wages of sin is death;" Rom. 6: 23.
- 32.** Is this death merely a bodily death? Ans. - "The SOUL that sinneth it shall DIE." Ezek. 18: 4.

33. If the wicked turn away from his wickedness and do right, what then? Ans. - "He shall save his soul ALIVE." Ezek. 18: 27.
34. "When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity and dieth in them:" what shall be his fate ? Ans. - "FOR his iniquity that he hath done shall he DIE." Ezek. 18 : 26.
35. As he first dies in his iniquity and then dies for his iniquity, what must this last death be called? Ans. - "The SECOND death." Rev. 21:8.
36. What is the result attained by the man who converteth a sinner from the error of his ways? Ans. - "He shall save a SOUL from DEATH, and shall hide a multitude of sins." Jas. 5: 20.
37. What then has God placed before us to excite us to action? Ans. - "I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and DEATH, blessing and cursing; therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may LIVE." Deut. 30: 19.
38. How does God manifest His love to men? Ans. - "God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish but have everlasting life." John 3:16.
39. What is our Saviour's complaint concerning mankind? Ans. - "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me. And ye will not come to me, that ye might have LIFE." John 5 : 39, 40.
40. What is the command of God to all? Ans. - "Cast away from you all your transgressions, whereby you have transgressed; and make you a new heart and a new spirit; for why will ye die, O house of Israel? For I have no pleasure in the DEATH of him that dieth, saith the Lord God; wherefore turn yourselves and LIVE YE." Ezek. 19: 31, 32.
41. Are there any passages that teach man's immortality ? Ans. - Yes. How many? Ans. - One, Gen. 3:4, "Ye shall not surely die."
42. Who is the author, God, or the Devil? Ans - The Devil. Does he speak the truth? Ans. - No, he was a liar from the beginning. John 8: 44.

BRO. FARMER'S EXHORTATION.

It is by the mercy and love of our Heavenly Father, that we are here met together around this table in health and strength, and are permitted to worship Him in peace and quietness, (and I am glad to say in goodly numbers we are thus met,) and by partaking of these emblems to commemorate Him who died for us. It is one of the greatest privileges saints can enjoy, because it reminds them of the love of their Heavenly Father, and thus increases their love to Him in return. And what follows? Good works, and love to one another. There is no meeting more calculated to strengthen us for the work of life, and inspire us with patience under trial; and to unite us in one loving, happy family. Our solemn duty on such occasions is to worship God in spirit, for only spiritual worship can be acceptable to Him.

The occasion is a most solemn one. The first thing is to pray - to thank God for His great love in allowing us thus to meet together, - to ask that His blessing may rest on all we do; also, to pray for one another.

Have we each really joined in that prayer? Have our thanks for His goodness, and prayer for His blessing, been real or merely formal?

The next thing is to sing. Did we sing simply for the love of music, or with grace in our hearts unto the Lord?

Then we read God's Word. Did we read it attentively; with a desire to learn; or parrot-like, just to get through the chapters? To read it with profit it is essential that our motive should be pure, even to learn the mind and will of God.

After reading comes the contribution. There is worship even in this, that is, if we contribute cheerfully in proportion to the extent God has blessed us, and out of love for the interests of the truth. "The Lord loveth a cheerful giver."

Then comes the breaking of bread, before which we give thanks. Did we really follow our Brother in the thanks and prayer? Did we discern in that bread the Lord's body which was broken for us? We naturally ask, Why was that body broken? When we remember that it was in order that we might attain unto eternal life, the warmest gratitude ought indeed to fill each breast.

We then take the cup, having returned thanks for the out-poured blood of our Lord and Saviour, which it represents to our hearts. If our thanks were not real, we indeed eat and drink unworthily. By constant attendance on this ordinance, our interest in the truth is kept up. Absentment tends to promote

disinclination to come, until we keep away altogether. Let us never forget our serious responsibility thus to remember Him who has done so much for us.

The partaking of these emblems was followed by the singing of a most beautiful hymn. Did we each sing it with the love of God in our hearts? It was a mockery if we did not, and we had better not sing at all than that such should have been the case ?

Then follows the exhortation. This needs to be done in a right spirit, not simply to make a fine speech to please one another. Let us earnestly attend to the exhortations given. I am sure we shall find them productive of happy results, we shall be strengthened thereby, and a better spirit manifested - being united in one loving, happy family - meet in greater numbers, and more regularly.

Brethren, we have need to thank God that we have been brought into such a grand position, having come to know God, whom to know is life eternal; become His adopted sons; closely allied to Christ, through whom we inherit all things. How blamelessly we ought to walk. We do well to examine ourselves, that we may see wherein we are lacking. If we do this in a humble, prayerful spirit, good cannot fail to come of it. Paul helps us in so doing, for he presents to us a "perfect man" in Christ. He does this in various ways. One aspect is that of a soldier in full armour, Eph. vi. 12-16. In his letter to the Colossians, iii. 9-10, he tells each brother that he "has put off the old man with his deeds, and has put on the new man which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him." The other proceeds to enumerate a beautiful spiritual dress of five garments, verse 12. "Put on, therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies," to encourage in us that disposition which is ever ready to forgive, having even a yearning heart to forgive; not soon taking offence, but rather pitying those who have offended against us. "Kindness," that is another garment; encouraging in us a disposition to contribute to the happiness of one another. "Humbleness," that is another; submissive to God whether in health or sickness, in riches or poverty. "Meekness" is also enjoined; softness of temper, not soon irritated by provocation. We are apt to misunderstand each other. How needful that we should be ready to put the most favourable construction upon what others do and say. Let us not be suspicious of one another. "Long-suffering," patient under injuries for a long time. If these things obtain with us, what is stated in the next verse will be sure to follow. Five beautiful garments, but there is still another - "Put on 'charity,' which is the bond of perfection." Just let us fancy each brother and sister attired in this spiritual dress. What a happy and prosperous state of things would obtain; what peace and joy, and not only so, but how the truth would spread.

Let us admonish one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs. We are about to sing again. Let us do it with the love of God in our hearts. "Whatsoever ye do, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, giving thanks to God and the Father by Him."

THE SECOND PART OF MR. PATON'S LETTER.

I think there is a vital principle involved here, the oversight of which is the great cause of disunion, discord, and strife among all sects of professing Christians; this spirit of life which incorporated in Jesus being begotten by the Deity, must have a beginning. It began with Jesus, as I said before, at His conception; it begins with us through being taught in some way to know God the Father and His Son. By this teaching our mind is changed from the vain glorious and independent boasting, which is natural to the fleshy mind, to the fear of God, our only helper and Saviour through Jesus Christ the Lord. But Paul, and indeed all the Apostles, and Jesus Himself, teaches another principle in connection with this moral reformation, and that is, the Spirit of Life which sustained Jesus, and enabled Him to continue faithful. It was not merely a moral power, it is also a physical power which is spoken of as an earnest foretaste of the inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession. See Eph. i. 13, 14, also 2nd Cor. 21, 22, 5th chap. 5th verse, also see Romans 8, 7th to 15th verses, you will notice the 11th verse which says, "If the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Jesus from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you." Now, sir, what can be inferred from these passages. The only inference I can draw is that we must, as a condition, be the recipients of that physical power, called the Spirit of Him who raised Jesus from the dead, and it must dwell in us in order that we be quickened by it from mortal to immortality. But I infer from your remarks in reference to our old friends in Listowell, Ont., that you do not believe all that is said by the Prophets, Jesus, and Apostles concerning the promise of the Holy Spirit, and if you did it would be hard to convince you that these friends had it. It is claimed by some of your friends that a society of peculiar people has done as great

feats as that done by our friends claiming to have the Holy Spirit. Now upon the same principle of reasoning, we might also doubt that it was given to Jesus and the Apostles, and a great number of their brethren of whom the Scripture testifies had the gift. Now if you could lay down a plan by which we might know whether they had it or not, it might be some satisfaction to a party like me who believes that the promise is as assuredly made as any other promise recorded in the book; and although I do not profess to have any such a gift, neither do I know that those who claim to have it have any right to such a claim. I dare not dispute them, however, having no evidence either for or against in the case. But I am satisfied that unless a return of that gift is come or about to come soon, there will not a soul of us be saved. Take a retrospective view of things in connection with the Christadelphian body, or rather bodies, and I think you will confess there never was a time in the world's history when the Holy Spirit was more wanted than since those known by that name came into existence. We discuss, debate, and contend and strive for our individual dogmas and opinions. We all profess to appeal to the same infallible source, but we return again, as a general thing, more and more strengthened and confirmed in our opinions. We form new opinions which upset all previous ones; we dig up the old foundation and lay new ones; some of us have been immersed three and four times, and every time satisfied that we have good reason for the new step until it becomes a doubt as to whether or no we have found the rock bottom, or whether it can be found at all. This is the condition of things in my experience. Is it not fair to conclude after all this, that something is wanting, and if we should find, after a fair and fearless investigation of the points of doctrine above referred to that a promise has been left us and utterly overlooked through false teaching a promise of that which was the only bond of peace of that that settled all disputes either in regard to government or teaching of the ancient Church, a promise of that that can alone confirm the fact whether or not we are in the body of the Christ. I say, could this be found, would there not be great cause for regret on the one hand, and great rejoicing on the other, that we had found at least a reason to hope for order and peace in place of discord and confusion. I did not intend to write so long a letter, and hope you will excuse this intrusion upon your time and may be your patience. - I remain, yours, in hope of brighter days, PETER PATON.

REMARKS.

Every reader of the foregoing will conclude that the writer of it is a firm believer in the gift of the Spirit; but our correspondent differs from some who believe this doctrine, namely, he does not pretend to be a possessor of such gifts himself, nor does he know anybody who does possess them. He seems to think there is no evidence either for or against. Still, while firmly holding this belief, Mr. Paton invites us to invent some plan by which it may be certainly known whether an individual who claims these powers is speaking the truth or not. This demand upon our inventive faculty is happily for us superfluous. Christ Himself has laid down a rule which will answer the purpose if it is fairly applied. "By their fruits ye shall know them." Can our modern "Spiritist or the progeny of Sceva in ancient days, equal the mighty deeds performed by Moses, Elijah, Christ, Peter, and Paul? They can, we grant, perform a few "tricks," "magnetise" and "mesmerise," so can others who lay no claim to the Holy Spirit. Indeed there are honest professors of the latter class continually exposing and denouncing the religious pretensions of the former in connexion with the same arts: we wonder what has become of the "Swedish brother who could speak Chinese" and of his patron the trine-immersionist. Ought it not to be patent to every man of common sense that all such professions are vain and often wicked. How long could Apostolic power be hid if it existed in this age of steam and lightning. The only sense in which a man can now have the Spirit is by being filled with the Word and the disposition it inculcates. But none can truly say that they have it in the miraculous sense. It does not now dwell with flesh as "a physical power." That we should disbelieve the promises of the Spirit made by the prophets, God forbid. Joel foretold an outpouring on "all flesh" of Israel, which was partially fulfilled in the days of Peter, and will be fulfilled when Jesus reappears in our world. But who can "prophesy;" who can "dream dreams" that are "visions of Elohim" nowadays. To deny the gifts in question to the Apostles on the same ground that they are denied to modern pretenders would be unjust, for the operations are not the same. In some instances, such as the multiplying bread and flesh, turning water into wine, raising the dead, opening the eyes of the blind, making the deaf hear, these are not even attempted; and the things which are done are either counterfeit or they come within the range of scientific knowledge. In conclusion we fully concur in the observations of Mr. Paton respecting the spirit of strife and division at work in our midst, and should hail most cordially the introduction of any sound remedy. But there is a remedy if men would only use it. The mischief is they foment sedition from base motives - a carping, tyrannising temper, befitting the cruel chieftains of some barbarous horde, rather than the professed followers of the meek and lowly Jesus. While this disposition is rife there cannot be

much advancement, or much unity and when the day does break for shedding those ancient spiritual gifts it is to be feared that some will be handed over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh and possibly the spirit too.

EDITOR.

THE REVEALED MYSTERY,

Or the Key given by John to unlock the hard passages concerning Jesus.

“In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.”

“Logos signifies the outward form by which the inward thought is expressed; also the inward thought itself” (Eureka, vol. 1, page 90). Ordinarily speaking, a purpose is conceived by reasoning, and then revealed by speech. The Word is first a purpose, then made known by speech, and when completed and perfected becomes that which was first conceived.

In order to understand the conception of the Deity, we go to the memorial name: “He who shall be our mighty one, is one who shall be, - Certain mighty ones are promised to Israel, - Who led to glory by the captain of their salvation is the One Yahweh, - Of these Elohim one is the first-born, Eloah in chief, - and this Eloah is the great theme of prophecy. His manifestation was predicted in the promise of the woman’s seed, in Isaac, the Royal Shiloh from Judah, the Star of Jacob, the Son assured to David, born of a virgin, and to rule upon His throne. In the fulness of time, Deity sent forth His son, made of a woman, and His name was called Jesus.” Thus Logos became flesh, and dwelt among us. Was the product, therefore, not Deity? (Eureka vol. 1., page 101.) In other words: As the memorial shews the purpose of the Deity was to manifest Himself in the Adamic race; when the manifestation was accomplished was it not Deity?

Jesus said to Nicodemus, “ No man hath ascended into Heaven, except the Son of Man, who is in Heaven.” Jno. iii. 13. How could the Son of Man be in Heaven, while on earth talking to Nicodemus? The same as Deity can be in Heaven, yet everywhere present by His Spirit; because the Spirit was not given by measure to Jesus, yet all power emanates from the Father; hence Jesus truly said, “Of mine own self I could do nothing.” The Spirit of Deity is the one great power of the universe. There is but one Power, - Jesus said, I and my Father are one. One what? One Power (AIL). The Deity announces the fact of the oneness of the Power, when He made Himself known to Abraham as Ail Shaddai, which signifies the strength of the Powerful Ones. The Power was One, yet the mediums through which it was manifested were many (see Phanerosis, page 16).

We find, then, that it was the purpose of the Deity to manifest Himself in the Adamic race; and those in whom He manifest’s Himself will constitute the One Yahweh.” Jesus the Anointed was the great central purpose. Paul says, “Favor was granted Him to make all see what the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid with God, who created all things by Jesus Christ. According to the Eternal purpose which He purposed in Jesus Christ our Lord.” (Eph. iii. 9-11.) “He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world.” (i, 4.)

We find, then, that the purpose which was with Deity, when completed, would be Deity. John says, “The Word became flesh, and dwelt among us;” and when John wrote Jesus had descended into Hades, “and ascended up where He was before,” John therefore represented the Word in its three connections: - first, simply a conception; second, with whom conceived; third, the thing itself.

In the beginning was the Word (inward thought), and the Word was with Deity (by whom it was conceived) and the Word was Deity (when completed), although not yet fully completed, as shown by the memorial name, yet Jesus, the great theme of prophetic promise, though, by (reason of), and on account of whom, were all things created and made, - was fully perfected when John wrote.

This brings the conception of the Deity before the mind in two aspects, 1st, the ministry of Deity before manifestation, 2nd, the ministry of Deity after manifestation.

Before manifested, it was a revealed purpose. After manifestation, it was the Lord from Heaven.

Jesus “proceeded forth and came from God,” as the outward expression of the inward conception, a manifestation of Deity in flesh. The LOGOS.

“All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that is made.” (Jno. i. 3.) This agrees with Paul, who says in Col. i. 13, “for by Him were all things created that are in the Heavens, and that are in earth, visible or invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities, or

powers, all things are created by Him, and for Him, and he was before all things, and by Him all things consist.” How could this be possible when Matthew and Luke tells us that Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea, in the days of Herod the King? Paul says in Eph. iii. 9, GOD created all things BY Jesus Christ. So the Messiah was the great revealed purpose of the Deity, through, by (reason of), and on account of - whom, all the rest were created.

If Eph. iii. 9-11, be transposed, it, will fully explain the position. Paul says favour was granted “him to make all see the fellowship of the ministry to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in the Heavens might be known by the ecclesia, the manifold wisdom of God, which from the beginning hath been hid in God WHO CREATED ALL THINGS BY Jesus Christ, according to the Eternal PURPOSE which He PURPOSED IN Christ Jesus our Lord.” Here Paul speaks of a ministry, which was Christ, through whom the wisdom of the Deity was focalized, and which from the beginning was hid with God. In what manner was the Messiah hid in Deity.

John says in the beginning was LOGOS (inward thought or conception) and the Logos was with Deity.

John and Paul both refer to the beginning, and this beginning doubtless refers to the renovation of the earth for the reception of the Adamic creation. Now as everything depends upon the inward thought or will of Deity, and this conception was revealed to man, and the revelation shows that the purpose of Deity was to make manifest Himself in certain ones of the Adamic race through one whom he should raise up of the “seed of the woman.” Is it probable that the Logos spoken of by John was literally God until that which was conceived was fashioned and brought forth, and stood as the outward expression by which Deity manifested His glorious conception.” “The Word made flesh; God with us.” That the conception, - which was the mystery hid in God from the beginning - should be spoken of as though it pre-existed, under such circumstances, is in many instances inevitable; and our language of to-day will afford many parallels. The finance of the United States has been much disturbed by the Northern Pacific Railroad. Yet there is no such Road in existence, except as a conception. So when we consider that the Messiah was the great purpose of the Deity, in whom the whole Adamic creation centred, and that He should be Deity in manifestation, it is inevitable that the Prophets of Israel should, in their revelation concerning Him, speak of Him as if He were really in existence.

Especially will this be seen to be the case, when we consider that the Elohim who appeared to Abraham, Moses, and the Prophets, were endowed with the great name of the Deity, with which in due time the Messiah was to be invested, and “we through him.”

It is not strange, then, that the Spirit in the Prophets should apply the great and terrible name to the Messiah, Elohim and Deity interchangeably.

But, it can be asked, what objection can you have to admitting that the “Word was God before it was made flesh”? This far I can admit it. To illustrate: - The Board of Supervisors of - - County, have conceived the building of a Court House. Now the Court House may exist as a design for ten years, and after its completion, as individual might say with truth, “this is the House that has been agitating the people of - - County for the last ten years,” although it may not have been built two weeks. So John could say with truth “this is he of whom I said, after me cometh a man who is preferred before me, because He was before me. Now, Jesus the Messiah, was the chief Eloah of the prophecies from the beginning, John comes in as a sequence. But to admit that the Word spoken of here to have been the One God, before it was made flesh, creates confusion in logic. For instance: “Theos became flesh,” or “Theos was made flesh;” was there any part of God that was not made flesh? If the Word always existed as God, when God became flesh, was He anything but flesh? If He was, He was not made flesh.

If a man could make himself into a horse, would he be anything but a horse? But if man had the power, and should propose to bring forth of horseflesh, a horse in which all his own attributes were manifested, the result might truly be called a man in horseflesh manifestation.

Jesus said to the Jews, “Before Abraham was I am.” That Jesus here alludes to His pre-existence as the conception of the Father, foreshadowed in the promise to the antediluvian world, as the “seed of the woman.” “The Man, the Lord,” will be seen on a moment’s consideration. The I of this passage, must be same I of verses 54 and 55, and reference to this same pre-existence had just been spoken of by Jesus in verse 56, but not extending so far back: “Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and saw it, and was glad.” Abraham saw it afar off, foreshadowed in the promises (see Heb. xi. 13).

But John says, “The Word was God - in the beginning.” Exactly; when blank township was organised, they formed a design; that design was a Town-hall in the beginning, but eventually became a church. A design is not actually a town-hall; yet if to conceive were to perform it would be. With God, to conceive is to do. A conception is not God! No, when first conceived, the Word was not God actually; yet with God who speaks of those things that are not as though they were, it was; the same as Abraham

was called the father of many nations, when he was such only in the conception of the Deity, and not actually.

“For unto you is born this day a Saviour, who is Christ the Lord.” Who is He? “The Anointed, the Who I will be;” Luke ii. 11.

Deity had had many anointed ones in Israel, but the Spirit here declares this is the Anointed, the Who I will be; hence, being the only begotten, Jesus stands by this avowal the chief Eloah promised in the memorial.

“But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall He come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting; 1 Micah v.

The question arises what the goings forth has relation to. Do they relate to us? If so, was there ever a time that there was no goings forth in relation to us? It will, perhaps, be well to consider, in connection with this passage, Eph. iii. 11, - “According to the eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord.” What is an “eternal purpose?” It must be a purpose that has always existed; yet the very idea that it was purposed shows that it had a beginning, and previous to that beginning it was not. So with the text in Micah. The goings forth have been from some period; previous to that, “HE that is to come forth unto ME,” had no existence. Therefore the “from of old “ is OLD as regards man, but not Deity, and the words “from everlasting” cannot signify from an existence without beginning.

The language here used by the Spirit shewed clearly to Israel, that the ruler who was here spoken of was the one promised of old, and not the promise of a new ruler. Although the Israelites knew the Messiah would come of the tribe of Judah, yet they had never before been informed that He should come out of Bethlehem.

FRANK CHESTER

Kankakee, April 15th, 1875.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

J. B. enquires our views on the following texts, namely, the latter part of the 15th verse of Acts 12th chapter, and Mat. xviii. 10. The latter passage, he says, “seems strongly to favour the common notion about dead children being in the Father’s presence living and joyful.” We trust the following explanation may serve to disabuse our correspondent’s mind of such an idea.

The words referred to in Acts are, “Then said they, It is his (Peter’s) Angel.” What, says our correspondent, did they mean by this term? We reply, a heavenly messenger like the one mentioned in verses 7 “to 10 of the same chapter, who liberated the Apostle from prison. A living intelligence of a superior order, similar to those spoken of by David in Ps. ciii. 20, 21, and by the Apostle Paul, in Heb. i. 14. The former passage reads, “Bless the Lord ye His angels, that excel in strength, that do His commandments, hearkening unto the voice of His words.” “Bless ye the Lord, all ye His hosts; ye ministers of His that do His pleasure.” And the latter, “Are they (the angels of the preceding verse) not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?” Such “ministering spirits” have at various times appeared to men on the earth, in executing their divine commands. Three appeared to Abraham, as recorded in Gen. chap. xviii. Two came to Sodom at even, Gen. chap. xix. 1; another appeared to Manoah, Jud. ch. xiii.; and not to multiply instances in the Old Testament, we will just make mention of two in the New which are found in Mat. ch. iv. v. 11, and Luke ch. xxii. 43 respectively, in both cases having reference to Jesus: firstly at the time of His temptation in the wilderness, and secondly shortly before His crucifixion. “Then the Devil leaveth Him, and behold angels came and ministered unto Him.” And there appeared an angel unto Him from heaven, strengthening Him.” And the angels of the “little ones” of Mat. xviii. 10 are in no wise different. Over little ones, that believe in Jesus, God exercises a peculiar care; of such like it is said, even “the very hairs of your head are numbered.” Mat. x. 30. And again, “The angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear Him, and delivereth them.” Ps. xxxiv. 7. To speak of dead children as living in the Father’s presence (or indeed anywhere else) is a contradiction in terms and a confounding of things that differ. Life and death are entirely opposite states or conditions, which cannot possibly be affirmed of any person at one and the same time, whether he be saint or sinner. In view of the plain and positive statement of Scripture, that the dead know not anything and that in the very day of a man’s death his thoughts perish, how can such a notion be maintained? The angels and the “little ones” are totally distinct beings of different orders. The former are “in heaven,” but there is no promise that the latter are to go there either at death or any other time. The promise to the righteous is that at the resurrection they shall be equal unto the angels and die no more.

Luke xx. 36. The phrases “little ones” and “little children,” as used in Scripture, have nothing whatever to do with dead children, nor with “the common notion” concerning their state after death. The passage quoted from Matthew, so far from strongly favouring the common notion, is directly opposed to it.

D. C. asks us to explain the following verses in the Christadelphian Lamp, namely: - John ch. i. 1-5, and 10, 14, 15; Col. i. 15-19; Heb. i. 2, 3, 6, 10; 1 Cor. viii. 6; Phil. ii. 5-8, - altogether quite a long string of passages, the explanation of which, to do them anything like justice according to their interest and importance, will necessarily occupy considerable time and space. We cannot, therefore, reply to them all in the present number. We will do what we can, and reserve the rest for another opportunity. They are usually quoted by those who contend for the pre-existence of Christ, his equality with the Father, eternal sonship, and so forth. And we are willing to admit at the outset that some of them do appear, at first sight, to favour such teaching, while in reality it is not so. In studying them we must be careful not to isolate them from other testimonies, but to harmonise them with all that God has been pleased to reveal in the Scriptures concerning Himself and His Anointed, or Christ. Rightly understood, there can be nothing in the New Testament contradictory to what is written in the Old. Moses and the Prophets, Jesus and the Apostles, being all under the influence of the same Spirit, must be in harmony with one another, and any inference drawn from their writings which would cause them in any degree to clash must necessarily be false. To commence, then, with John’s Gospel, the Apostle affirms in the first verse that “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.” This statement, like that in Gen. i. 1, carries the mind back to a period infinitely remote, and in effect declares that there never was a time when God was not. He is eternal or everlasting in the most illimitable sense, the Most High, who is above all and over all, and in whom all live, and move, and have their being. The one great source of life and power. But the chief stumbling block in the verse is the particular phrase used by John, namely that the Word was in the beginning and was with God, so commonly interpreted to signify a second person or God and applied to Christ, although the Apostle states so pointedly, as if to prevent such an idea from arising in the mind, that “the Word was God,” and therefore not another but one and the same God, the God of Israel, the One living and true God. As Moses declares to the Jewish nation, “Hear O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord.” Deut. vi. 4. Unity, and no duality nor Trinity, is the idea set forth in the Scriptures from Genesis to Revelation. In the work of creation described by Moses and referred to by John in this passage, the Deity was not associated with a second person, as the following texts prove. “Thus saith the Lord, thy Redeemer, and He that formed thee from the womb, I am the Lord that maketh all things; that stretcheth forth the heavens alone; that spreadeth abroad the earth by myself.” “I form the light and create darkness; I make peace, and create evil, I the Lord do all these things.” “I have made the earth, and create man upon it; I, even my hands, have stretched out the heavens, and all their host have I commanded.” “For thus saith the Lord that created the heavens; God Himself that formed the earth and made it; He hath established it; He created it not in vain; He formed it to be inhabited; I am the Lord, and there is none else.” “I am the first and I am the last, and besides me there is no God.” Isaiah xlv. 6, 24; xlv. 7, 12, 18. These are very significant and striking testimonies. They exclude the idea, that Jesus was co-existent with the Deity “in the beginning,” and associated with Him who is “the former of all things,” in the mighty work which He then performed. There are, however, many other proofs, and these will appear as we proceed. But if not a person, what was it that was with God in the beginning? John says it was the WORD. But what is the signification of the term? The Book of Proverbs is enlightening on this point. “The Lord by wisdom hath founded the earth, by understanding hath he established the heavens.” Ch. iii. 19. “The Lord possessed me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. When there were no depths, I was brought forth; when there were no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth: while as yet He had not made the earth, nor the fields, nor the highest part of the dust of the world. When He prepared the heavens, I was there when He set a compass upon the face of the depth; when He established the clouds above; when He strengthened the fountains of the deep; when He gave to the sea His decree, that the waters should not pass His commandment; when He appointed the foundations of the earth. Then I was by Him, as one brought up with Him; and I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him: rejoicing in the habitable part of His earth; and my delights were with the sons of men.” Ch. viii. 22-31.

Now, what is signified by all this? Clearly Wisdom, as the whole tenor of the chapter shows. Wisdom then was with God; it was one of His attributes, and by it He created the heavens and the earth. Or, as it is written in the Psalms, “By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth.” Ps. xxxiii. 6, 9. “By His Spirit He hath garnished the heavens.” Job, xxvi. 13. “-He spake and it was done; He commanded, and it stood fast.” These are but different forms of

expression, all having the same meaning, and mutually explanatory one of another. They might be greatly multiplied, but we will only make one more quotation, and that from the Prophet Jeremiah. "He hath made the earth by His power. He hath established the world by His wisdom and hath stretched out the heavens by His discretion." Ch. x. 12. What are power, wisdom, and discretion but divine attributes, as, says the Prophet Daniel, "Wisdom and might are His." Ch. ii. 20. And what is Spirit but power? And God is Spirit. Not a separate being apart from Himself. The original term used by John in the first chapter of his Gospel is *λογος*, "In the beginning- was the *λογος*, and the *λογος*, was with God," and is thus defined by lexicographers: the word by which the inward thought is expressed, the inward thought or reason itself, that which is said or spoken, language, reason. In the New Testament (say Liddell and Scott), comprising both senses of Word and Reason. These explanations give no countenance whatever to the idea of personality as contained in the term used by the Apostle. One might as well contend that a man's faculty of speech or reasoning power is one person and his bodily self another, as seek to maintain that the "Word that was with God, and was God," was after all not Himself, but some other being!

Having premised thus much on the first three verses of John's Gospel, we now proceed to the consideration of the fourth, which reads, "In Him was life; and the life was the light of men." In Him, God that is, was life. Deity alone possesses life inherently and underived. "He only hath immortality (or deathlessness) dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see." 1st.Tim.vii.16. And John says "As the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself." Ch. v. 26. Life therefore was not inherent or underived in the case of the Son, but was a gift bestowed upon him by his heavenly Father. And this brings us to the second clause of the verse "the life was the light of men." But how, and when, and where? Now here let us place ourselves under the guidance of the Apostle John and allow him to explain himself. "I am (spake Jesus) the light of the world; he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life." John viii. 12. This introduces us to Jesus, the Son of God. "the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the Word of life. (For the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us;) that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us: and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ." 1st Johni. 1, 2, 3. That which John heard, saw, looked upon, and handled was not, and could not possibly be the Father Deity, for concerning Him the same Apostle says, "No man hath seen God at any time." John i. 18. What John saw was "the only begotten Son" who declared Him and manifested Himself through him. Thus the Father was "the Word of Life that was from the beginning," and the Son a manifestation of that life when "the Word was made flesh." When Jesus appeared in the land of Israel, which was his own, he shone there as a great light amidst the surrounding darkness. "The people which sat in darkness saw great light: and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death, light is sprang up." Matt. iv. 16.; Is. ix. 1, 2. But though so great a light., the Jews, His contemporaries to whom He came, knew Him not, nor comprehended Him, but rejected Him, cast Him out, and crucified Him. To them, for the most part, His sayings were dark and unintelligible they perceived not that He spake to them of the Father, and accused Him of blasphemy when He claimed to be His Son. Intensely dark was the Jewish world into which He came, and dark it remains unto this day, rejecting the Nazarene and looking for another. The Great Light made that darkness visible.

10th verse, "He (Jesus) was in the world, and the world was made by Him, and the world knew Him not." The world here spoken of is that to which Jesus was specially related, that is to say, the Mosaic world. Kosmos, order or arrangement of things existing in the land of Israel at the time when He sojourned there. It does not refer to the material heavens and earth described by Moses, of which Jesus was not the creator as already shown. The Jewish world before spoken of was made or constituted by reason of Him, or on account of, or in reference to Him. The same idea is expressed by the Apostle Paul in writing to the Hebrews, where he says, "God hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son, whom He hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also He made the worlds." Heb. i. 2. The latter part of this verse, however, is not correctly rendered, the original words are *δι' ου και τους αιωνας εποιησεν* and signify 'on account of' whom also he made (or constituted) the ages. Paul is not here, speaking of the creation of the world, but of particular times in relation to the Son, to whom has been given all authority and all power, and in relation to whom, as the Redeemer, the whole plan of salvation has been arranged from the beginning. This explanation disposes of what is a difficulty in the way of some when they read this verse.

14th verse. "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father), full of grace and truth." The word of promise became an

accomplished fact when Jesus was born of Mary. The “prepared body” in which the Spirit was hereafter to dwell had appeared, and in due time was manifested to Israel. But before this period there was no being in existence answering to John’s declaration, except as a purpose in the divine mind. There was no such manifestation in flesh. Though the particular form of words used by John in the phrase “The Word was made flesh” is found only in this place, the fact itself is just as clearly stated by Paul when speaking of the mystery of Godliness, he says, “God was manifest in the flesh.” 1st Tim. iii. 16.

The promise to Israel was that God would raise up unto the nation a Prophet like unto Moses, and this promise was fulfilled when the man Jesus was born. His birth of the virgin according to the prophecy of Isaiah was a wonderful manifestation of the power of God, and marked Him out and separated Him as His only begotten Son. “Who was born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.” To our own mind the meaning of this particular phrase, as used by the Apostle John, is as clearly explained as such a matter can be, by the record given of the conception and birth of the Saviour by Matthew and Luke. As to the words of this verse enclosed in a parenthesis, we understand them to refer to what was witnessed by Peter, James, and John on the mount of transfiguration, when, as recorded by Matthew, “Jesus was transfigured before them: and His face did shine as the sun, and His raiment was white as “the light.” Matt. xviii. 1, 2. On this point we cannot do better than quote Peter’s observations on this remarkable scene. He says, “We have not followed cunningly devised fables when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye witnesses of His majesty. For He received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came such a voice to Him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved son in whom I am well pleased. And this voice, which came from Heaven we heard, when we were with Him in the holy mount.” 2nd Pe. i. 16-18. On this occasion Jesus was changed in appearance but not in reality, that is to say He remained a flesh and blood man the same as before. He was not really transformed from flesh to spirit until His resurrection, when His “natural body” becomes a “spiritual body”. The whole scene was a representation of things to come, a vision, as Jesus Himself called it, when as they come down from the mountain He charged them saying “Tell no man of the vision until the Son of man be risen from the dead.”

Fifth verse. “John bare witness of Him (Jesus) and cried, saying, This was He of whom I spake, He that cometh after me is preferred before me, for He was before me.”

The point of difficulty in this verse is the statement that Jesus was before for John, whereas in regard to age John was older than Jesus. The question for consideration, therefore, is in what sense this statement is to be understood. The latter part of the verse has been somewhat differently translated by different critics. Nonetheless, the author of a New Testament critically emphasized from the text of Tregellis renders it, “He who after me was coming before me has advanced: because He was my Christ.” And the Emphatic Diaglott gives it thus, “He who comes after me is in advance of me, for He is my superior.” These renderings are more in harmony with other declarations of the Apostle John concerning Jesus than that in the authorized version. He speaks of himself as the inferior to Jesus; for instance, he says, “He that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am unworthy to loose.” Matt. Iii. 2. An overwhelming sense of his own inferiority in comparison with the Messiah whose forerunner he was, was evidently the idea which possessed John’s mind. The Apostle well knew who and what Jesus was when he exclaimed “Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world. He had witnessed the descent of the Spirit upon Him and could therefore bare record that He was the Son of God. This, however, by no means proves that John either believed or taught the pre-existence of Jesus when he said He was before him. He was before, or in advance of him in being the subject of prophecy from the beginning, and in being “full of grace and truth.” In this sense He was “in the bosom of the Father,” and before John, and preferred before him. In the sacred style, things which be not (or exist not) are spoken of as though they were, and in the same manner God speaks of His Son and in the same way also the Son frequently speaks of Himself. But there we must pause for the present.

--- S.G.H.

Q 1. Upon what equitable principle did God give commandment to the Israelites for them to destroy the Canaanitish infants?

Answer: This is equivalent to asking whether it is just for God to exterminate the wicked. The persons in question are classed as wicked, God dealt with them as He threatened to deal in the future with the same class; “utterly destroy them root and branch.

Q 2 Did He act upon the same principle in giving commandment to Jesus to suffer a violent death?

Answer: If the question means, did God act in giving commandment to Jesus to suffer, we say, yes. Jesus came to fulfil the Scripture, and He did fulfil it. If this is not the meaning of the question, we do not understand it.

Q 3. Supposing Jesus was in the same condition as other men (as defined in Numbers xvi. 29; Job xiv. 5; and in Psalm xxxiv. 4,5,) in submitting to the death of the Cross, could not He be rightly said to “lay down His life” or “give His life?”

Answer: Had Jesus been “in the same condition as other men,” that is to say, under the sentence which fell on “other men” through Adam’s sin, He might have “laid down His life,” but it could not have “ransomed them from the power of the grave,” for the simple and sufficient reason that the grave would have had the same power over Jesus as it has “other men.” Can you not see that one man may be the same in nature as another without being under his sentence? Can you not see that when a man is “born in sin,” though he himself may be innocent, that he is disinherited? To be “born in sin” does not mean to have poisoned blood, but to come under a legal sentence for the sin of an ancestor. Every such sentence comes through the sin of the father, and if he be not a transgressor then are the offspring free. If one man “in the condition of other men” gave his life, it could only be as a martyr, not as an eternal redeemer. But by Christ’s free gift of Himself we obtain “eternal redemption.” Over Him the grave has no power, for “He did no sin,” nor was there any sin “in Him.” He was not under sentence on account of sin. The supposition that Jesus was in “the same condition as other men,” i.e., under Adam’s sentence, is without a shred of proof. The repeated statement that He was “begotten” of God destroys the notion.

Q 4. The same thing being supposed as in the third question, in the violent death which He (Jesus) was put to, could it not rightly be said, “He was ‘cut off, but not for Himself,” in contrast with Korah, who was ‘cut off ‘ for himself? See Leviticus xvii. 8, and Numbers xvi. 1-40.

Answer: The cutting off of Korah was a great “contrast” to the cutting off of Messiah, truly, but beyond this we do not see what the question means. Besides the death of any man is a contrast to the death of Christ. No other person can be said to have given “himself a ransom for all” as did Christ.

Q 5. The phrase “Son of Man” being applied to Jesus. In what sense was He Son of Man? (Granted, not in any sense, upon which personal sin is predicted; but was He not in the ordinary sense a Son of Adam, involving the truth of the supposition made in the 3rd Question?

Answer: The phrase “Son of Man” is sometimes applied to the Prophets. It is said by Oriental scholars to no more than “man.” Adam in languages is called “the son of the first,” the meaning being “the man.” As to the question was not Jesus “in the ordinary sense a Son of Adam,” we do not know how it can be asked by a person who professes to believe that Jesus was “born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, but was begotten of the Holy Spirit, that is, God. “The ordinary sense” - Jesus cannot be said to be Son of Adam in any sense except that in which He was Joseph’s son - namely, indirectly His mother being Joseph’s wife as she was Adam’s daughter. But concerning begettal - which is the ordinary sense in which we are sons of Adam - neither Adam nor Joseph stood for anything. In this matter it is quite needless to speculate, adding one supposition to another. The fact is plain, and there is no other fact like it on record; the question is what does it mean? We say, and have proved, that it means this: - Jesus was human in His nature; was, through His mother, the brother of all mankind, - “God has made of one blood all nations of men”; - by His Father He was free from the sentence put by Adam on all begotten by him.

Q 6. Do any of the sons of Adam; need an offering to cleanse them from federal sin?

Answer: Federal signifies “pertaining to a league.” We judge our correspondent means Adam’s sin. The reply is that death being the consequence of that sin, the sons of Adam stand in need of redemption from death. Hence it is plain that Christ, instead of being heir Redeemer from death, would, had He been in their condition, have required someone to die to redeem Him from death, by giving his life a ransom as He gave His.

Q 7. If not; would Jesus (who did no sin) be invalidated from being an offering for others though he were a son of Adam in the sense of having the “federal” sin?

Due consideration of these questions on your part will be followed by due reflection of your answers on my part. - Yours faithfully, F. Peel.

Answer: This question is a conclusion arising out of the “supposition” of the question before it. The reply given to that causes this to require no further answer.

In conclusion, we sincerely trust our correspondent will be as good as his promise, giving “due reflection to our answers.” This promise seems to imply that he is not quite satisfied with the position in which he finds himself; and we are convinced no man can be if he will deal fairly with the evidence and not stifle the admonitions of his conscience.

EDITOR.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

To the Editor of the Christadelphian Lamp.

CULLEN, Banffshire, Scotland. – Dear Bro. Turney. - I trust you will find enclosed P.O.O. for 7s., which I send in payment of my Lamp for the current year; and for the balance, please send me a small supply of the tracts you have on hand suitable for distribution; amongst which, please send a few copies of your lectures, entitled “The great Salvation,” etc., and “Obedience better than Sacrifice.” Kindly excuse me for being so long in remitting the price of the Lamp, and believe me that it is not because I don’t think it worth the money that I have been so long, for I do appreciate it highly, and can say that the perusal of its pages has greatly assisted me in arriving at a fuller knowledge of the Truth as it is in Jesus, than I formerly possessed. And that the Lamp may long continue to shed abroad its enlightening rays, is the sincere wish of your brother, in the One Faith, GEORGE LILLIE.

To the Editor of the Christadelphian Lamp.

LISTOWEL, ONTARIO. Dear Sir, - As an interested reader of your paper, I am glad to see the statement on one of its title pages, “that it is your intention to admit into its pages the opinions of opponents, so that both sides of any question may be seen on the principle that truth has nothing to fear, but everything to gain by comparison” hoping therefore that such good intentions will be fairly kept, I take my pen to address you. In regard to the question at issue between the Lamp and the Christadelphian -

Was Christ under condemnation? I of course hold that He was not; but forasmuch as Jesus, the Christ, was a man, and must have had a human father, as in order to fulfil God’s oath to Abraham and to David, He (Christ) was to be their descendant according to the flesh, how could He, if all men are under the Adamic penalty, have escaped the universal condemnation. The answer to this is very plain to me, and that is that neither Jesus of Nazareth, nor any other of Adam’s race, are under the condemnation of death on account of Adam’s transgression, that is, that original sin, or Adamic guilt, is not transferable; and that all the human family from the days of Adam, to the present time, with the single exception of the Saviour, have been, and are still under sentence of death, not, however, on account of Adam’s sin, but on account of personal transgression of law. Therefore, looking at Jesus as free from original sin, and by His perfect obedience to law, - which was ordained to life - free from transgression of law, which is sin, He had a free life by the latter, and power to lay down that life as a sacrifice, and power to take it up again, both of which were done. Jesus was therefore a free and sufficient Saviour, although he was a man of men, and born of a woman. I know it will be asked, if Jesus was born like other mortals, how could he be Son of God. I answer that Jesus claimed to be both, but while no genuine portion of the word of God teaches the miraculous conception, Jesus, - while declaring himself the Son of Man, and knowing that both His friends and foes regarded Him as nothing more, - wished to impress on the minds of His hearers, that though He was in very humble circumstances, yet that that humanity was on His part voluntary, that He was as a descendant of David, the heir to the throne of Israel, and the individual whom God in His promises to David had said, I will be His Father, and He shall be my Son,” and as Paul says, Jesus, by loving righteousness and hating iniquity, was anointed with the oil of gladness above His fellows or companions, which anointing or christening took place when the Holy Spirit descended upon Him at His baptism in the Jordan. Nor should we forget that Jesus taught the absolute necessity of the second, or Spiritual birth, and that He was the subject of it Himself; and again, it seems strange to me how intelligent men can, after a careful examination of the subject, come to the conclusion that Jesus of Nazareth was not by nature the Son of Man, without virtually charging the God of Israel with a breach of His most sacred laws and solemn oath, and involving both the Messiah and His parents’ transgression of law. Much might be said on this subject from a Scripture point of view, and also we might go on to show that a noble few continued to bear witness against the progressing apostacy, until the triumphant “Man of sin quenched the voice of their testimony in fire and blood.” After much investigation with Philip, I can say, We have found Him of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Joseph. Hoping you will publish this note, and treat the matter in a Christian spirit, I remain, yours in the hope of Israel, WILLIAM L. KELLS.

[We shall have somewhat to say on this (Unitarian) letter next month, and will endeavour to say it “in a Christian spirit,” as requested. - ED.]

To the Editor of the Christadelphian Lamp.

LISTOWEL, ONTARIO, Canada. - Mr. Edward Turney. - Dear Sir: You will find enclosed two dollars, being payment for volume No. 2 of the Lamp. I have sent you three pamphlets by post, which I hope you will read, and weigh the arguments advanced therein. If you think the arguments don't prove the points aimed at, I hope you will criticise them in the Lamp. If you think they are truth, you would be doing your duty if you gave the benefit of them to the readers of the Lamp. There are arguments advanced in one of the pamphlets which we will not have to wait long to decide, viz., the coming of our Lord on the fourteenth of the first (Jewish) month, 1875. (April 19th, 1875). I think the arguments advanced to prove this are some of the best you have seen. It would seem that some of the arguments wherewith we prove that Jesus is the Messiah, also prove that He will come again on April 19th, 1875. We interpret prophecy by the same rule in both cases, and as it was fulfilled to the very day in the coming of Jesus the first time, and as the same rule is applied to prophecy concerning His second coming, why should it not take place accordingly? In the last number of the Lamp you represent us as practising "trine baptism." Such is not the case; we practise one baptism, consisting of three immersions. I have sent you a tract on this subject; perhaps you will understand it better after reading that. We believe in being baptized "into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

One dip for each name. If you can get away with two names, you can get away with two dips. The above applies to Gentiles (or the "nations.") There was no one but Jews or Jewish proselytes that were said to be baptized into the "name of Jesus" only, and they had three immersions, put all together: once into the Father, when they were baptized unto Moses nationally, and once at John's baptism, and once into the name of Jesus. The one immersion will do for Trinitarians who make the three names one. You must admit there are three names used if there are not three persons. You will find out the main arguments by reading the tract. I hope you will consider it well. - Yours truly, A. ROBINSON.

REMARKS. - It will be seen from the date of the Lord's expected appearing on the 19th of April, that we could hardly have published this letter in our May issue. It is needless to remark that "the best arguments" for that great event taking place on that day need no refutation from us on this 30th day of April. If we may be excused for saying so, we think the predictions would have been more in harmony, in some respects, if they had been set down for the first of April, instead of the 19th. It is only men who are not acquainted with the difficulties which beset chronology that are so confident in their figures. The conclusion is simple enough, provided the premises are sound. But we are strongly inclined to think that no man living is in possession of the exact starting point of certain prophetic dates. The uncertainty of figures in the different copies of the Old Scriptures is most discouraging to the earnest student. But the signs can hardly be mistaken in their general character. How far a given sign is advanced it is not easy to determine. If men would be as solicitous to be ready for the Judge as they are to cry lo! here, and lo! there, it would augur better for themselves. A contemporary showed scorn at an article some time ago in the Lamp, because, according to a certain point de départ, together with a lunar reading of the 1260, this period would terminate in the next generation, but the same writer professed to have no faith in Thurman's 19th of April prophecy, but feared the great event was not very near. Then why try to raise the damaging cry, the Lord delays His coming, as emanating from us. If Thurman was much too early, the next generation could not consistently be complained of as much too late. But angry men and enthusiasts are too much in danger of having to make a feast on their own words. At present we have only time to express our solemn conviction that the three-dip business is of as much value as the calculations touching the 19th of April. We may some day find leisure to treat the subject seriously.

SUBSTITUTION.

I do not see substitution ; but, in the sacrifices offered, I do see, in Gen. 9 chap. and 2 and 3 verses, that all animals were a part of the man's possession, and when he offered them he offered not a substitution, but of his own, such a part as Jehovah approved of, namely, the only clean part he had in his possession, viz: a life (blood) that never was guilty, never having been under law, then it certainly had never transgressed, i.e., was not a sinner, and yet was a part of the man's own life in right of possession.

The death was necessary, not to save the man's life, but because in a secondary sense the life or blood was in the animal's possession, and could not be exclusively the man's own, until drained out of the body; or, in other words, taken from the animal's possession, and then having been presented in the immortal state, or place of incorruptibility, viz., the most holy; it would be accepted by virtue of its cleanliness, i.e.,

innocency, and was accounted to the offered being His by right of possession, and not accredited in the right of substitution.

It is true it was a shadow life, both national and individual sacrifice, that passeth away, and only saved a shadow life still longer to the man's, and also typified the offering of the substantially free life: first, the individual Christ to His, Jehovah's, service, by obedience; and second, by the grand aggregate, still to his service, during the age and beyond, whose lives are all derived from the one, and are a part of that identical substance, life, laid down (or left in abeyance) when He commenced His mission of love, at 30 years; and thus we have the offering by detail (individual) and in general (national), shadowed and realised.

But the components, or numbers, of this obedience that was to be, were either in the grasp of the unsatisfied dominion or on the road thitherward, because of sentence pronounced against the head or root. God is love. He looked for help; there was none to save. Immortals could not go down in that place, dark and deep. Who then? His own right hand brought salvation. How? First, by formation or creation; second, by adoption or public acknowledgment, after probation. Proving, or trying, not his sword made by men's hands (see David), but the pebble out of the brook, and then sending him, not instead of, but for the chosen ones kept prisoners. Down he went, proving his sonship by his obedience – oneness in the plan or scheme of love, and thus is seen – God manifested in the flesh, i.e., love. God is love. "The Father and I are one." Deity devised the scheme; gave the necessary tools at the various times and sundry manners by the prophets, for the formation of the character required, and by His own superintendence prepared an organization or body that was capable of assimilating the food prepared of old for its use, and thus grew up into the favour and the truth until matured, when it would not depart from it. To Jehovah be the glory, for it is His - the glory of a glorious, because an only begotten, Son, full of grace and truth. Is it not so? The Elohim say of themselves (see Gen. iii. 22), the man is become as one of us - to know good and evil. To know is to experience; understanding is of evil gained only by experience. They have then most assuredly seen tribulation, and by experience can testify of good and evil, but not one of them can say, he passed a probation of trial successfully, never having transgressed, never needed a redeemer for himself. But we have such an one whose only experience of evil was that of death by favour (Heb. ii. 9, 10), that He might be the head or captain of many to their salvation, and whose only suffering was that incidental to a nature necessitated to be able to go where the immortal cannot go.

Picture to yourself a world or place peopled by a race of beings never having sinned. Death would be stranger in those parts, because to those under law, death can only come by transgression, and evil would also be a foreigner, since it is produced only as a result of disobedience. Let it be mental or physical then, He, the Christ – alone - is the Son of Jehovah's right hand throughout the universe. No wonder He (Jehovah) seats Him upon His own throne; no wonder Elohim sang the heralding of His birth; no wonder angels, principalities and powers now and to come, are and will be in subjection to Him. No wonder as the Father has life unfettered and free to flow forth at His disposal to quicken whom He will, so hath He given to His express image to possess it likewise.

But you are tired, brother mine; here, take the pen, and I will listen for its delineations.

With the love that forbearth all things and grudgeth not, I subscribe myself, yours, R. S. S. POWELL.

INTELLIGENCE.

BIRMINGHAM. - I am glad to report that during the month our number has been increased by the obedience of Miss Matilda Atkins, daughter of Bro. Atkins. She has been studying the truth for some time, and was fully alive to her position of alienation from the Almighty, and believing in the power of Jesus, as a Redeemer, mighty to save, she laid hold of the favor held out in the Gospel, and became one of God's family by obedient faith in the Only begotten Son of God. We are sorry to say that our Bro. John Butler has removed from this town to Bradford, having obtained an appointment there on one of the daily papers. He has been an active and earnest supporter of the important point in question, i.e., the non-condemnation of Jesus, and was always willing to help in the way of enlightening and building up of the Brethren. The Sunday evening lectures have been as follows :- April 18th. "Christ's Sermon on the Mount." Bro. W. Ellis. April 25th "The Water of Life." Bro. F. N. Turney. May 2nd. "The new Jerusalem." Bro. W. Ellis. May 9th "The Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven." Bro. David Handley. The

lectures have been fairly well attended, and we trust that, with continued perseverance on the part of each, we may be able shortly to shew others “the way of salvation.” - CHARLES JENNINGS.

CARLUKE AND NEIGHBOURHOOD. - Dear Brother Turney: I have much pleasure in complying with your request to send intelligence. For several months past, several brethren from Edinburgh and Glasgow have been giving lectures at Lanark, Carluke, and Lesmahagow, on Future Punishment, Immortality, the Coming and Kingdom of Christ, etc., several persons have been stirred up to put on the name of the Lord by being baptised. David McMillan, Carluke, David and James Bain and Marion Bain (the Brothers and Wife of Brother William Bain), Telford Gilroy and his wife Ellen Gilroy. These five Brethren and Sisters reside at a mining village called Hurleyburn, near Carluke. After an intelligent confession of their faith in the things concerning the Kingdom of GOD, and the name of Jesus Christ, were baptised by me at Lockhart Mill, near Lanark, on the 11th of April. I may also mention that the persons named along with George Keer and William Keer, already in the truth, and James France, Carluke, who were baptized here in February, have formed a meeting at Harleyburn. Let us hope that they may continue steadfast in the faith, rooted and grounded in love, and so be prepared for the coming Kingdom and Glory. Lockhart Mill, Lanark, May 3, 1875. JAMES MURRAY. - [We thank Brother Murray for this encouraging news; and congratulate him and his New Brethren on the good work in the Lord. ED.]

CULLEN. - Dear Bro. Turney: I go occasionally to Whitehills - a small fishing village near Banff - on the first day of the week, to commemorate in the divinely appointed way, along with Sisters Andrew and Ritchie, who live there, and Sister Helen Andrew, of Banff, the crowning act of our Lord’s love and compassion towards us. We were greatly cheered and edified by having Brother Charles Reid, of Newpitsligo, to preside over our assembly on Sunday, the 18th of April. Brother William Smith, of New Mill, near Keith was with us, also Brother William Sinclair, of Turriff, who earnestly and affectionately exhorted us to lead a life in keeping with the faith we profess, to the end, that at the appearing of the kingdom of the Christ, we may have an abundant entrance ministered unto us into that kingdom; so that altogether it was a meeting well calculated to excite within us isolated ones the liveliest feelings of thankfulness to Him from whom all our blessings flow. It is refreshing in these times of divisions and contentions, to find even so many who can unite in showing forth the great love of GOD, in that He spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all. May we then all see to it that we strive more and more to walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to GOD for a sweet smelling savour. - GEORGE LILLIE.

DEAL. - Sister Chitty has arrived from Calcutta. She spent the first Sunday in April with the brethren in London. - J.M.

DERBY. - William Spencer, named in Nottingham Intelligence, is the “work in the Lord” of Brother C. Rogers, who accompanied him on his visit for baptism. Both brethren are engineers at the locomotive works. Bro. Spencer’s mind had been a long time occupied with reading different papers and books on the subject of the Gospel, and in a favourable condition he fell as it were into Bro Rogers’ hands; thus the work was perfected. Bro. R., who had stood for a long time quite alone, has now a fellow-labourer into the kingdom of God. It has been decided to break bread together, by way of laying the foundation of a church; help will from time to time be sent from Nottingham.

FETTERANGUS. - In a kind and interesting letter from Sister H. Kerr, we gather that while some are firm in the faith of an uncondemned Christ, others are indifferent to the question in any phase; others again show anything but a Christian spirit to those from whom they differ. It is folly to take pride in neutrality on a matter which must be true or false; and if false, is most serious to those who cherish it in the face of plain and oft repeated instruction. Misrepresentation, wilful or not, only injures those who deal in it. Let all such study to be impartial, to lay aside all malice and envy, and look not at men but at principles. A Trinitarian tells you he cannot explain his Trinity, but you must receive it. A condemnationist points you to a diagram constructed out of the brains of angry vicious men, and cries “that is Paul’s explanation.” An “explanation” that lacks the vital element - truth; an explanation which affirms that to be very bad which the Creator declares is “very good;” an explanation which, if true, would charge the Apostles John, Peter, and Paul with falsehood. These men - puffed up in their fleshly minds, aspiring to lordship over GOD’S heritage, terrified at the searching effect of calm enquiry, shout “Wolf! Wolf!” create consternation where there should be peace; and then superciliously offer to “protect” the flock. But it is more than they can do to protect themselves; the barbed shafts of truth pierce their spongy armour, and we behold them struggling and writhing in the anguish they would fain inflict on their opponents. Let the Lord of Glory come; let them tell Him to His face they believed Him filthy and vile; let them charge upon Him sins more numerous than the hairs of His head; let them speak this blasphemy in the face of the lamb who in the days of His flesh was “without blemish and without spot.” Will He not

reply, "Ye be blind leaders of the blind;" can that which is filthy cleanse the filthy? Can sinful blood, be precious blood?" Can that which is "undefiled " be most defiled? Does the gift cleanse the altar or the altar sanctify the gift? "Ye be blind leaders of the blind;" and unless ye repent and do works meet for repentance ye shall "both fall into the ditch." Ye who are commanded by Christ to "love your enemies," but who obey the command by practising the cruel, unrelenting spirit of the Inquisition, who hate those who love your Lord and who know "the faith of Christ," - "Cleanse your hands ye sinners" and cease to splash your pen in gall.

LEICESTER. - Since writing you last month, we have been visited by Bro. and Sister Martin, of Birmingham, who stayed with us a fortnight, Bro. M. lecturing three times. His first lecture, on Sunday evening, April 25th "Where are the dead?" brought together a large and appreciative audience; the subject was dealt with in a plain and most convincing manner, and must have created the impression in thoughtful minds that there was something radically wrong in the popular panaceas administered for the purpose of comforting the bereaved. On the Tuesday evening following, the subject of his lecture was "The coming King;" it was not so largely attended as was hoped, there being various counter influences which tended, doubtless, to hinder its success in point of a numerous attendance. We had taken a larger hall for the occasion, fearing the one we usually occupy would be inadequate. The lecture was listened to with marked attention; the lecturer unfolded the purpose of God to bring to an end the present unsatisfactory state of things, and set up a King of His own, choosing and proclaiming a code of laws under His own seal, the distinctive characteristics of which would be, what is much lacking under the best regime extant, righteousness, joy, and peace. The lecture on Sunday evening, May 1st, "Heaven to come to men, not men to go to Heaven, was well attended, and listened to with interest. Our number has recently been increased by the removal of Sister Rogers from Wisbeach to Leicester, she having obtained an appointment in one of the Board Schools here. The day, noted by Mr. Thurman, the American writer, for the coming of the Lord, came and went, but the Lord came not with the day; this only serves to shew the very decided unadvisability of fixing a day, or even a month, for the fulfilment of that, to us, momentous and auspicious event; nevertheless, there certainly are, to thoughtful minds versed in the prophetic writings, most unmistakable indications that that time of times is fast nearing, and is assuredly not very far off. The unsettled and confused state of the world - political, ecclesiastical, and social, appears to increase in intensity daily, and will require more than human effort to set things to rights; ever and anon rumours of war are rife; then professions of peace and amity go round, only to be succeeded by some fresh cause of apprehension and distrust, showing that the said professions are only skin deep and scarcely that. Among other noticeable indications, not the least important is the present stir among the Jews, who certainly are no longer, except perhaps in some very

exceptionable cases, a proverb and a hissing among the nations; they are coming to the front in political and social movements, and are exhibiting to a somewhat remarkable degree a cohesion as a people such as has not characterized them since the time of their dispossession some eighteen centuries ago. All these things should have the effect of fortifying us in our faith, and keeping alive individually and socially that healthy watchfulness which should distinguish those who wait and look for an event of so glorious moment; affording at the same time an answer to the scoffers who say, "Where is the promise of His coming?" and an incentive to perseverance in the believer to continue to pray "Thy Kingdom come." I hope to have to report in the next number of the Lamp, the obedience of a few others who are enquiring' and looking into the Truth. - CHARLES WEALE.

LIVERPOOL. - As our variety of tracts is nearly exhausted, we should be glad if you could spare us some more. We take them along with the Sun Dial and leave them at houses and call again in a fortnight, as will be seen by the enclosed papers which are pasted on. But the greatest difficulty is to obtain a sufficient variety, as not many care to read the same over again. Some of the parties where they are left seem to appreciate them, and several have been brought to the room through the advertisement of it upon them; whether any will accept the truth remains to be seen; it is the only way to reach the people here, and we must sow beside all waters, and hope that God will give them increase. The following are what we have (the lectures are liked the best): "The probable position of Britain in prophecy"; "The way they call heresy"; "Mosaic teaching concerning the Sabbath"; "The mark of the beast"; "The Christ of the Old and New Testament"; "Obedience better than sacrifice." If you can spare any of the above, and some "Thirty-two Questions," it will help us very much. The following is the announcement for the Tracts: - "Christadelphian Tracts: This Tract will be called for in a fortnight, and another left if required. Meetings held on Sundays, at 11 a.m, and 6-30 p.m., at 98, Soho-street. All Seats Free. All are welcome." - Since my last communication, we have added one to our small church, in the person of sister Jane Waite, who was associated with the other meeting; but after consideration of the "New Theory" became satisfied of its scripturalness. During Easter, Bro. Ellis and family paid us a visit. A lecture was delivered by him, upon

“The wages of sin is death, and not eternal torment.” Some strangers were present. Brother Hedgley’s business having led him here, we have been refreshed by his company. April 25th, exhortation by Bro. Hedgley, who also addressed the evening meeting, from Mal. iii. 16-17. May 2nd, exhortation by Bro. W. L. Atkinson, subject: “Christ and the woman of Samaria.” The same speaker took the evening, upon “The harvest and the vintage.” May 9th, Bro. Lind delivered the exhortation, and Bro. Terry spoke at night on “The promised land” - W. L. ATKINSON. [This intelligence is sent in according to our wish, entered on separate sheets for each week. - EDITOR,].

LONDON. - It may interest some of your readers to know that I sojourned in the Metropolis during the month of April, and that at the request of the brethren delivered several lectures in their Meeting-room (198, Islington). The first lecture had special reference to the work of Messrs. Moody and Sankey, on which occasion a goodly number came together. Bro. Watts, of Edmonton, occupied the chair. On the following Tuesday I delivered a lecture with the view of keeping up the interest awakened by our attack on the “Revivalists.” This was followed by Bro. Nichols, who lectured the following week, choosing for his subject “Peter at Caesarea, and the baptism of Cornelius.” On the Sunday evenings following the subjects handled were, “Paul at Thessalonica, Berea, and Athens.” The brethren have had a good deal of up-hill work lately; their opponents are many; but their courage is commendable. Before taking my leave for the provinces a social meeting was held, at which the merits and demerits of “Unitarianism” were discussed, and a very sensible paper was read by Bro. D. Brown on the necessity of “unity of Faith, Judgment, and purpose.” J. M.

MUMBLES. - In order to help you to answer the question, What Bro. Clement is doing? I send you the enclosed bill. In the language of Abraham Lincoln, you will see that we are “pegging at it,” or perhaps better described by our brother Paul, “stedfast, immoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord.” I can assure you I should be as much pleased to see the brethren in Nottingham, as they would be to see me. But at present I cannot gratify myself nor them. But, all being well, I intend trying to do so sometime before the close of this year. I am very pleased to hear of the success attending the labours of the brethren with you; and may God speed the right everywhere. We intend having a tea meeting on Whit-Monday, when I hope we shall have something that will be worth sending on Tuesday, the seventeenth. - W. CLEMENT. - The following is the placard referred to in the letter:- “The Great Deliverer.” A course of lectures will be delivered, on the above subject, in the Christadelphian Synagogue, Mumbles, as follows: - On Sunday, April 11th, 1875. Subject: “Deliverance of mankind from sin and death; deliverance of the Jews and restoration of the world to God” By Mr. H. Flint, of Birmingham. - On Sunday, April 18th. Subject: - “If the New Testament Scriptures be true, none are righteous in the sight of God but those who believe the Gospel and are immersed into Christ,” By Mr. W. Clement. - On Sunday, April 25th Subject: “If the Scriptures be true the reward of the righteous will be a the coming of the Deliverer, and on the earth, not in Heaven.” By Mr. W. Clement. - On Sunday, May 2nd Subject: “If the Scriptures be true the Kingdom to be given to the saints will be the restored Kingdom of Israel, and not a Kingdom above the skies.” By Mr. W. Clement. - On Sunday, May 9th. Subject: “If the Scriptures be true, Christ will be King in Jerusalem and Emperor of the whole world.” By Mr. W. Clement.

NOTTINGHAM. - During the month there have been fourteen immersions, Sarah Hall, 53; William Hallam, 52 and his wife Elizabeth, 33; Eller Atkinson, 35, wife of Brother Atkinson; William Spencer, 40; Thomas Severns and wife; William Tuckwood and his wife Harriett; Thomas Parker 30, and his wife Ann, 29; Mr. Handley 40; John Longdon, 40, and his wife Ann, 50. Bro. Turney’s last course of four lectures has been brought to a conclusion. The audiences were good and regular. Bro. James Martin has also lectured once - “Where are the dead?” There was a large audience; the lecture was excellent, and well appreciated.

[We regret, not being able to give more Intelligence this month owing to pressure of matter, but will try to make it up next time. - ED.]

STOURBRIDGE. - April 18th. Subject of evening address: “If going to Heaven is not the reward of the righteous, what is? H. Turney. April 25th. “Eternal life a promised gift, not a present possession.” W. Ellis. May 2nd. “The keys of the Kingdom of Heaven delivered to Peter when and how used, and where are they now?” D. Handley. May 9th “The Claimant to the throne of David.” J. Wooton, - Attendance very fair, especially at Bro. Handley’s lecture, May 2nd. Morning meetings well attended. The Bible class has been well attended, subjects of papers as follows :- April 21st, “Thoughts on the miracles of the Bible.” F. N. Turney. April 29th. “The parable of the unjust steward.” J. Wooton. May 6th. “The travels and teachings of Paul.” H. Turney. Here we see the beneficial effects of prompt organization. The adoption of the plan herein sketched has imparted more life and interest to the meeting, and we trust will be practically observed by other meetings. - F. N. TURNEY.

TAMWORTH. - Dear Bro. - Having to pass through this place yesterday, I made an attempt to see Bro. and Sister Mackay, but it turned out that Bro. M. was from home, and Sister M. could not be seen; however, I was introduced to Sister Rebecca Wood, with whom, together with Sister Townsend, of Birmingham, I had a long conversation. Strange as it may seem, both (whether knowingly or not is another thing) took up our position with reference to the relationship of the Christ to the law of sin and death. Sister Wood affirmed that Jesus was the Son of God in the same sense as Adam was son of God. "Yes," said I, "and when Adam was first made he was flesh and blood, and yet free from the sentence of death." To this she assented. "Well, then," said I, "if he had remained obedient he would never have been sentenced to death," "Certainly not," was her reply. I then proceeded, "A man may be flesh and blood, and yet free from the sentence of death. "Jesus was flesh and blood like the first. Adam, and also like him free from the sentence of death; he having never transgressed, he never came under the sentence of death; consequently His death cannot be traced to the same cause as Adam's." I think time will shew the brethren and sisters everywhere what the point in dispute is. - J. M.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

HAMILTON, ONT. - The following appeared in the Hamilton Evening Times for March 23rd. It shows that the "faithful brethren" there do not mean to hide the light under a bushel. We hope this may stimulate others to exert themselves: -

"Christadelphian Brethren. The Good Templars having changed their hall, the Christadelphians will not be able to meet there; so they have purchased the building that was formerly used by the New Connexion Methodists as a church, on Main-street east, and they intend to hold all their meetings for the future in that place, commencing to-morrow night, when a public Bible class will be held. The place is in very good condition and commodious, so that it will comfortably accommodate all their friends and as many of the public that may feel desirous to attend. All are welcome."

Under date April 14th, we have some more good news from the same quarter. Bro. Powell writes:- "We have been cheered by an addition, a native of Scotland, formerly Presbyterian, Mr. Easton. He is now, I believe, a sincere and truth-loving brother. We are having an increased attendance on Sunday evenings, as we have a much better meeting place. Formerly we went upstairs in the Good Templars' hall, but now we have purchased the oldest but one of the Methodist churches in the city of Hamilton. It was formerly styled the Methodist New Connexion church; now it reads, "The Christadelphian Synagogue." The brethren feel not a little encouraged, and are in earnest to make known to the public of the city of Hamilton and its suburbs, that they are ready to give to every man that asketh a reason of the hope that is within them with meekness and reverence." In another part of our issue appears an article by Bro. Powell on Substitution. This has been omitted, by a slight misunderstanding on the part of the brother who received it, during our absence. We have also a paper to appear shortly from the same pen, headed "The Seed."