

The Christadelphian Lamp

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

Vol. 1.

FEBRUARY, 1874.

No. 4.

CONTENTS

Page 2	Isaiah and Ezekiel Concerning Tyre	Editor
Page 4	The Nature of Jesus The Christ	
	in Relation to Romans VIII. 2	Bro. Swidell
Page 5	The Twelve Hundred and Sixty Prophetic Days	Editor
Page 8	The Nature of Christ	David Brown
Page 11	Christmas at Bethlehem	P.Marie-Joseph De Gerambe
Page 13	The Thessalonica Spirit	John Butler
Page 15	Fresh Evidence “To The Point”	James Martin
Page 16	On The Hebrew and Samaritan Chronology	Eclectic
Page 17	Critical Illustration of Genesis IV. 23, 24.	Eclectic
Page 18	Critical Illustration of Isaiah IX. 5	Eclectic
Page 19	This Is Not Your Rest Poem	C. J. W.
Page 19	Worship Including Prayer Considered In Several Aspects	Editor
Page 22	Who Can Reconcile These Things	A.B.C.
Page 24	Inconsistency	Editor
Page 24	Reference Tablet	W.
Page 25	A Fortnight with The Brethren in Scotland	William Ellis
Page 28	“Is There A God Beside Me: I Know Not Any”	David Brown
Page 28	Intelligence	

The persons that Jesus taketh hold of are the children of Abraham, the circumcised in heart and ears, the children of the free woman (not of the bond), all such are cleansed by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit. “Such are begotten” by the word of the truth of the Gospel “Wherefore, it behoved Him in all things to be made like unto,” etc. In this scripture, we have the reason given why He was made a little lower or inferior in nature to the angels. It was that He might be a merciful and faithful high priest. It was that He might destroy the power of death and deliver those that were under its sentence. This He did when “He put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself.” “He was manifested to take away our sins.” For this purpose was the Son of God manifested, that He might destroy the works of the devil,” which are sin and death.

**“He that hath my word,
let him speak it faithfully.
What is the chaff to the wheat?”**

Jeremiah 23:28

ISAIAH AND EZEKIEL CONCERNING TYRE

(Continued from December 1873, page 24.)

When we wrote the preceding article on Ezekiel's chariot, nearly a year ago, we had an idea of attempting a series of papers upon the prophecy in the order of its chapters. But since then it has appeared more convenient to take up such parts of it as strike the attention more particularly, without regard to the order of the prophecy, in the hope of covering the whole in course of time.

Ezekiel's description of Tyre seems to our mind about the finest and most graphic piece of writing in the Old Testament; and, when we consider his predictions concerning it, they are truly marvellous. The boldest and most hardened sceptic must be embarrassed at the circumstantial accuracy of its recital. It is most un-accountable that the daring infidel Volney, so delighted with the prophecy as to quote nearly the whole of it, was not struck dumb with astonishment at the complete refutation it gives to his own principle?

To establish the genuineness of a prediction several conditions are absolutely needful. First: The prophecy must be delivered before the event. Second: The terms in which it is couched must be plain, and not admit of double meaning. Third: There should be nothing to indicate to an observer the most acute, that such events are at all probable. Fourth: The person or persons who deliver the prophecy should have no power whatever to bring about intentionally the fulfilment of their predictions.

More than a hundred years before Ezekiel's time, Isaiah had foretold that the Babylonians would besiege the city of Tyre and take it. Our version runs thus: - "Behold the land of the Chaldeans; this people was not till the Assyrian founded it for them that dwell in the wilderness; they set up the towers thereof, they raised up the palaces thereof, and he brought it to ruin. - Isa. xxiii. 13.

This passage shews, perhaps, clearly enough that the founding of the Chaldean Empire was the work of the Assyrian power, but as regards the Chaldean siege of Tyre it reads obscurely. Boothroyd's translation seems preferable.

"Behold the land of the Chaldeans;
(This people was formerly of no account;
Wanderers of the desert till the Assyrians founded them).
They raise up their Towers against Tyre;
They make an assault on her palaces;
They make her an utter desolation."

When these words fell from the lips of "the royal prophet," Tyre was the naval mistress of the world, the Britannia of her time, she "ruled the waves." The blue waters of the Mediterranean were speckled with many a sail of fine Egyptian flax, clean and bright, like the wings of sea birds in the dazzling sun. Her spars and masts of scented cedar stood like sentinels against the sky, from the Bosphorus to the Pillars of Hercules. Her planks were of choice fir from the ridge of Hermon. Her decks and cabins ornate with ivory and gold, and inlaid box of Corsica, and fragrant cedar from Libanus. The sturdy oaks of Bashan formed her oars. Her pilots ruled the helm. The ports of Greece, of Italy, and Spain were hives of busy traffic to and from the Tyrian marts. Her freights were silver, iron, tin, and lead; horses, mules, oil, wine, wool, spices, gems, and gold. The clatter of caulkers resounded along her beach. The merry songs of myriad mariners rose upon the air. Thousands of busy feet hurried through her streets and squares. The rich and greedy merchants haggled for their price. The gay shops and stores were filled with wealthy eager customers. Tyre was full of bread and full of pride. Her ruler was "wiser than Daniel" in his own sight, and aspired to the honours of a God. Such was this "joyous city" when the prophet of Israel uttered "the burden of Tyre."

Now glance at Tyre's enemies. "Wanderers of the desert," says Isaiah. "Such they were," writes Boothroyd, "in the time of Job" (chapter i. 17.) mere freebooters like the Arabians, and such they continued to be until subdued by some Assyrian king, who gathered them together and settled them in Babylon, and the neighbouring country. It has been commonly supposed that these people sprang from Chised, the son of Nahor, the brother of Abraham; but Michaelis has rendered it probable that they came from the mountains of Armenia, where Zenophon found them in his retreat." When the voice from Heaven went out against Tyre, her destroyers were hardly a compact people, an infant colony of nomads of the wilds; almost without the elements of cohesion requisite to build up a nationality. Humanly considered there was therefore no evidence extant from which the overthrow of Tyre by such means could be inferred. The signs had yet to be developed by the Eternal Light from the dark face of the earth's tablet.

A century and a half had scarcely rolled away, when the new colony on the banks of the Euphrates had risen to political eminence. Its growth was rapid, like the growth of Britain in modern times. But why might Tyre not be able to resist the Babylonians as she had resisted the Assyrians and Phoenician's? If she had withstood the assaults of a gigantic consolidated power like Assyria, and had become stronger afterwards, there did not seem much cause to dread the attack of this newly organised people. But the battle is not always to the strong, nor the race to the swift. There are causes, though near to the eye, and effects sure, which escape the observation of men.

To understand clearly what the Scripture says of Tyre, it is needful to observe that in the first instance the city stood altogether on the mainland. There was, however, an island half a mile from the shore. This island was about two miles in circumference, and at an early date in the history of Tyre, began to form part of the city, and is spoken of as New Tyre. The prophet sometimes speaks of Old Tyre and sometimes of New. Old Tyre, Josephus says, was built by the Sidonians, two hundred and forty years before the temple at Jerusalem, this is why it is styled the Daughter of Sidon. It soon eclipsed the mother city. The same historian also informs us that it was besieged in the year 719 B.C., by the united fleets of Assyria and Phoenicia. At this epoch the New city had surpassed the Old, and although Shalmaneser became master of the latter, he was compelled to abandon the siege of the former as hopeless after a vigorous effort for five years. This circumstance, as Rollin remarks, greatly heightened the pride of Tyre.

One hundred and forty seven years later, Nebuchadnezzar laid siege to Tyre, that is, the old city. Thirteen years this attack was arduously prosecuted before the city fell into the hands of the besiegers. The houses were laid in ruins and the walls razed to the ground. Everyone who compares this event with the language of Ezekiel must own the finger of God.

(1) "Son of man, Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, caused his army to serve a great service against Tyrus: every head was made bald*(2) and every shoulder was peeled; yet he had no wages, nor his army for Tyrus, for the service that he had served against it," (Eze. xxix. 18). When Nebuchadnezzar came against Tyre, she was most wealthy and populous; what, therefore, could appear more unlikely, than that, having conquered the city, he should find no spoil! Yet this was the fact. As we have said, New or insular Tyre had grown and become prosperous. When the inhabitants of the old city saw they could no longer resist they removed all their valuables and effects into the new city. The Babylonians could not prevent this because they had no fleet; so that when they entered the city they found nothing but empty houses. Ezekiel tells us that God provided for this by making Nebuchadnezzar a present of the land of Egypt, verses 19, 20.

The prophet further testified that Tyre "should be no more; though thou be sought for, yet shall thou never be found again, saith the Lord God," chap. xxvi. 21. This has reference to old Tyre, the exact site of which has not been ascertained.

In 538 B.C., Cyrus became master of Phoenicia, which at that time again stood under Babylonian supremacy, and the hegemony was bestowed upon Sidon. For a long time Phoenicia prospered under wise Persian rulers; but when Xerxes, in his Greek wars, had completely destroyed the Phoenician fleet, and exhausted nearly all her resources, the exasperated inhabitants rose once more, but only to be utterly crushed. Sidon, at the head of the revolution, was fired by its own inhabitants, and once more Tyre resumed the lead (350 B.C.)" - Chamber's Cy.

Tyre was a powerful and thriving city in the time of Alexander, and was besieged by him after the battle of Issus because they would not pay tribute. This time it was the insular city that was attacked. The ruins of the old city were thrown into the sea to form a pier, on which to fix the engines, and to bring up the Macedonian troops. This work was hardly completed when it was partly carried away by a heavy sea. But Alexander was the wrong man to let so trifling an obstacle thwart his purpose. The breach was soon repaired. In the formation and repairing of this pier, the words of the prophecy were literally fulfilled. "They shall lay thy stones, and thy timber, and thy dust, in the midst of the water." (Eze. xxvi. 12). After holding out seven months the proud city gave way, and the new master took a terrible vengeance on her for her obstinacy. Alexander put two thousand of the inhabitants to death by crucifixion; he sold thirty thousand for slaves; and peopled the city chiefly by Carians. Amos and Zechariah had foretold that the city should be burned with fire besides having its walls broken down. This also was done by the Greeks.

Footnotes:-

(1) The phrase "Son of Man" is said to mean, according to the Syriac idiom, no more than man. In the Syriac, 1 Co. xv. 45, the first man Adam is rendered, "Adam the son of the first." - Boothroyd.

(2) With carrying timber and stones.

(To be continued.)

THE NATURE OF JESUS THE CHRIST IN RELATION TO ROMANS VIII. 2.

“For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death.”

(Issued by the Christadelphian Ecclesia, Tranent, Scotland, April, 1869.

(Continued from January, page 12)

But it is said that they are sin's flesh and blood, of whose nature He taketh hold. The nature that the children were partakers of was flesh and blood; “He Himself took not on Him the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham.” If the nature is cursed that He taketh hold of, He being found in fashion as a man, clearly proves that there is no way of exemption for Him, for He was bone of their bone and flesh of their flesh; we say, if the nature of Abraham is a cursed nature, then Christ is cursed. It may be so, but we have it yet to learn. We believe the flesh nature to be very good, but inferior to the angelic. The persons that He taketh hold of are the children of Abraham, the circumcised in heart and ears, the children of the free woman (not of the bond), all such are cleansed by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit. “Such are begotten” by the word of the truth of the Gospel “Wherefore, it behoved Him in all things to be made like unto,” etc. In this scripture, we have the reason given why He was made a little lower or inferior in nature to the angels. It was that He might be a merciful and faithful high priest. It was that He might destroy the power of death and deliver those that were under its sentence. This He did when “He put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself.” “He was manifested to take away our sins.” For this purpose was the Son of God manifested, that He might destroy the works of the devil,” which are sin and death. This He could not do in angelic nature, so the body prepared for Him was suited to the work given Him to do. Sin could not be condemned in spirit nature, but in that nature in which sin was committed, that is, flesh. It is said that on account of sin being committed in and by the flesh, that therefore all flesh is sin. I read of flesh being many things, but I have yet to learn where it is written that flesh is sin.” I read of “sinful flesh,” but that is no proof that flesh is sin. “Sin is the transgression of law;” flesh then is not sin, for its existence is clear, so that “the sinful nature of Jesus” must be proved from some other point than that He was found in the likeness of men. Again, it is argued that He was constituted a sinner in Adam being in his loins. This would be fatal to all our hopes if such was the case. If no amount of repentance or good works could save Him from the execution of the judicial sentence passed upon Adam, “for the eating of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shall not eat of it.” The sentence is, “in the sweat of thy face shall thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground, for out of it wast thou taken,” etc. If this sentence stood against Jesus as against Adam, then He required one to take away His own sins (if that were possible) as all others. That I believe this doctrine of “sin's flesh” to be subversive of the plan of salvation, I need not say, “for there is no other name given under heaven whereby we must be saved.” But, besides, we cannot overlook the fact that it is a principle in law that one criminal cannot condemn or justify another, so that if Jesus came under the sentence passed upon Adam, the death power will destroy Him instead of Him destroying it. The whole theory proves its own destruction, and that is a sufficient reason for us to lay it aside, as unworthy of faith. We maintain that if the death of Christ is to be the death-destroying power, He must be free from the condemnation of the law. I conceive that the general mode of reasoning is as unscriptural as it is without precedent, either in law or morals, upon this matter. The whole system seems to be based on the false supposition that the mission of the Anointed was to destroy flesh, instead of sin and death. Again, it is said that the seeds of decay and death were in Him as in all flesh, and that if He had not the tree of life restored to Him, He must perish. But what am I to understand by the seeds of decay and death? Is it that flesh in itself has not the power of self-existence? If that is what is meant by the “seeds of decay and death,” then I admit the doctrine of uncleanness in relation to Jesus, for He was not self-existent, but depended on that provided for Him outside of Himself – His meat and drink was to do the will of His Father. It is the revealed purpose of the Deity that man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God. That is the source of life for all flesh, but it is not in that sense that I object to the word “uncleanness” being applied to Jesus. If that is the meaning you put upon it, then I have no objections, but when I speak of cleanness or uncleanness, I do not refer to the state of health a body may be in, but to the character of the person spoken of in the eye of the law. It is law that determines the character. Now what I want is, that something more should be given than mere assertion, judged from what appears on the surface. You seem to think that Jesus had not access to the tree of life, because He died. That proves to me the very reverse; that, in fact, His dying was

the manifest token of His access to that tree. In this act He plucked of the most precious of her fruit. You must bear in mind that the tree of life was not removed, but Adam, in his state of disobedience, was driven from the inheritance. However, it is maintained that his death was evidence “that he had not the antidote to the murderous work.” It was never designed that it should be so. If Adam’s access to the tree of life was not an antidote to the death power’s approach, why should it be thought that Jesus had no access to the tree of life because He died? This same sort of argument was found in the mouths of His murderers. “If Thou be the Christ,” said they, “come down from the cross,” and if He had done so, it would have proved their supposition to be well-founded, that He was not the Christ. They had read out of the law “that Christ abideth for ever,” and therefore they reasoned that Jesus “could not be He.” Why? Because they found Him in the place of death instead of that of life. But this sort of reasoning only proved their ignorance of that law which they had read, and we are convinced that the advocates of this “sin’s flesh” theory used the same mode of reasoning when they assert that His death was proof that He was under the law of sin and death. The mere fact of His being in Joseph’s tomb, no more proves that He was the property of a broken law, than His being found on the Cross proved He was not the Christ, for if the argument be good in the one case, it holds equally good in the other. But both are false. The Cross was the place that proved Him to be “the Christ, the Son of God, and King of Israel,” the sepulchre proved Him “to have life in Himself.” It was the law of life that put Him there, and not the law of sin and death. The argument, then, vanishes as soon as it is known that He is just in that place that the law – even the law of life – demanded of Him. In this act, He proved, in the drinking of the cup of death, that He had not only access to the tree of life, but that He had access to the fountain of the water of life, and thus ate and drank of the fulness of Deity. To the question: Wherefore did He die? We answer: Because the law of obedience (which is the law of life) demanded that it should be so. 1st. Because the law of obedience could only be perfected in His death. 2nd. Because the law of the New Testament demanded the death of the Testator. 3rd. Because of the necessity “of a fountain being opened for the house of David, and for the inhabitants of Jerusalem for sin and uncleanness.” “For without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins.” “His death, then, was not the result of the operation of the law of sin, but of the result of the operation of the law of life, and in this last act, “He was obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross;” and nowhere do we see the proof made so manifest, that He not only had access to the tree of life, but that He had got to have life in Himself, and is thus constituted the bread of life unto all who hearken unto His voice. Blessed are the dead who die in obedience to the will of the Deity, they rest from their labours and their works do follow them. There is no such thing as death to the obedient, nor punishment to the innocent. Sin and death are linked together, as righteousness and life. Those who look on the death of Christ as punishment for sin, never could go further from the truth as it is in Jesus. My conviction is strong that in Him there was no cause of death. He possessed Himself of the every word of Deity, and was thus empowered to repel the devil, or that having the power of death. In His last hour of trial He could say, “Now is the Son of Man glorified, and God is glorified in Him, and if God be glorified in Him, God shall also glorify Him in Himself, and shall straightway glorify Him.” “The prince of this world cometh and hath nothing in Me.” Such was the testimony of Him (who was the image of the invisible God), and verified by the anointing spirit of the Deity in all the holy men of old, “who testified beforehand of the sufferings of Christ, and of the glory that should follow.” Deity was manifested in flesh (or lower nature) in the Christ, so will He be manifested in spirit (or higher nature), when the glory of the Anointed shall be made manifest in the heavens. “He is” the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.” “For in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily” of which the law was a shadow, but the body is of the Christ who in the days of His flesh was the first fruits of that glorious harvest, when the world shall have been reaped, when every knee shall bow of things in heaven and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus is Lord to the glory of God the Father. And not only was He the first fruits unto Deity of that glorious day, when the knowledge of the glory of Jehovah shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea, when “no-one shall need to say to his brother, know the Lord; for all shall know Him from the least unto the greatest.” Then shall the world’s King and Priest present on the altar of the Deity a world redeemed from the law of sin and death. He is the first in all, not only the first fruits acceptable unto Deity in flesh, but also in spirit, so that He is the first fruits of that holy nation, the temple of the Deity, the royal household whose number no man can count, in whom and by whom shall the decrees of the Almighty be revealed and executed in the day of His great power and glory. Then shall the glorious tidings be proclaimed: “The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our God and of His anointed,” and He (or they) “shall reign for the ages of the ages,” when all flesh shall be blessed in Him.

Such is our faith, and hope, and joy.

Brother Swindell,

[This article was unexpectedly sent to us by Brother Swindell, of Halifax, to whom we are much obliged. We received it on the 16th October, and were quite ignorant of its existence before that date. – EDITOR.]

THE TWELVE HUNDRED AND SIXTY PROPHETIC DAYS.

The more we read on the subject of fulfilled prophecy, the stronger our faith becomes in the inspiration of the scriptures; but the more we read on prophecy unfulfilled, the less and less positive we feel inclined to be in speaking of the time of its accomplishment.

Of writers upon the 1260 days of Daniel it may be said that their name is legion, for they are exceeding many; and for the most part it is equally true that their failures have been legion also. Unfulfilled prophecy seems to have a line for nearly all theological writers, and the ignominious defeats sustained by their predecessors have suggested to the minds of few the extreme danger and uncertainty of all dogmatic and positive interpretation.

Many have fixed a date in the near future, and sometimes in the present, suggested by the state of political affairs, and run back through the given number of years to find a suitable epoch of departure; while others have paid little attention to the future and have fixed rigidly on some dates for the commencement of the vision. The general tendency of writers appears to have been to find the fulfilment of the prediction in their own time, and frequently very near to the time of writing; and in some instances it should seem that the glory of finding themselves hardly second in foresight to the old prophets, has outweighed the grave considerations of possibly leading society along a hazardous path almost without any light to fall into the ditch of disappointment, and sometimes even to make shipwreck of faith in the word of the Most High. In the years 1807 and 1808 there was a great deal of learned speculation and controversy in this country on the termination of the 1260 years. The most distinguished, perhaps, of the writers here alluded to was Mr. G. Faber. Some who took part in the debates were convinced that 1792 was the ending of the 1260 years, and found no difficulty in squaring the political events of that period with their own ideas on the state of affairs at “the end of the days.” Among those who held this view were Newton, Mede, Whiston, Cunningham, and Dr. Moore. Others directed attention to 1843 as the true date, easily bringing the events they deemed necessary to the prophetic word within the compass of 30 years ensuing. Marvellous as are the changes in a few years, the prophetic expositor often finds it a light thing for his mind to compress the revolutions of ages within the narrow limits of half a lifetime. In the midst of this prophetic war stood Mr. Faber, firm and immovable in the belief that the end was much further off; that it would not arrive till 1866. But even then Mr. Faber held that 75 years more must elapse before the return of the Lord from the heavens; 1866 being only the expiration of the “time, times, and a half.”

In contrast to these views, Butt fixed the close earlier than 1792, and Milner found it to be later than 1866. To transcribe facts and arguments for these different dates would be very tedious to the writer, would occupy much space, and perhaps would not be, after all, very instructive to the reader. As regards all the writers who have affirmed the termination of the 1260 to be the coming of the Lord, and that not later than 1866, it is enough to say that these interpretations are now numbered with the errors of the past.

There is one feature in reckoning up prophetic time which is almost invariably overlooked. Jewish time was calculated by the phases of the moon; and the months were of 30 days each, 12 making the lunar year. This year was composed of 360 days. In almost every treatise on prophetic time the ordinary year is taken as though it corresponded with the Jewish, or lunar cycle. For instance, in writings with which our readers are familiar, 606 being taken as the starting point of the 1260, it is said that the end of that period arrives in 1866. This would be right if prophetic and ordinary years were of the same length. The difference, however, is far too considerable to be neglected. The ordinary, or Julian year, is just about 365 days 6 hours. The six hours, an a long period, make an item not altogether unnoticed in accurate calculation; but the five days add up to so large an amount in 1000 years as to be very significant.

Supposing it to be correct that the 1260 ought to be dated from the year 606, instead of the end coming in 1866, as it does if our years are taken, the true end of the time is 1848, for in 1260 years the additional 5 days, to say nothing of the 6 hours, amount to no less than 18 years. What is to be said to this? Here are the facts: first, the prophetic year, which is Jewish, is 360 days; second, the Julian year is 365 days 6 hours. Would it not be as reasonable to call ten tens ninety-nine, as to call 365 days 360? From whatever year we take our departure the true time must be counted.

The grand difficulty, of course, in the calculation of a prophetic period is to fix accurately its commencement. As regards the 1260 days or years, there does not at first sight appear to be any obstacle to fixing upon their true beginning. The period evidently concerns to papal power, and the history of that power is as complete, perhaps, as any history we possess. The elaborate works of Bower and of Ranke, together with more recent histories, lead us step by step to the first Pope, through the lives of the 259, down to the present claimant of infallibility. Still with all these materials, opinions greatly differ as to the prophetic rise of the Little Horn. The date of Justinian's decrees have been selected by some. These writers looked to 1792 to finish the prophecy. Others begin with the Pelagian epistles in 583, which runs out the 1260 in 1843. Others again have taken the Hegira or flight of Mahomet in 606, the terminus being the same as that following from the decree of Phocas which was the same year, or as some say, two years later. And some writers give the secular ascendancy of the papacy in 758 as the proper starting point; from this the time would run out in the year 2018, or, allowing for the difference of lunar and solar time, in the year 2000. Much confidence has been placed in this reckoning on account of an ancient Jewish tradition, that, as the world was made in six days, so there would be six working days of a thousand years each, and a seventh day of the same length as a Sabbath of rest. Adopting this view, the end of the times of the Gentiles is not far off; two ordinary lives would reach to the dawn of that great morning when they that sleep in the dust shall awake and sing. In the study of this intricate subject there are two things in particular which engage our attention: the spiritual and the secular power of the Little Horn. From Paul's letter to the Thessalonians we judge that it is the spiritual rather than the temporal power that is to be destroyed by Christ at His coming. See verses 8-12, second chapter, second epistle. Daniel and John speak of the secular strength of the Horn. This authority was wielded to "wear out the saints," and to cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed." The political power of the papacy has recovered from several severe shocks, and, judging from these, it seems somewhat hasty to conclude that the last reverse of fortune in 1867 was final. Is it not under the recognised Headship of the papacy that the words of Revelation, xviii. 7, are to be accomplished? "I sit queen, and am no widow?" May not the present imprisonment, as it is called, of Pius IX. be regarded as a state of spiritual divorce for Rome? To conjecture there is no end; still should France call Chambord or some other member of monarchy to the throne, and should a similar event happen to Spain, it looks not improbable that Rome would again rejoice under the secular and spiritual paternal protection of St. Peter's chair. The 1260 years have been treated as though it were absolutely necessary for the secular power of the Horn to continue for the whole of the period; they have also been thought to comprise all the authority both secular and spiritual. But it would be no easy thing to prove that for 1260 years the papacy has had power to kill those it calls heretics. Two difficulties are suggested by this view, namely, if the 1260 years were to be a period of iron rule with power to kill, when did it commence? And if the expiry of that period is the advent of Christ, how is it that for so many years the papacy has had no power to kill, neither is Christ yet come?

Concerning the Little Horn, Daniel says, that the saints should be given into his hand until a time, times and a half. We would suggest that this may not imply power to kill or to imprison for the whole of that period, but, that the 1260 years being the time assigned to the supremacy of the Horn, both temporally and spiritually, the beginning of 1260 would not be before the attainment of power to kill, though that power would not necessarily be in force to the end of the days. The reason we offer for this view is this, that those saints who were killed while the Horn held supreme sway, may be regarded as still "in his hand," until Christ raises them from the dead, although the Horn has not had the power to kill for many years before their resurrection takes place.

As intimated above, whatever might be the ecclesiastical domination of the Horn, the saints could not be said to be given into his hand prior to the acquisition of full temporal rule; so that, if they were to be given into his hand until the time, times and a half," the inference presents itself that the duration of spiritual tyranny is to be dated from that epoch. There are a variety of opinions with respect to the proper starting point, for the spiritual power does not apply to the rise of the temporal, so far at least as we know. The latter is mostly reckoned from 750 to 800. On this we quote Fleming.

"I cannot reckon him (the Pope) to have been in a proper and full sense head of Rome, until he was so in a secular as well as an ecclesiastical sense. And this was not until the days of Pepin, by whose consent he was made a secular prince, and a great part of Italy given to him as St. Peter's patrimony. Now, as near as I can trace the time of this donation of Pepin, it was in or about the year 758, about the time that Pope Paul the First began to build the Church of St. Peter and St. Paul."

The state of Europe at present is not strongly indicative of the very near advent of Christ, nor do the Jews and their land correspond with our own ideas of the prophetic word regarding them at the time of Messiah's approach. The changes produced by war, especially as now carried on, alter the ways of the world considerably in a few days; but where it is a question of colonization and agricultural prosperity, on

however small a scale, some length of time must elapse for its achievement. On the whole, then, our present judgment inclines to the last mentioned computation as appearing more reasonable than those which place the completion of the 1260 at an earlier date.

EDITOR

THE NATURE OF THE CHRIST.

BY DAVID BROWN, LONDON.

PART I.

To determine this point in the light of the Scriptures it is necessary for us to take heed to the revealings of the Spirit concerning the nature of Adam, and the effect of his condemnation for transgression of law, as well as to the predicates of the means of grace for the hope of glory.

1st. It is manifest that the nature of the first Adam was a corruptible nature of the same basis as the animal creation, and that it was his moral and intellectual faculties alone that gave him the pre-eminence over the other creatures of God. The first chapters of Genesis and Ecclesiastes and the 49th Psalm establish this view. The Edenic law, which brought him under responsibility to God, opened to him the possibility of escaping death through faith and obedience, and of attaining to a higher order of existence. The result of his disobedience to the Divine law was the condemnation of his flesh to the unrestrained operation of the natural law embodied in the words, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shall thou return," and to place him on a level with the animal creation as regards the perishable characteristics of their respective laws of generation, inasmuch as he was to be the federal head of a race to be propagated after the law of a carnal commandment; hence the laws of sin and death were written in his members as the prototype of all who should come out of his loins, or be born according to the law or principle of human generation. The Apostle Paul bears testimony to this in many of his utterances, "All in the Adam die," because "all (in him) have sinned and come short of the glory of God," "As by a man came death (upon all men) the bondage of corruption," "The wages of sin is death," etc. These conclusively define the effect of Adam's condemnation on himself and his posterity, and shew the reason why all who have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression become subject to the dominion of the grave or death, and when they lie down in the dust, shall rise up no more, and the wrath of God, or the curse or penalty of transgression of law abideth upon them.

Such being the nature of the first Adam, and the effect of his condemnation for transgressing the Edenic law of God, we have to consider (secondly) what are the predicates of the means of grace for the hope of glory, or how can the grace of God act to bring to a condemned race deliverance from the bondage of corruption consistent with the demands of His righteous law? We see, in searching into the matter, that God magnifies His own law, and makes it honourable by His own provision to work out His purposes of love and mercy, and to testify to all that He has not made man for nought. He signified to the sinner Adam in the institution of sacrifices that without shedding of blood there is no remission of sin, and in the speciality of the sacrificial victim that the real sacrifice must be of his flesh and blood nature, but without spot or blemish, and not subject to the law of sin and death, though capable of death by the nature of his own existence, and that the sacrifice dies not for Himself – i.e., on account of His own sins, hereditary or personal – but for the transgressions of those who should become Jehovah's people by hearkening to the name of the Lord. The type of the Lamb, as more fully elaborated in the Mosaic Law, illustrates these particulars, and they are further shadowed forth in the Psalms and the prophets.

1st. The promise or covenant with Adam intimated that the Seed of the woman "should bruise the serpent's head," and the peculiarity of this language has reference to the purposes of God in the manifestation of this Seed in flesh and spirit. The phrase "Seed of the woman" has this hidden wisdom underlying the letter, that though the Seed by being born of a woman should have affinity with the Adamic race (for that which is born of flesh is flesh), yet from not being a son of man by natural generation He would be free of the condemnation in Adam, and be qualified to become the Redeemer of the race dead in the Adam by saving Himself from a like catastrophe, and so gaining the ability to bruise the serpent's head, while in doing so He voluntarily submits to the serpent "bruising His heel," or causing Him to die as a sacrificial victim to the intent that in His resurrection He might overcome for others that which has the power of death, which rested on Adam and all his posterity, and forms in them the law of sin and death

written in their members. The phrase, “bruise his head,” reveals the promise of a triumphant resurrection to the Seed of the woman, and of His prevailing power against the binding force of the enemy, and therefore it is an inference, a priori, that the Seed was to be a new Creation by the Spirit in mortal flesh of the Adamic race, not under condemnation to death, ab initio, and that He should, as a Man from the Lord delivered from all congenital disabilities, work out His own salvation from natural death, and that, being called and chosen as a Lamb without blemish and without spot, He should die a Just One for unjust ones; and that, in this submission to poverty to do the will of His Father, He might make others rich with His riches in glory as the beginning of the new Creation of God, and being the First-born among brethren He should eventually be the destruction of death and the grave, reigning until all enemies should be put under His feet, and the curse should be taken away from off all the earth.

2nd. The promises made with the fathers of Israel, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, which certify that in Abraham and his seed all the nations should be blessed – and that his seed should possess the gates of his enemies – support the conclusions inferred from the Edenic promise with this addition, that the woman’s seed would in the fulness of time be made manifest through the posterity of Abraham. And when the tribes of Israel were constituted a nation, He is identified with that family of the earth (out of all the other families) which God had known and chosen to place His name there, and of that family He is designated the Supreme Ruler; as is evident from the words of Moses, Dent. xviii., 15, 20. These words preclude the idea that, before the manifestation to the nation of this Ruler, as the prophet like unto Moses, He was other than on the same level of flesh and blood as the people themselves with the like senses, and affections, and passions, only in the accident of birth not under the condemnation of the original sinner. The raising up of this Prophet indicates that the Deity would act Himself in the inception and in instructing Him in the way He should go throughout His probationary career, until He should be fitted and prepared for the Master’s use, and then, but not till then, the Word would become flesh, or dwell in Jesus, as the Minister of the Circumcision, for the truth of God to confirm the promises made to the Fathers, and, says the Apostle, “we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.”

3rd. The terms of the Davidic Covenant correspond with the Edenic and Abrahamic, in demonstration of the like conclusions, and set a seal to the truth of their testimony, as well as to the teaching of the types and shadows of the Mosaic Law. The expression, “I will be His Father and He shall be My son,” embracing in its compass the two births of flesh and spirit, asserts (firstly) that the inception in flesh of the Son of David, was of the creative energy of the spirit, whereby He was in the flesh like the first Adam, a Son of God, not “the,” as if He were the only one of a fleshly nature entitled to that appellation; and (secondly) that His renewal in spirit consequent upon His fleshly resurrection by ascension to the Father, sealed His claims to that peculiar title, which consubstantiality with Deity confers, and qualified Him to be “My beloved Son, my beloved, in whom my soul delighteth.” “The first begotten from the dead;” “the only begotten Son,” etc.

Another division of this covenant, viz., “in suffering for iniquity I will punish Him with the stripes due to the children of Adam,” in effect proclaims the liberty of the Christ from the bondage of the curse, and the preciousness of His voluntary obedience unto death, as a ransom for “children of Adam;” the stripes were not due to Himself; as they would have been had He been born in the natural course. “A child of Adam,” but to the children of Adam apart from Himself, so that, “in that He died He died unto, or as a propitiation for sin, once, and in that He liveth, He liveth unto God.” The doctrine concealed under these words being, that He must have been a “living man” before He could die for those who are. “dead” while they live; and to be a living man in the scriptural sense here, death could not have had dominion over Him because He was not under the law of sin and death, but under grace. Again, the phrase, “I will not take my mercy from Him,” foreshows a gift of life to which He would be entitled for a possession, before He should lay down His life, to take it up again. A legal forfeiture restrains free will, and cannot be cancelled by any act of the party under condemnation, and hence Paul argues, that restitution must be done by another who is not a particeps criminis, or involved in its consequences, to allow “mercy to season justice,” saying, in Rom. v. 18, “As by the offence of one judgment came upon all men unto condemnation, even so, by the righteousness of One, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.” By the Davidic covenant the house of David, of all the houses of Israel, was the appointed line for the manifestation of the promised Seed, and in due time the Seed of David, the Holy Child Jesus, came forth through a Virgin of that house, in fulfilment of this Scripture, “A virgin shall conceive and bear a son;” “therefore,” saith the angelic messenger to Mary, “the holy thing which shall be born of thee (for all that openeth the womb shall be hallowed unto the Lord) shall be called ‘a Son of God.’”

Thus we perceive, that in the counsel of the Most High, the fleshly connection through Mary was necessary to establish the covenants of promise, and the Spirit inception as a new creation of God was equally so, to enable the Child Jesus to fulfil all things spoken concerning him in the Psalms, the law, and

the prophets. We may also note that the word “holy” applied by the angel to the offspring of the Virgin’s womb is an evident proof (in se) that the hereditary curse did not operate to affect the position of the Christ as a candidate for immortality, and it aids in making assurance doubly sure that He was never liable as a son of Abraham to the Adamic condemnation which passes upon all men of natural generation, who in the Adam have sinned and come short of the glory of God, and are consequently without hope and without God in the world, made to be taken and destroyed, and like unto the beasts that perish. And (lastly) the parallelism between the expressions, “the holy thing which shall be born” and “shall be called a Son of God,” as used by the angel, is clearly an indication that the flesh of Jesus, or rather His bodily organization, was not to be “evil” or “cursed,” but “holy” and “undefiled,” and separate from that of sinners, and “very good,” like the first Adam when he sprung up fresh from his Maker’s hands, “a Son of God” in weakness.

We affirm, then, that the harmony of the Scriptures is maintained in all its revelations concerning the principle of God manifestation, and we have no hesitation in receiving as the doctrine according to godliness, that the Lord Jesus the Christ did not live and move and have His being in a condemned nature, under the curse or wrath of God, which would have been wholly unprofitable for the purpose of the scheme of God’s redemption, but that He stood on the same basis as the first Adam in the choice of good and evil, and by His steadfastness in well-doing achieved a victory over the death power of the flesh, and of the grace of God obtained the reward of faithful service – a right to the blessing, life for evermore, on His own behalf. Released, upon this termination of His earthly career of probation, from fear of evil, and chosen of God as the Minister of the Circumcision for His truth in confirmation of the promises made to the fathers, He became “the Word made flesh,” as the Apostle John declares: “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God; the same was in the beginning with God . . . 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.

And the Word was not made flesh until this beginning.”

PART II.

This development of the truth as it is in Jesus varies to some extent from the theories concerning His nature and origin which are now in controversy amongst the Christadelphians, yet it is the Christian mean between two opposites which do equally invalidate the means of grace for the hope of glory; for whether we look to the declarations authoritatively set forth that “Jesus is the Father incarnate by His Spirit, the result being a Son,” or to the charge of “mere manism” which makes Him a production of human generation, so far as deteriorated nature is concerned, we are shut up to the conviction that in either case the righteousness of God, as witnessed in the law and the prophets, cannot be accomplished without a violation of His revealed Word. A flesh and blood nature being designed by the Deity for the probationary existence of the Adamic race, the prescription of His law in connection with this creation when condemned under sin was “that without shedding of blood there could be no remission of sin,” and this is the key to the mystery of godliness; and the wisdom of God brought to light in due time the instrumentality whereby it was carried out without let or hindrance from the force of His other unalterable law, “the wages of sin is death “ The combination of these two laws necessitated the manifestation of the Redeemer in Adamic flesh and blood capable of death, and of being tempted in all points like as we are, and of resisting the power of temptation, and of working out His own deliverance from the dust state to a higher state of being, and of standing as a living man free to offer up His life for His brethren in voluntary obedience to the will of God, and to present Himself by a resurrection from the dead as the “living sacrifice” who had tasted death for every man’s sin, and risen again for every man’s justification, that God might be just, and yet the Justifier of them that should believe in Jesus. If these things be so, and we have before shown their necessity in the righteousness of God to seal up the testimony of the law and the prophets, how does the belief that “Jesus was the Father incarnate by His Spirit, the result being a Son,” correspond with these conditions of existence? Is it not rather a revival of the old heresy of a Divine and human nature in one Christ; and can the Father, who is inherently immortal, and impassable, and impeccable, divest Himself of these qualities by becoming incarnate? If not, He cannot manifest Himself as the Christ of His Word, and if He can thus deny Himself He cannot be also the Eternal and Unchangeable God. But as there is nothing in the Scriptures to show that Jesus was “a Son of God” by direct creation in any other sense than Adam was, the comparison of the two opposing doctrines of “Father incarnation” and “mere manism,” in a syllogistic form, reveals the absurdity and blasphemy we are compelled to uphold in acceding to the terms of the propositions, and accepting as the bases of “the truth as it is in Jesus” their God-dishonouring demonstrations.

CHRISTMAS AT BETHLEHEM.

BY P. MARIE-JOSEPH DE GERAMB.

Translated by the Editor from "La Semaine Religieuse" of the Diocese of
Rennes, Saturday, December 27th, 1873.

ASCENDING some steps we find a door which leads to the subterranean chapel of the Holy Grotto. It is thirty-eight feet in length, eleven in breadth and nine in height; two staircases of fifteen steps each, constructed at the sides, lead, the one to the church of the Greeks, the other to that of the Arminians, the rocks and the pavement are covered with precious marble, given by Saint Helene, and two lamps burn without intermission in this holy place, where the light of day never penetrates. At the bottom, towards the east, is the place where the purest of virgins gave birth to the Saviour of the world. This place, which is illuminated by sixteen lamps, is indicated by a marble fixed in the pavement and incrusting with jasper, in the middle of which is a silver sun encircled with this inscription:

HIC DE VIRGINE MARIA
JESUS CHRISTUS NATUS EST.

Above is a marble table which serves as an altar, and is supported by two columns. It is between these two columns, and under this altar that we prostrate ourselves to kiss the august place which the inscription designates. Several steps lower towards the south, is seen the manger.

At the distance of three steps, opposite the manger, is the spot where Mary was seated, with the child Jesus in her arms, when the Magi came to worship Him and to offer gifts.

The manger is raised a foot above the level of the grotto, and covered with white marble. At the bottom is a pretty good picture, the frame of which is silver, representing the Adoration of the Shepherds. It covers the face of the rock. On Christmas day it is removed, and the bare rock remains for some time exposed to the veneration of the faithful. At this epoch the reverend guardian Father cleans it, and gathers with respect the little pieces which are detached therefrom. I brought away some of these which I owe to his kindness.

Christian princes have made it a duty to send presents for the ornamentation of the manger. It is always hung with magnificent draperies those of this week are on a ground of white silk, strewn with roses and embroidery of gold. At the spot where the Magi came to worship Jesus, is an altar with a fine picture representing the Adoration, and surmounted with a grand star.

The sanctuary of the Nativity belongs to the Greeks; the manger and the place of Adoration of the Magi to the Catholics.

I never enter this august Grotto, my dear friend, without a long wax candle in my hand, as when I have visited Calvary, and the holy Sepulchre.

When prostrate before the place where the Saviour was born, I cast my eyes on these Words, Hic de Virgine Maria Jesus Christus natus est: Here JESUS CHRIST WAS BORN OF THE VIRGIN MARY. I experience, I know not what feeling altogether distinct and different from that which other acts of Christian piety produce in me.

The word HERE has for the faithful a charm, an attraction, a sweetness which cannot indeed be felt or understood except upon the spot. The soul, the heart, all the faculties are arrested with this word; one repeats it a thousand times, and after having a thousand times repeated it, we say it yet again, it returns incessantly to the lips burning with gratitude and love.

In fact, there is no place in the world where the heart can be more delightfully moved than in this Grotto at Bethlehem. When carrying my thoughts back to the time, to the season of the year at which the poor little child Jesus was born, I add, in speaking to myself, "The place, it is HERE," it seems that I hear Him cry with cold, with want, and immediately I think I see Mary, His good mother, showering on Him the most endearing and tender cares; Saint Joseph hastens at the cries of his adopted son, to receive him from his mother's hands, and to press him affectionately to his breast; and these thoughts fill my soul with ineffable sentiments, which my pen would in vain endeavour to describe. I pray, I sigh, I lift my eyes wet with tears towards heaven, I murmur the sacred name of Jesus, the holy names of Joseph and Mary, and I bless God thrice holy, for having in His mercy given me His Son as a Saviour; again I bless Him for having given to be His mother her whom He Himself has judged worthy to be the mother of this divine

Son; I bless Him for having given me a soul which these grand and incomprehensible benefits penetrate, touch, and melt.

You know, my dear friend, with what pomp, with what joy, the Christmas fete and the midnight Mass are celebrated in all the Catholic world; you have like me been able to remark the beauty of the decorations which embellish our temples at the epoch of this grand solemnity and the immense concourse of the faithful, and their pious haste to go and adore the infant Jesus, and the unanimous concert of praises and of prayers for the happy advent of the Messiah, and those hymns, those songs through which breaks forth with one accord the heartfelt joy; concourse, ardour, concert, hymns, psalms, joy which more than once have won to Jesus Christ the heart even of those whom a profane and oft a more criminal curiosity had attracted. Think what such a fête must be, such a mass celebrated at midnight in Bethlehem, and at the very place where Jesus was born. I will retrace nothing here of what you have seen besides; I will not pause to picture the holy magnificence which is displayed at this solemnity, I will not speak to you of the riches of the tapestries with which the marbles are covered, nor of the ravishing strains of music in perfect harmony with the sublimity and sweetness of the mystery, nor of that myriad of long wax candles which burn not only before the altar but in all the interior; nor of the pomp which surrounds the reverend guardian Father in the exercise of his functions, nor of the shining ornaments of gold due to the munificence of Catholic princes of another age, and with which the numerous priests who assist him are invested, etc.; but I will speak to you at least :a few words of a touching and august ceremony which has not and cannot take place anywhere but here. The office begins by a solemn procession to the holy manger.

At midnight, at this hour of blessing, at which in all the Catholic churches of the universe the infant Jesus receives the homage of all the Christian faithful upon the earth, the reverend guardian Father commences the march and advances with slow steps, his head inclined, carrying the infant Jesus in his arms with great reverence, then come the Bethlehemites and the Catholic Arabs, then the pilgrims of different nations, each with a torch in their hand. The celebrant and the cortege having arrived near to the place of the Nativity, the deacon, with deep devotion, sings the Gospel. . . . When he has reached these words and having swaddled him, he receives the child from the hands of the officiating minister, wraps him in swaddling clothes, lays him in the manger, prostrates himself, and worships. . . . Then, my dear friend, something supernatural transpires within the soul. I will venture to say, if I may judge of it by what I have witnessed, by what I have felt myself. Piety has no longer any voice wherewith to express her gratitude and love; she speaks no more save by the tenderness of her looks, by her sighs and tears. Saint Basil puts in the mouth of Mary these words to her new born son: “What shall I name you, O my well beloved? What shall I call you? A mortal? But I have conceived you by a divine operation. A God? But you have a human body. How shall I act with regard to you? Must I draw near to you with incense in my hand, or must I nourish you with the milk of my bosom? Ought I to have only the cares of the tenderest of mothers for you, or ought I to serve you prostrate in the dust? O marvellous contrast! Heaven is your abode, and I am nursing you on my knees! You are on the earth yet you are not separated from the inhabitants of the skies, and heaven is with you!”

THE THESSALONICA SPIRIT.

**[An Address delivered before the Ecclesia in the Temperance Hall,
Birmingham, on Sunday morning, Oct. 12, by Bro. John Butler.]**

Dear Brethren and Sisters – I have been requested by the Managing Brethren, in my address this morning, not to enter into questions of a controversial character. Indeed my doctrinal proclivities being known, I narrowly escaped at the Managing Brethren’s meeting on Monday last being crossed off the speaking list altogether, or at any rate of being remanded for a month on suspicion; but on reconsideration they refrained from taking those extreme measures, and appointed a deputation to wait upon and ask me not to enter upon the now vexed question. With their request, backed as it has been by the good examples set from this platform,* I complied all the more readily because I had previously no intention of doing otherwise.

* The new theory had been continually and vehemently attacked by every speaker who had on previous occasions addressed the meeting.

I wish to direct your attention this morning to a little advice given by the apostle John, in the 4th chap. 1st verse, of his first epistle, "Beloved," he says, "believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God, because many false prophets are gone out into the world." Now, how were these beloved brethren of the beloved apostles to try the spirits? The answer to this question is contained in a statement made by another apostle – the apostle of the Gentiles – that we are to prove all things, and hold fast that which is good, which advice is riveted by the words of the Lord Jesus Himself, "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me." When Paul visited Thessalonica, as you know, he came across a class of his own countrymen, who did not believe in searching the Scriptures for the purpose of finding anything contrary to what they had been taught from their infancy – bigoted, contemptible people, who were not willing to abide by an impartial appeal to their own authorities, who treated with scorn the bearer of any new light, who, even at the risk of his own life, sought to shew them the way of salvation. They were not willing that the statements of Paul should be calmly investigated either by themselves or by others, for a weak cause is best screened by not being disturbed, by refraining from having it agitated; and so these malicious Jews who believed not, moved with envy, it is said, took unto them certain lewd fellows of the baser sort, such as are indeed to be found in every town, and set the city in an uproar for the purpose of expelling the unwelcome expositors of unpalatable truths. Their expedients succeeded, they drove the apostle out of their city, and he went to the neighbouring town of Berea, to preach the gospel there. And here we find materials for a great contrast. The Jews of Berea, we are told were more noble than those of Thessalonica. Why were they more noble? Because they received the word with all readiness of mind, and above all, searched the scriptures daily to see whether these things were so. They acted fully up to the advice of him whose proclamation they were called upon to test, by endeavouring to prove all things, in order that they might hold fast that which is good. This is indeed the truly noble spirit, and it is no wonder that we have the further statement, after this exemplary exhibition of character: "Therefore many of them believed of honourable women and of men not a few." Men and women cannot advance to the truth, nor can they advance in the truth, unless they have this mind of the noble Bereans, if they imitate the bigoted, self-satisfied men of Belial inhabiting Thessalonica. And yet which class is the more numerous in the world? Alas, you know full well. There is always a tendency in the human mind to rest satisfied with things as they are, to think we have arrived at the complete attainment of the truth in all its bearings and aspects; to think we have reached the Ultima Thule, beyond which there is nothing but chaos and heresy. And not only that but there is also a tendency in us to regard with suspicion and distrust all innovation, all disturbers of that which is quiet, all radicals, Christians, if I may use the term, whose motto is legion, as that of the radicals in politics is "Forward and upward" The Jews of Thessalonica were greatly disgusted at the interference of Paul – that great turner of the world upside down. What business had he to come into their synagogue and there streets, to proclaim something which would subvert their existing institutions and change the whole current of their religious life? So it has been all the world over, and all history through; and this tendency to stagnate, this indisposition to change, is manifest even in the very progress, or rather in the stages of progress, which have been made toward truth in religious history. Through the labours of Paul and his co-workers, a vast number of people were led to embrace the truth; they were persuaded that the belief they before held was based on a false foundation, and so they embraced the gospel of Paul; but again becoming satisfied that they had arrived at that position beyond which there was no reason to advance, they rested, stagnated, and ultimately began to surrender to the keeping of ambitious leaders who rose up amongst them, and who loved, above all things, to occupy pre-eminent positions among them. What wonder was there that this condition of things should at length develop into the system of Popery, which has sat like a nightmare on the earth – a system in which the truth was lost, and became supplanted by dead forms and ceremonies and spectacular displays, which pleased the eye, but spread over the mind the lethargy of spiritual death; a system in which one man became paramount in the person of the Lord God – the Pope – who with his devilish minions ruled in both temporal and spiritual matters, and persecuted to the death with sworn and faggot, all, however noble and just, and good, who dared to lift their little fingers against their usurped and truth and soul destroying authority. At length arose, even amidst this vast ocean of death and darkness, one or two men possessing scintillations of truth, combined with indomitable energy and great ability, and they succeeded, though in most cases with the loss of their lives, in weakening the fetters by which Europe was bound, and in awakening large numbers from the slumber in which the Papal opiates had kept them, and "The Protestant Reformation," as it is called, became an accomplished fact. But mark the innate intolerance of the human mind, and how men can rebel against tyranny and yet be tyrants themselves. The very men who had cast off the shackles of Popery sought to rivet their own shackles on others passed in this country an Act of Conformity, and in their turn sent many to prison and to death who

wished to make further progress towards truth and light. But progress would not be arrested. From Popery emerged Protestantism, from Protestantism emerged Dissent, from Dissent sprung many branches, each branch being as a rule in advance of the one preceding it, and each experiencing in a greater or less degree the persecution and intolerance of those from whom they sprung. The spirit of Thessalonica indeed seems universal; it is manifest in every sect of society; none appear exempt. Cast your eye upon the denominations around us, you there behold many illustrations of what I have said, illustrations of the various stages of growth; and on all you see that the spirit of self-satisfaction and confidence has fallen like a pall upon confined corpses. They have placed their confidence and their consciences in the keeping of eloquent and clever leaders, whose spiritual expositions they think it blaspheming to dispute, or whose spiritual directions they explicitly follow. Let the truth of God in its purity be introduced among them, and woe to him that introduces it. He may hold it himself, certainly, without agitating it, and he may be considered a respectable member of the congregation and be tolerated for years. But he must not agitate, he must not express his doubts and advanced opinions. Keep quiet, don't introduce your unpalatable views too prominently; don't seek to disturb those friendly and comfortable relations which have hitherto subsisted between ourselves and our ministers or leaders, that harmony in which we have so long dwelt and rejoiced. Do you mean to hint that our ministers may possibly be in the wrong? Do you think he has lived so many years amongst us and done so much good, and yet is not in the right path; we have known him too long to believe that; we have sat under him all these years, and if we are in error with him we will rest in error. Don't promulgate your heretical doctrines, here. But the man thinks it his duty to agitate, to proclaim what he conscientiously believes to be the truth. Ah, notice men how the cold shoulder is turned towards him; notice the manifestation of the Thessalonica spirit. Many of you know from bitter experience what that spirit is, what small credit your opponents give you for conscientious convictions, and what large credit you receive for malicious self-seeking motives. There is much to do and to suffer in contending against the tendency I have spoken of, the tendency to become stereotyped, cramped, and conservative in one's religious opinions and sympathies, the tendency to misrepresent, and persecute, and disable all who chance to differ from us in religious convictions. Agree on all points with some people, and they are as sweet to you as honey and the honey-comb; disagree on one, and they become bitter as the waters of Marah. They usurp the position of Christ, and, not in words perhaps, but practically, they say "ye are my friend if ye do whatsoever I command you; if you do not you are to me a heathen and a publican." They only are to contend earnestly for the faith; they only have consciences; they only have a right to proclaim what they believe to be true: they only have a right to mount their pulpit Olympus, and hurl at their opponents the thunderbolts of Jupiter, and you must sit quietly by and listen, like dumb dogs that cannot bark; you must not lift up a finger of protest against their statements and accusations for they only are the trustees of the truth. Such is the true Thessalonica spirit; it is not the spirit of Berea; it is not the spirit of Paul; it is not the spirit of Christ; for their purpose is not to prove all things and hold fast that which is good; but to prove their own things and hold fast that which they have held for so many years before. Oh! That we could rid ourselves of this accursed spirit, which clings to human nature so tenaciously and oft-times mars our noblest efforts.

We must serve God if we would be saved; let us endeavour to serve Him with singleness of heart and pureness of purpose, for these only are evidences that we have got the saving truth in our hearts. We have warnings sufficient in the scriptures that not to him that merely saith, Lord, Lord, will the door be opened, but only unto him that doeth the will of the Father; and the will of the Father is that each of His children shall manifest the fruits of the Spirit – love, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness. Let us strive to be doctrinally perfect; but in all our contentions, and discussions, and efforts to attain doctrinal perfection let us by no means forget that he that does not manifest the Spirit of Christ is none of His. If people think that on being immersed into the name of Christ they are at liberty to treat with contempt, and black looks, and foul words those who may conscientiously differ from them, however vital the difference may be; they have not yet learnt Christ, "He that hateth his brother is a murderer, and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him. "Though professing the truth, they still in a great measure retain the spirit of Thessalonica, the spirit of the world, the spirit of the Spanish Inquisition, the spirit of intolerance, which is rampant around us. Paul, speaking of charity, which as you know is love, states that amongst its other qualities it never faileth. Well, in the sense in which Paul meant, there is no doubt it is true; but alas, if we examine one another and ourselves very closely we shall find that it fails too often to be exhibited when it ought to be; that instead of the soft answer that turneth away wrath there are accusations and counter-accusations, which engender strife and bitterness, where such things ought not to be, for surely, if patience and forbearance ought to be exhibited anywhere they should be shewn amongst those who, in the face of the whole world, proclaim the primitive truth of Christ.

We have arrived at our present position through much contention and opposition on the part of those with whom we once associated. They “despitefully used us and persecuted us” without cause, for our object was truth – to seize upon truth wherever it might be found – let us now beware lest we repeat the conduct to others that has been manifested to us. We have contended for liberty of speech for ourselves, let us see that we accord the same measure of liberty to others. We have upheld the right of proving all things and holding that which is good, let us do so still. Let us not seek to claim the monopoly of speech, nor think we possess the monopoly of conscientiousness, but in all things do unto others as we would that they should do unto us; not do unto others as they do unto us – let us remember that; if we follow the directions of our common Guide, and calmly investigate in the true spirit of brotherly kindness and love with our present measure of enlightenment, there need be no fear for the result. The fear lies in our tendency to let well alone, and to let our sympathies, as is the case with the religious world in general, be our guide; the tendency to neglect searching the scriptures for ourselves, and to take it second hand, as it were, from those whom we think ought to know better than we; the tendency to hang up our faith, as we hang up our hats, on pegs that we think are safe, leaving it there whilst we go to and fro in our search for the bread that perisheth. Let us not make ourselves of the number or compare ourselves with some that commend themselves, with some who, measuring themselves by themselves and others by others, and commending themselves among themselves are not wise. Let us always compare ourselves with Christ, and always seek to arrive at and follow His truth, regardless of individuals amongst ourselves. We are too apt to look at who preaches the truth. Paul declared that, if an angel from heaven preached any other gospel than that he preached let, him be accursed, and by the converse law, if Diabolos preaches a gospel that is in harmony and can be proved from Paul, we must accept it.* Let us in all things adopt the advice of the beloved Apostle whose words I first quoted, and try the spirits by the only infallible test; let us follow the example of the noble Bereans and search the scriptures to see whether the things proclaimed are so. If a thing be of God it will prosper; if not, it will come to nought, for

Truth crushed to earth will rise again,
The eternal years of God are hers;
While error, wounded, writhes in pain,
And dies amid her worshippers.

[* The Presiding Brother (Shuttleworth) here emphatically shook his head in dissent, yet he had just been singing hymns composed by those he regarded as Diabolos, practically following a course he theoretically condemns.]

FRESH EVIDENCE “TO THE POINT.” “THE SOCRATIC METHOD.”

QUESTION No. 1. – When was the law of generation introduced?

ANSWER. – Simultaneously with the formation of Adam. See Gen., i. 28, and compare with Gen. iii. 16.

QUESTION No. 2. – What does this imply?

ANSWER. – It implies that if Adam had not sinned he would have become the federal head of an undying immortal race.

QUESTION No. 3. Would this immortal race have been born of women?

ANSWER. – The statement of the Deity in the 28th verse of the 1st chap. Of Genesis, shows that this was His divine will, and the 24th verse of the 2nd chap. Of Genesis shows that Adam apprehended this to be the will of the Almighty.

QUESTION No. 4. – Then to be “made of a woman” does not, of itself, necessitate that the one so “made” is under condemnation?

ANSWER. – Certainly not, seeing that Jehovah having made the law of generation prior to Adam’s sin, that Adam and Eve could become parents of children who, like themselves, would have been free from the sentence of death.

QUESTION No. 5. – As Adam was not made of a woman but “of the ground,” what was the difference between his nature and his sons, Cain and Abel, who were “made of a woman?”

ANSWER - Facts show that there could be no difference, and that a man made from the ground is the same in nature as one made of a woman, this shows that “with God all things are possible.”

QUESTION No. 6. – Was there any constitutional difference in Adam’s nature on account of his disobedience?

ANSWER. The difference which occurred at the fall of Adam was not in nature or constitution, but in relationship and destiny. The law, or sentence of death, now hangs over him.

QUESTION No. 7. – Why was Christ “made of a woman?”

ANSWER. The reasons are various: 1st, It was on account of Adam’s transgression for if Adam had not sinned no Christ would have been required to undo his act, the will of God evidently was that he should be the “seed of the woman,” to be born of a virgin “of the house and lineage of David.” It is evident from what we have said before, that God could have made him from the ground in a nature identical with Adam’s, but in that he was made of a woman we see the truth of the hackneyed phrase, that God never in His dealings with mankind resorts to the miraculous when the natural will do.

QUESTION No. 8. – But was not Jesus miraculously conceived?

ANSWER. – Yes, and this fact alone shows that the natural means would not do, the reason being, doubtless, that if He had been begotten by the will of the flesh He would have been an ordinary man, and therefore could not have been the Son of God from His birth, and the prophecies concerning His divine sonship would have failed.

QUESTION No 9. – Does His divine begettal make Him other than of the nature of Adam and of His mother?

ANSWER. Obviously not, for the Scriptures abound with testimonies that He was “bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh.”

QUESTION No. 10. – Then was He like Adam in all respects, or was there any difference, if so, what was it?

ANSWER. – He was like Adam in all respects, so far as bodily nature or substance is concerned, but relatively He differed from Adam.

QUESTION No 11. – What do you mean by using the word “relatively?”

ANSWER. – We mean that Adam, at first, was a son of God, but that through his disobedience he ceased to be God’s son, but Christ was the Son of God from the first; and that He never forfeited His right to that sonship, therefore while Adam was a son of God for a short time only, Christ was ALWAYS the Son of God, and on account of His obedience He never came under the law of sin and death, He did not require to be redeemed from the power of that law; this relationship to God and non-relationship to sin and death, made Him “mighty to save” those who were under it.

QUESTION No. 12.- Then it would appear that the point at issue is not the flesh of Jesus but the conditions under which He lived, including His relationship, as before stated?

ANSWER. – Just so, and this is what, I apprehend, Bro. Handley and Bro. Turney with others, wish to set forth.

JAMES MARTIN.
(To be continued.)

ON THE HEBREW & SAMARITAN CHRONOLOGY.

According to the Chronology of the Hebrew Pentateuch, Abraham must have been contemporary with Noah 38 years, and must have died before his ancestor Shem. If this chronology be accurate, it is very singular, indeed almost unaccountable, that no mention should be made of these patriarchs in the life of Abraham. It is also difficult to conceive, since the first form of government was doubtless patriarchal, how Nimrod could usurp an empire during the lives of Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japheth. There is, moreover, another difficulty which deserves to be mentioned. The Hebrew Pentateuch places this building of Babel 100 years after the flood. In this affair all mankind were not concerned, but only the followers of Nimrod. A work of such magnitude is the work of a multitude, and the posterity of Noah cannot have been very numerous at the end only of a single century. All these objections, which I know not how to answer, will be completely removed if we adopt the chronology of the Samaritan instead of the Hebrew Pentateuch. Noah will then be found to have died near 500 years before the birth of Abraham, and 60 years before the founding of Babel; and this last event, which is generally supposed to have happened in

the days of Peleg, will be placed 400 years subsequent to the deluge, a sufficient period of time to admit a very great increase of mankind. If this hypothesis be admitted, all the vague conjectures respecting Melchisedec, some of which make him Shem, and others Ham, will be completely done away. The chronology of the Hebrew and Samaritan Pentateuchs is as follows:-

Years after the flood

According to the Hebrew			According to the Samaritan		
	Born	Died		Born	Died
Noah	---	350	Noah	----	350
Shem	----	502	Shem	----	502
Arphaxad	2	440	Arphaxad	2	440
Selah	37	470	Selah	137	570
Heber	67	531	Heber	267	691
Peleg	101	340	Peleg	401	640
Rehu	131	370	Rehu	531	770
Serug	163	393	Serug	663	893
Nahor	193	341	Nahor	793	941
Terah	222	467	Terah	872	1017
Abraham	292	467	Abraham	942	1087
Isaac	392	572	Isaac	1042	1222

The Christian Observer, February, 1802.- Page 84.

As is well known, the only portions of the Hebrew Scriptures received by the Samaritans were the five books of Moses. With respect to the value of any opinion, or conclusions founded on the Samaritan Pentateuch, it may not be out of place to quote the subjoined passages. Of this recension the “boasted superiority en bloc, gradually dwindled down to two or three passages, in which the Samaritan reading seemed preferable, and even these have now been disposed of in favour of the authorised Masoretic text. A chronological peculiarity deserves special mention, viz., that no one in the antediluvian times begets his first son in the Samaritan Pentateuch after the age of 150, either the father’s or the son’s age being altered in proportion; after the Deluge, however, the opposite method is followed of adding 50 or 100 years to the father’s years before the begetting of a son.”

Chambers’ Encyclopaedia. – Samaritan Pentateuch. – “We are brought to the conclusion that the Samaritan, as well as the Jewish copy, originally flowed from the autograph of Moses. The two constitute, in fact, different recensions of the same work, and coalesce in point of antiquity.”

Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature, by J. KITTO. – Samaritans – In his Chronikon Hebraikon Dr. Thomas says, “Shem ceases from among men 35 years after Abraham’s death.”

ECLECTIC.

[We are extremely obliged to our correspondent ECLECTIC for these instructive extracts, and hope to receive a further supply from the same painstaking hand. ED.]

CRITICAL ILLUSTRATION OF GENESIS IV. 23, 24.

Our present translation of Lamech’s speech is unintelligible, though undoubtedly it is perfectly accurate. It may therefore be useful to remark, that the Hebrew is capable of three different interpretations, all equally literal; consequently we are at liberty to choose that which is most agreeable to the context. The first interpretation is that of our translators: “I have slain a man to my wounding, and a young man to my hurt.” The second, and perhaps the best, is offered by Bishop Lowth, and before him by Howbigant: “I have slain a man for wounding me, and a young man for striking me.” (Praellect. Poet. Iv., p. 52, 53). In this case the sense will be if Cain, who slew his brother unprovoked, shall be secured by the Deity seven-fold from all human vengeance (see Gen., iv., 15) surely Lamech, who slew a man in the act of self-defence, shall be secured seventy and sevenfold. The third interpretation is that of Winkliff, to be found in his MS. Bible, which at least is more intelligible than our present translations: “I have slayn a

man by my wound, and a yong mesngns man by yyolent beetynge.” It is a singular circumstance, that all these renderings are equally literal.

G. S. F.

The Christian Observer, Jan., 1802, p. 6.

Boothroyd gives the passage thus:-

“I indeed, being wounded, have slain a man, And being assaulted, a young man. If Cam shall be avenged seven times, Certainly Lamech seventy and seven.”

Note – “Of this first polygamist Moses has preserved an address to his wives.- they might fear lest some blood-avenger should kill him; and to inspire confidence he observes, that if the death of Cain, who without any just cause, had slain his brother was to be avenged seven times, surely his would be seventy-seven times. He contrasts the murder which Cain had committed with his own justifiable homicide.”

Thomas Scott remarks on the verses under consideration - whether he (Lamech) spake affirmatively, and acknowledged that he had killed a man, though not his own brother; or interrogatively, “Have I killed a man to my hurt?” he evidently drew a comparison betwixt himself and his ancestor Cain, and flattered himself that he was much less criminal; while he seems to have abused the patience of God, in sparing Cain, into an encouragement to himself to expect impunity in sin, and to defy the vengeance of his adversaries.”

Kitto, in his Biblical Cyclopaedia, observes that Lamech’s “speech” “is not only remarkable in itself, but is the first and most ancient piece of poetry in the Hebrew Scriptures; and indeed the only example of Antediluvian poetry extant, it exhibits the parallelism and other characteristics of Hebrew poetry.”

ECLECTIC.

CRITICAL ILLUSTRATION OF ISAIAH IX. 5.

In our present translation, this passage is rendered as follows: “Every battle of the warrior is with confused noise, and garments rolled in blood; but this shall be with burning and fuel of fire.” These words immediately precede the famous predictions of the Messiah, with which, as they now stand, they certainly appear to have very little connexion. Dr. Kennicott therefore proposes a different translation “Every weapon of the warrior used in battle, and the garments rolled in much blood (or often rolled in blood) is for burning, even fuel of the fire.” This agrees very well with the promise of peace at the advent of the Messiah, and is the counterpart of the words of the Psalmist, “When God maketh wars to cease in all the world, He breaketh the bow, and knappeth the spear in sunder, and burneth the chariots in the fire.” In the MS. Translation of Wickliff, this passage is thus rendered, “Al violent raveyn with noyse, and a cloth medlid with blood, shall be into brennynge, and shall be the meate of fyer.” - G. S. F.

The Christian Observer, January 1802, p. 6.

ECLECTIC.

Polemical discussions, even when found necessary to the maintenance of Christian verity, and conducted with the utmost caution, are apt to generate in the minds of both writers and readers feelings very dissonant from the meekness and gentleness of Christ.

We cannot be too often reminded that our spiritual state is to be estimated, not by our skill in theological contests, nor merely by our zeal for certain tenets however essential, but by our love to God and our devotedness to His service, by our active and unwearied benevolence, by our victory over sin, the world, and the flesh: by the purity of our motives; by the heavenly tendency of our affections; by our relish for divine and spiritual occupations; by the rectitude of our conduct; by the unfeigned humility of our hearts, in short, by the growing resemblance we bear to our Blessed Master.

The Christian Observer, Preface, 1803, p. vi.

“THIS IS NOT YOUR REST.”

“Now in this age we must combat with sin,
Here is no rest – is no rest.
Here faith’s good fight must be fought, if we’d win,
Here is no rest is no rest.

But to the faithful there cometh a day,
When crowns immortal are given away,
To all God's children who wisely obey.
Then there is rest – there is rest.

Now in this age, oppression we know,
Here is no rest – is no rest.
Strife and confusion attend as we go,
Here is no rest – is no rest.

Yet in God's Word it is made clear and sure,
On earth there comes a kingdom most pure,
Silencing wrong, for all woe a cure;
Then we shall rest – we shall rest.

Now for the Truth, we must strongly contend,
Here is no rest – is no rest.
These are the days when the truth doth offend,
Here is no rest – is no rest.

Soldiers of Christ, arise, 'tis His call;
Hark to His voice for He speaketh to all.
Watch! Lest His coming with fright doth appal,
Here is no rest – is no rest.
C. J. W.

WORSHIP, INCLUDING PRAYER, CONSIDERED IN SEVERAL ASPECTS.

WHEN practised for the love of the subject, prayer is the most powerful agency for bringing about a close resemblance between the worshipper and the being worshipped.

If this law be admitted, it will follow that the morals of people will, in a great measure, reflect the morals of their gods. This would, of course, place those nations commonly called Christian nations on a much higher level in the scale of morality than those who serve gods like unto beasts, and birds, and creeping things. This principle, however, only applies to the earnest worshippers among any people, its accuracy cannot be judged of from the point of view of the indifferent either among Pagan or Christian communities. When the effect of heathen worship is considered, the wisdom of its strict prohibition by the Almighty is clearly manifest. The morals of the worshipper must reflect the morals of his god; and where the god cannot properly be said to possess a moral character, that negation of such character will become conspicuous in the votaries. In whatever quarter we look upon this subject the principle of assimilation is sustained.

The extreme indolence and languor of the Orientals may be traced to the character of their deities. The river and flower worshippers of the east desire to become insensibly mingled with the drops they adore or transmuted to the form and essence of their lily gods. While in the manners of the hardy children of the north is reflected that unrest and love of blood characteristic of the gods they serve. According to Medhurst and other writers the doctrine of assimilation is understood and enforced among the Chinese Buddhists. "Think of Buddah and you will be transformed into Buddah. If men pray to Buddah and do not become Buddah, it is because the mouth prays and not the mind."

This maxim may be truly applied to Christians so-called. If men do not become like God it is because they do not understand Him to whom they pray, or do not pray to Him from the heart. To be transformed into His moral image they must pray to Him with the heart and with the understanding also.

The Egyptians, to whose religion we have elsewhere alluded, adored birds and beasts of various sorts, and also creeping things. These are to be seen in groups of revolting association in their arts and

sculptures. And as they were the patterns for Egyptian guidance there was no vice of which mankind is capable that these people did not practise. The prophet Ezekiel has a graphic passage on the subject in his eighth chapter.

“And he brought me to the door of the court; and when I looked, behold, a hole in the wall. Then said he unto me, Son of man, dig now in the wall; and when I had digged in the wall, behold a door. And he said unto me, Go in, and behold the wicked abominations they do here. So I went in and saw; and behold every form of creeping things, and abominable beasts, and all the idols of the house of Israel portrayed upon the wall round about. And there stood before them seventy men of the ancients of the house of Israel, and in the midst of them stood Jaazaniah, the son of Shaphan, with every man his censer in his hand, and a thick cloud of incense went up. Then said he unto me, Hast thou seen what the ancients of the house of Israel do in the dark, every man in the chamber of his imagery? For they say the Lord seeth us not, the Lord hath forsaken the earth.”

This was an exhibition of the brute adoration of Egypt, to which Israel so often turned back in their hearts. According to Diodorus, the walls of the chambers built round the tombs of the kings of Egypt were covered with paintings of birds, beasts, and all manner of reptiles. Such were the gods to whom the Levites paid their devotion, and burned incense in the secret chambers.

The custom of offering prayer to these creatures soon produced a resemblance to them in their natural habits, and man, who was created in the image of God, become fit society for the beasts of the field.

The worship of Adonis is another example of the demoralizing influence of wrongly directed devotion. Adonis was a favourite god at Alexandria in Egypt, and as much admired by the Hebrews as the Egyptians. At Alexandria there were magnificent gardens dedicated to this god, called the gardens of Adonis.

It would not become these pages to rehearse the details of the high days of the god Adonis. Suffice it to say that the worship of this mythical personage in Syria was a means of corrupting the daughters of Zion. Adonis, who was supposed to spend part of the year on earth and part in heaven, in the society of Venus and Proserpine, respectively, was believed to have been killed by a wound from a boar, and the annual reddening of the river named after him in Syria, was supposed to be in commemoration of the tragic occurrence. On this occasion a festival was celebrated. The daughters of Israel gave themselves up to an agony of lamentation at the loss of Adonis, but the latter part of the festival was signalized by unbounded joy at the imaginary recovery of the lost god. It is related that the damsels of Syria were, on these occasions, as lavish of their love as of their tears. Here was literal conformity to the life of their god.

The names of the days of the week carry our minds back to the hero worship of our rude forefathers. Old Thor, the Scandinavian god, was adored as the smasher or mauler of his enemies: the weapon he used being called Miolnir, that is, a hammer, or more literally, a smasher or mauler. The ardent worship of such a savage monster effectually branded his devotees with the horrid lineaments of their god. Old Thor's worshippers revelled in scenes of rapine and of blood. What there was of kindness in their nature was almost totally effaced, and they resembled bloodhounds rather than men. Even self-destruction was rendered popular by such gods; and it came to be thought almost disgraceful to die peacefully in bed. In a word, the lines of Pope fairly picture the majority of heathen deities,-

God's partial, changeful, passionate, unjust;
Whose attributes were rage, revenge, and lust.

Paul's description of the original manners of the Corinthian disciples refreshes our memories with their forms of worship. “Fornicators, idolaters, adulterers, effeminate, abusers of themselves with mankind.” These were Corinthian citizens; natives of that city which was said to be “the eye of Greece,” such were the hideous hues of light flashed forth from this “eye” for the illumination of the Grecian body politic and religious. The state of things sketched by Paul was fostered at Corinth, and in fact in all Greece, by the nature of the national worship. The most sacred persons in Corinth were prostitutes; and no small part of the revenue was the proceeds of sacred debauchery.

Rome was no better than Corinth. Indeed, until the Pagan worship was abolished it waxed worse and worse. Some of the philosophers of those countries have rebuked the popular religious services in language which confirms the statement just made. “How great,” exclaimed Seneca, “is the madness of men! They lisp the most abominable prayers, and if a man is found listening they are silent, what a man ought not to hear they do not blush to relate to the gods. If any one considers what things they do, and to what things they subject themselves, instead of decency, he will find indecency; instead of the honourable, the unworthy; instead of the rational, the insane.” On the influence of heathenism the following extract is from Tholuck :-

“We should naturally suppose, that among so great a variety of gods, of religious actions, of sacred vows, at least some better feeling of the heart must have been excited; that at least some truly pious sentiment would have been awakened. But when we consider the character of this superstition, and the testimony of contemporaneous writers, such does not appear to have been the fact. Petronius’ history of that period furnishes evidence that temples were frequented, altars crowned, and prayers offered to the gods, in order that they might render nights of unnatural lusts agreeable; that they might favour acts of poisoning, that they might cause robberies, and other crimes to prosper.”

Seeing it is a universal fact that the traits of the beings worshipped are reflected upon the worshippers, it follows that, the more perfect the understanding, and the more intense the sympathy, the more exact will be the likeness to the original. When we come to consider the Christian portrait, it is that we realize the vital application and bearing of this deduction. As our minds become more and more enlightened upon the subject of divine justice, goodness, and mercy, the disposition is farther removed, not only from open and secret acts of cruelty and of wrong; but also from all the minor practices of severity of judgment, of selfish display, of vanity, and want of paternal consideration. To express the same sentiment in the language of Scripture, we must have on the whole armour of God. We must put on God-likeness. This covering consists of a variety of parts, each suited to that portion of the figure for which it was designed. A partial investiture will reveal to the observant eye some spot of nakedness, the warrior will in other words, be imperfectly equipped.

A correct understanding of the value of every Christian virtue will lead to a sense of our own native nakedness, and produce a corresponding feeling of need for divine covering. This, however, is only attainable by discerning the true character of Him whose righteousness we desire to put on. Righteousness means a system of right. “Jesus said to His disciples, Verily, verily, I say unto you, except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven.”

It is especially important that, as earnest prayer is the most potent engine of worship for changing the moral man, it should be directed aright. We have not seen God, and can only judge of Him through His works in nature and through His revealed will. The value therefore of a knowledge of these, more particularly the Word, cannot be over-rated. It is not that the commands of God are so abstruse as to limit a good understanding of them to the few; it is rather the danger of negligence of that which is easy of apprehension that produces serious defects in the Christian character.

If we pray fervently for what we ought not, or omit to pray for what we ought, the result will be much the same. For example, if a man habitually prays for the overthrow of the kingdoms of the world, and neglects to pray for kings and persons in authority, the mind of that man only delights in the prospect of a universal war, and becomes hardened towards all rulers and governors, as persons not worthy of any consideration on the part of either God or man.

The application of this in many ways is plain to be seen; and while a man may habitually go through the forms of worship and even increase in a knowledge of divine things, his heart may, after all, be left as hard as a stone, and his disposition but faintly reflect the coldness of stern un-tempered justice. Let him neglect to pray for his brethren, and he will never feel any real interest in their present or future happiness; let him neglect to pray for the sick, very soon he fails to understand the trials of bodily affliction; let him neglect to pray for daily bread, and by and by he will not see the finger of God in the seed time and harvest. In a word he will degenerate into the lukewarmness of the Laodicean, and at last be amazed to find himself rejected by the Spirit.

We conclude with the quotation of several portions of the Word on the subject of prayer, which shew us how to pray, when to pray, and what to pray for.

Be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thine heart be hasty to utter anything before God: for God is in heaven, and thou upon earth: therefore let thy words be few. - Eccl. v. 2.

But when ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do: for they think they shall be heard for their much speaking. Be ye not therefore like unto them; for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of before ye ask Him. - Matt. vi. 7, 8.

When thou prayest, thou shall not be as the hypocrites are; for they love to pray standing in the Synagogues, and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men: Verily they have their reward. But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut the door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly. - Matt. vi. 5, 6.

Men ought always to pray and not to faint. Be ye therefore sober and pray without ceasing with all prayer and supplication in the spirit, watching thereunto with all perseverance, and continuing instant in prayer. - Luke xviii. 1.; 1 Peter iv. 7.; 1 Thess. v. 17.; Eph. vi. 18., Rom. xii. 12.

Be careful for nothing; but in everything by prayer and supplication with thanks giving, let your request be made known unto God. - Phil. iv. 6.

Is any among you afflicted, lei him pray. - James v. 13

Call upon the Lord in the day of trouble; pour out thy heart before Him ; and unto God commit thy cause.- Ps. Iv. 15. Ps. Ixii. 8. Job v. 8.

If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all liberally, and it shall be given him. But let him ask in faith, nothing wavering: for let not that man that wavereth, think that he shall receive anything of the Lord. - Jam. i. 5, 6; vii. 6, 7.

Pray one for another that ye may be healed: for the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much. - James v. 16.

If a man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall pray for it. - 1 Jno. v. 16.

Let supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men, especially for kings, and all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life, in all godliness and honesty, for this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour. - 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2, 3.; 1 Tim. ii. 3.

Pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you. - Matt. v. 44.

Pray for the peace of Jerusalem: seek the peace of the city where ye live, and pray unto the Lord for it. - Ps. cxxii. 6 ; Jer. xxix. 7.

Editor.

WHO CAN RECONCILE THESE THINGS?

BY A. B. C.

(Continued from January, Page 18.)

YEA.

NAY.

<p>His body was as unclean as the bodies of those He died for; for He was born of a woman, and “not one” can bring a clean body out of a defiled body; for “that,” says Jesus Himself, “which is born of the flesh is flesh.” Elpis Israel, 4th Edition. - Revised. p. 114.</p> <p>According to this physical law, the Seed of the woman was born into the world. The nature of Mary was as unclean as that of other women; and therefore could give birth only to “a body” like her own though especially “prepared of God.” . . . The purpose of God was to condemn sin in the flesh; a thing that could not have been accomplished, if there was no sin there. - Elpis Israel, 4th Edition. - Revised, pp. 114,115.</p> <p>Speaking of the conception and preparation of the Seed, the prophet, as a typical person, says, “Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.” This is nothing more than affirming that He was born of sinful flesh. . . Elpis Israel, 4th Edition - Revised, p. 115.</p> <p>Mankind being born of the flesh, and of the will of man, are born into the world under the constitution</p>	<p>Or “the fellow” and “equal” of the Deity? Zech. Xiii. 7; Jno. V. 18; Phil. Ii, 2. The latter unquestionably. Eureka, vol. 1., p. 101.</p> <p>In what did the offering of this body consist? In the condemnation of sin in the nature that sinned in the Garden of Eden. – Dr. Thomas, Christadelphian, August, 1873, p. 364.</p> <p>That this Jesus Anointed was the Eternal Invisible Father, by His spirit, manifested in the nature that sinned in Eden’s Garden. – Dr. Thomas, Christadelphian, August, 1873, p. 364.</p> <p>The original constitution of human nature was sinless. – Dr. Thomas, Christadelphian, August, 1873, p. 338.</p> <p>This Eloah (the Divine Son assured to David) is the great theme of prophecy . . . The time of</p>
---	--

<p>of sin. That is, they are the natural-born citizens of Satan's Kingdom. By their fleshly birth, they are entitled to all that sin can impart to them. – Elpis Israel, 4th Edition - Revised, p, 115.</p> <p>It is absurd to say that children are born holy, except in the sense of their being legitimate. None are born holy but such as are born of the spirit into the kingdom of God - Elpis' Israel, 4th Edition. - Revised, p. 116.</p> <p>Children are born sinners or unclean, because they are born of sinful flesh; and “that which is born of the flesh is flesh,” or sin. “By Adam's disobedience the many were made sinners;” that is, they were endowed with a nature like His, which had become unclean, as the result of disobedience; and, by the constitution of the economy into which they were introduced by the will of the flesh, they were constituted transgressors, before they were able to discern between right and wrong. Upon this principle, he that is born of sinful flesh is a sinner. . . Such a sinner is an heir of all that is derivable from sin. Hence, new born babes suffer all the evil of the peculiar department of Satan, or sin's, kingdom to which they belong. Elpis' Israel, p. 116, 4th Edition. - Revised.</p> <p>“Sinful flesh” is as much an element of the divine Jews as “the Spirit.” - Dr. Thomas, Herald of the Kingdom, Dec., December, 1856, vol. 6, No. 12, p. 268.</p> <p>All sinners are in the first Adam. - Elpis' Israel, p. 118.</p> <p>Sinners were in the loins of the former (the first Adam), when he transgressed – Elpis Israel, p. 116.</p>	<p>manifestation was appointed and placed on record in Dan. ix., 25 ; and “when the fulness of the time was come, the Deity sent forth his son, made of a woman; begotten, not of blood, nor the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of the Deity; by holy spirit coming upon her, and power of the Highest enveloping her; therefore, also, the holy thing she bore was called a Son of Deity, and named Jesus. Luke I, 35-31. – Eureka, vol. 1., p. 101.</p> <p>The name (the Yahweh Name in prophecy, comprehends the things concerning the Christ), then, in connection with the testimony of the prophets, indicates a conversion of spirit into flesh and blood, developed by the formative power of the Eternal, independently of and apart from the will of man. It (spirit) operated germinatively upon the contents of Mary's ovarium; and caused an ovum or “seed of the woman” to be deposited in her womb. Here, as the spirit-germ of the second man it remained the usual “set time,” subject to the laws of the animal economy.</p> <p>At the appointed time it was born the babe of Bethlehem, and duly named Jesus, or He shall be, who shall save – both “Son of God” and “Son of Man,” . . . being a creation of the Eternal Power from the substance of David's daughter. – Eureka, vol. 1., p. 276.</p> <p>They (the Jews) can only see in Christ a son of David, leaving no higher origin than blood, or the impulse of the flesh, or the will of man. They have no conception of a Christ, who shall be formed by the Eternal Spirit from the substance descending from David; as Adam was formed by the same Spirit from the dust; * and therefore generated by the will and power of Ail. – Phanerosis, p. 33.</p> <p>It (Genesis iii. 15) teaches us by implication that He (the Christ) was not to be begotten of the impulse of the flesh, nor of the will of man; so that in being born of the human nature, He would be directly son of Woman and only indirectly Son of Man.</p>
---	---

* What Adam was when “formed from the dust,” is shewn in the extract from Christadelphian, August, 1869, p. 216.

INCONSISTENCY.

ON account of the recent interest which has sprung up concerning the Scripture doctrine of the Christ, a great outcry has been raised against two classes of learned men, contemptuously styled “Heathen poets and Doctors of the apostasy.” The note of scorn and alarm has been sounded in consequence of an allusion made in our lectures in Birmingham, to Milton, Shakespeare, and several other authors as to the

correct use of certain words, and also as to the meaning of certain passages of Scripture; the latter referring to Milton's Treatise on Christian Doctrine.

Of this offence, however, our accusers are guilty in some measure, and their guilt would perhaps be greater if their acquaintance with "Heathen poets and Doctors of the apostacy" was not so limited. Be this as it may. Why object to reference to such authors? Because they are incorrect on some points, are they perverse and ignorant on all? Where is there a single idea that we dare call original, and ours exclusively? But the best Christadelphian author, Doctor Thomas, did not think it insane to quote and approve what he found in the writings mentioned. Let those hot-headed men who have raised this foolish cry recollect the free use that has been made by themselves of certain notes which they probably never saw except in Dr. Thomas's works - from Tillotson (do they know who Tillotson was and where he preached?) Whately, Luther, and some others. These have been cited with pride as orthodox weapons against orthodoxy on the subject of the soul. Why then are such writers not to be cited on "the record God has given of His Son?" None but mad bigots and wrong-headed sectaries would object to the citation of any author who might shed one ray of light on a question under investigation. Paul, we know, risked his life in exposing and condemning "the heathen poets and speaking at Athens he found it convenient to quote the Greek poets on the deep subject of man's relation to the Divine Being. Certain of those poets had said that in God we live, and move, and have our being, and that we are His offspring. Then, as to the character of the inhabitants of Crete, Paul quoted what their own prophets had said. The Pharisees were denounced by John and the Lord Jesus as vipers, yet Paul did not repudiate all they held and taught as heresy. Paul was a man of discrimination and discretion; even in his opponents he knew how to discern between good and evil: this discernment had come through the exercise of his senses by reason of use.

"Keep sound wisdom and discretion so they shall be life unto thy soul and grace unto thy neck." - Proverbs.

EDITOR.

REFERENCE TABLETS BY W. INTRODUCTION.

If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God, 1 Peter iv. 11; otherwise he had better hold his peace. If a reference tablet sets forth error, or that which is contrary to God's oracles, it ought never to be again referred to. If it be true that flesh is everything that is abominable and vile, it follows that the flesh of Jesus (which is Himself) is abominable and vile. How is it possible for "filthy dreamers," or dreamers of any kind to defile such flesh? Jude v 8. Was the heart of Jesus deceitful above all things and desperately wicked? Was His tongue a little world of iniquity in itself? Was that flesh which He gave for the life of the world and concerning which He said, "Except ye eat My flesh and drink My blood ye have no life in you," was that flesh, I say, the devil? Was that flesh the adversary and enemy of God and man? And if flesh in general be all this, what advantage will the Jewish nation restored have by the exchange of stony hearts for hearts of flesh? Scriptural answers to these questions would be edifying and would form a tablet worth referring to. In the form of a tablet I will, by God's help endeavour to set forth the truth concerning the flesh of Jesus.

1. - There is but one God (the Father) of whom are all things.
2. - There is but one Lord Jesus Christ (the Son) by or through whom the all things may be obtained. 1 Cor. viii., 6.
3. - Unfortunately there is not in every man that knowledge. 1 Cor. viii. 7.
4. - Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He (Jesus) also likewise took part of the same. Heb. ii ,14.
5. - Jesus was bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh.
6. - Jesus was in the likeness of, or exactly like sin's flesh, but not sold under sin. Rom. viii. ,3; Phil. ii , 7.
7. - Jesus, God's Son, came as the representative or substitute of His Father. He was God's weakness, which is stronger than men. 1 Cor. i., 25.
8. - Jesus was God's righteousness, not Adam's iniquity. Matt. vi. 33.
9. - Jesus was God's Firstborn, the beginning of His strength. Gen. xlix. 8.
10. - Jesus was God's power. 1 Cor. i , 24.
11. - Jesus was God's strength made perfect in weakness. 2 Cor. xii., 9.

12. - Jesus was crucified through weakness. 2 Cor. xiii., 4.
13. - Jesus was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death- Hebrew ii.9.
14. - Jesus was made so much better than the angels, because He inherited a better name than they, viz.: Son. Heb. i., 4, 5.
15. - Angels are not sons but ministering spirits, i.e., servants, slaves. Heb. i. 14.
16. - Jesus took the form of a servant and, like a good servant, He was obedient even unto death. Phil. ii., 7.
17. - Had Jesus been disobedient unto death He, like the first Adam, would have transmitted the consequences of His crime, instead of transmitting the consequences of His righteousness, to is posterity.
18. - As all in the first Adam die, so all in the second Adam live. 1 Cor. xv., 22.
19. - To judge Jesus after the flesh is not wise; it is neither doing justice to Him nor to ourselves. John viii., 15.

A FORTNIGHT WITH THE BRETHREN IN SCOTLAND.

Having a few days leisure time and circumstances favourable, I left England on the 6th December to visit a few of my brethren in Scotland, who had heard with surprise, and many of them with regret, that I had changed my mind upon what the Scriptures teach concerning the sacrifice of Christ. Several letters had reached me from various parts, which were duly answered, but, from the temper many of the brethren shewed, it was manifest they did not fully comprehend the bearings of the question.

On arriving in Edinburgh about noon, and after seeing a few of my old friends, I landed in Bro. Charles Smith's house. My presence soon resulted in a discussion of the various points on which I had changed since we met in July last. Bro. C. Smith having quoted the statement of Paul, "It behoved him to be made in all points like unto his brethren." The emphasis being placed upon the word all, caused me to express dissent, saying there were certain exceptions which must be taken into account. Bro. Smith, thinking he could easily involve me in confusion, here anxiously asked for the exceptions I referred to. These I gave as follows: -

- 1st. - Jesus differed from all His brethren in His paternity, they being all begotten of the flesh, whereas He was the only begotten Son of God.
- 2nd. - He was not a personal sinner.
- 3rd. - He was not personally under sentence of death, although capable of being put to death.
- 4th. - He had not the law of sin and death in His members in the same sense as they have it.

These points being questioned, the evening was spent in discussing them, and points which arose out of them. Ten o'clock having arrived, and the object of my visit being known, a discussion was arranged for the Sunday afternoon following, to which the various brethren in Edinburgh and Leith were invited. It was agreed that I should open with a speech of half-an-hour, and then Bro. Smith to follow, having the same time, after which we should each have ten minutes until 5 o'clock. As much of the confusion everywhere arose from a supposition that we contend that the flesh of Jesus differed from ours to the extent that our contention amounts to a denial that He was flesh and blood, I took the opportunity at the out-set of saying that "God had made of one blood all nations of men," and that so far as I knew, there never was nor would be any other, and that Jesus, through his mother, had the same flesh and blood common to all. But while that was true as to nature, the relationship of these various nations and the individuals composing them was very different: and inasmuch as Jesus was the only begotten of His Father, He was separated by that operation from every other member of the race.

The reason why He was brought into existence being expressed in Rom. viii., 3, That as the law of Moses could not set free from the law of sin and death any promised from the foundation of the world; or say, with Peter, Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God. And give to the Father unfeigned thanks that "He so loved the world as to give His only begotten and well-beloved Son that whosoever believeth in Him might not perish but have everlasting life:" and give up the use of words and phrases which dishonour either the Father or the Son. The brethren will suffer the frank advice of one who sincerely desires that we all may be found of the Lord Jesus Christ in peace, without spot, and blameless.

From East Linton I went to Tranent, and spent about three hours with Bro. B. Strathearn, Sister ditto, and Bro. Hogg, and also Bro. Cornwall. The views of Bro. D. Handley have always to a certain extent been held by those in Tranent, and I trust they will receive a fresh impetus, that the love of the Father in

the Son may fill their hearts with gratitude. Our time was spent for the most part in the exchange of thoughts and the comparison of ideas on certain parts of the scriptures. I spent a few hours with Bro. and Sister Wood, at Joppa. The principal difficulty they have in accepting the new theory (which is not new to them, excepting in some phases) is that Jesus was the son of Mary. To make Jesus the descendant of Mary, because she brought Him forth in obedience to the will and power of the Almighty, is simply equal to making Joseph His father. If Mary was the mother of Jesus to the same extent as she was the mother of her other sons the will of the flesh was exercised, but such cannot be admitted as true in the case of Jesus, and, therefore, I conclude, He was not her descendant although her son, and, if not Her descendant, neither was He the descendant of David, although His son. Mary was the descendant of David, but Jesus was the descendant of His Father in our nature the descendant of His Father through Mary and in her nature. She was the fruit, of David's loins, but Jesus was the fruit of the Almighty extracted from the fruit of David's loins, and therefore his descendant, and at the same tune a Son which He raised up to David to sit on His throne for ever; David's Son and David's Lord in one power.

Friday evening was spent at Sister Steele's, in company with a few friends representing the various meetings in Edinburgh. On this occasion Bro Smith introduced again what he considered an unanswerable argument for Jesus being a descendant of the first Adam, and therefore inheriting the condemnation due for his transgression. The argument runs thus: under the Law of Moses if a man died without issue it behoved his next of kin to take his wife and raise up seed to redeem his kinsman's inheritance. The first-born of the kinsman redeemer, though really his son, did not take his name but the name of the dead or the name of his mother. From this it was argued that Jesus, though begotten of the Father did not belong to Him but to His mother, and, in virtue of belonging to His mother, He inherited her nature and also the condemnation which Adam brought upon himself by transgression. The fallacy of this argument soon became transparent when we transferred ourselves back to the first transgression. Here we have three parties, two transgressors and one Redeemer the Father of them both. Two being concerned in the transgression, both were dead, so that on neither side there remained any power to bring forth an heir who could redeem their lost inheritance. The Father the only kinsman in the premises, devised a plan and then declared the seed of the woman shall bruise the head of the serpent. This promise of a seed was the promise of life, or of a living seed to be extracted out of the (legally) dead woman; when fulfilled, it was a living child, flesh and blood, in every respect as to substance the same as the dead Adam: but Adam was dead and could not produce an heir and so also was Mary, his daughter, therefore what neither could do conjoined or separately, God, the Almighty kinsman, did by causing the woman to have a son. This Son was neither Adam's son nor Adam's descendant, although born by Mary, Adam's daughter. Jesus was the kinsman Redeemer's Son, through the dead man's daughter, born to inherit the dead man's estates, and therefore born to him not an old Adam but a new, who did not alienate His right to inherit on His own account all that His dead father had originally received from His living Father. Jesus being brought into the world by God was His Father's heir; and being brought into the world by His Father, the Redeemer, to redeem the lost inheritance of His Father, according to the flesh it was competent for Him to inherit the earth with all its belongings for both reasons. But, in addition to this, all the children of God by faith in His promise to raise up a redeemer were in the grave, and could not raise themselves therefrom. It behoved the Redeemer to possess the power of raising them. The Apostle informs us that "To this end the Christ died, and rose, and revived, that He might be the Lord, heir, or possessor both of the dead and the living." "He gave Himself a ransom for all." "If one died for all, then were all dead, that they who live should not, henceforth live unto themselves, but to Him who loved them and gave Himself for them." These passages clearly shew that Jesus was not only the heir raised up to inherit the first Adam's lost inheritance, but by His death He acquired a property in every son and daughter of the first man. They became His by right of purchase. But although He acquired a right in them to do with them whatsoever He pleased, they acquired no right in Him to demand anything from Him. Jesus therefore, as the sovereign of all the nations of the earth, offers to all, in every place, the gift of everlasting life and co-heirship with Himself of all the kingdoms of the world.

Another hackneyed argument was brought forth by Bro. Smith from Heb. vii, 27, from which he tries to prove that Jesus offered for Himself. There are several assumptions regarding this passage which could scarcely have escaped the discernment of Bro. Smith if he could afford time to look at them.

1st. - That Jesus was a High-Priest before He died and rose again; whereas Paul says, He glorified not Himself to be made an High-Priest, but He who said unto Him thou art my son this day have I begotten thee. Heb. v., 5.

2nd. - That sin offering never was offered to God. A creature suitable for a sin offering was brought before the Lord, but if anything were found defective in it the sins of the transgressor could not be

confessed on its head, and therefore it never could be slain nor its blood offered, but an additional curse came upon the man who dared to bring it.

3rd. – That the High-Priest offered for the cleansing of his nature. Of this there is no evidence.

4th. - That Jesus Himself was sin, and therefore that He offered His sin which was himself. This looks like offering sin as an atonement for sin. I could see some sense in offering a sinless life for a sinful nature, if such were the argument, but to offer a body shapen in iniquity and conceived in sin would have brought upon any priest the curse of instant death for his wickedness.

The object of offering by the High-Priest was to obtain redemption for a sinner. It behoved him to enter God's presence with the evidence that the life of the victim had been taken. Jesus could not do this while a living victim, nor while in the state of the dead; it behoved Him, therefore, to be alive after having been put to death, and to carry with Him the evidences of having suffered a violent or sacrificial death, so that before He came into a position parallel to the Aaronic High-Priest He was in His own Person in possession of eternal redemption. What did Jesus offer? A body of sin's flesh, as described above? Nay, verily, but a body without spot, and Himself, the High-Priestly Offerer, in possession of a priesthood higher than the heavens of the Aaronic order. Heb. ix., 12, and vii., 26.

These arguments and several others being disposed of, I parted from Bro. Smith, supposing that I had seen the last of him on this visit.

On Saturday I left for Glasgow, where formerly I was a welcome visitor, but on this occasion my former friends positively refused to see me or hear any explanation for my change of mind, although from remarks in their letter to me they shewed they did not see the real bearings of the question. I am happy to say, however, that there are in Glasgow a few warm friends of the truth, who were glad to see me, and seem to have greater desire for the benefit of the other friends than they have shewn to recover what they consider their erring brethren.

I spoke in the morning to the brethren, and in the afternoon gave a lecture on "The Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world." The attendance was small, very small for such a city as Glasgow, and none of my old friends, among whom I spent more than two years, came to see me. In the evening I learned that a few had collected in a brother's house not far from where I was; I resolved, at the risk of refusal, to go and see them, for I can say in all good conscience, "I never sought theirs, but them." On being invited in, to my surprise here is my old friend Bro. Smith once more, and learned that I, though absent, had been the subject of conversation. My presence was the note for discussion, which was speedily introduced by Bro. Smith asking me to expound 1 Peter ii. 24, "Who His own self bare our sins" in His own body to or on the tree." I remarked that I saw no difficulty in the way of understanding it in the way Bro. Roberts had given in the Christadelphian for September. The substance of what he wrote there is as follows: - If sins are immoral actions, and as you cannot take the immoral action of one person and put them upon another, you can only visit another with the penalty due to immoral actions, and this meets the circumstances of the case." Christ never committed any immoral actions, but He suffered on the cross the penalty due to the immoral actions of others. He never was either unjust, rebellious, or a blasphemer, and yet He died under the two last charges, "that we being dead to sins might live unto righteousness, by whose stripes we are healed." Bro. Smith's contention was, that no one can suffer for the transgressions of another, and that Jesus suffered because He was in the nature that committed the transgression, but not for any transgression which He personally committed. This, put in other words, means Jesus was flesh and blood the same as transgressed the law of God in Eden, and therefore He was hung upon the cross for that transgression which He inherited from His father Adam. My contention was, that no fair construction of the law of entail could include Jesus among the descendants of Adam, because the Father of Jesus existed before Adam, and also as He was a child of promise by His Father, His coming into the world was the fulfilment of a promise and not due to the law regulating descent, especially as regarded His mother. Jesus was in the flesh of Adam but not of Adam by descent, because His Father was not a descendant of Adam.

Bro. Smith pled that there could be no such thing as the forgiveness of sins if Jesus suffered the penalty due to or for sins. He failed to perceive that the redemption which has been accomplished by Christ Jesus and His Father was brought about by them both without the third party, the human race, ever being consulted. This, in other words, stands thus:- Two very rich parties agree to discharge the liabilities of a third, who hated them both, and then send the notice of discharge, coupled with an invitation to participation in an inheritance which cannot be defiled, and a life without end in their glorious kingdom,

WILLIAM ELLIS.

“IS THERE A GOD BESIDE ME: I KNOW NOT ANY.” - Isaiah.

Jehovah dwells alone,
No equal can He see;
The unchangeable and mighty God,
From all eternity.

Chorus - We praise, we praise His Name,
His wondrous Name of Yah,
Through Him who stands within the veil,
Our bright and morning star.

Through realms of boundless space
His spirit works His will,
And with Creation's endless forms
The Heavens and earth doth fill.

Chorus - We praise, we praise, His Name . . .

Who can compare with Him
In Majesty Divine?
Ye sons of God His praises sing,
Who in His glory shine.

Chorus - We praise, we praise His Name . . .

And ye His Saints rejoice
His praises to declare,
Whose mercy calls you from the dust
Their blessedness to share.

Chorus - We praise, we praise His Name . . .

For soon He will reveal
Himself in His dear Son,
To seal the covenants of His truth,
And perfect all in One.

Chorus - We praise, we praise His Name . . .

Jehovah! He is God,
And there is none beside;
Under the shadow of His wings,
O Israel, still abide!

Chorus - We praise, we praise His Name.

DAVID BROWN.

INTELLIGENCE.

BIRMINGHAM. - In Birmingham, the truth is making progress. On December 28th, Bro. David Handley visited the brethren, who now meet in Broad-street. Thirty-seven brethren and sisters met in the morning to symbolise their union with the risen Lord, and in the evening Bro. Handley spoke to an audience of eighty upon the two Adams, illustrating that by the first, sin and death were brought into the world, and by the second righteousness and life, which are unto all and upon all them that believe. All felt much encouraged and strengthened. On the Tuesday evening following, the 30th Dec., a tea meeting was held, at which about sixty sat down to tea; after which music, interspersed with addresses from brethren Shelton, Dr. Hayes, Ellis, and Handley were given to a company of about eighty, who seemed delighted with each other, and what they had heard. Bro. Hayes gave a sketch of his own history in connection with that phase of the truth which had caused the separation from those whom we still love and formerly

associated with as brethren in Christ. The remarks illustrated that the experience of Bro. Hayes was very similar to most of the others who have come to see the truth that Jesus was the Son of God, and not the son of Adam. Bro. Ellis spoke about an hour, and shewed pretty clearly how very nearly in every particular the position of a large portion of those who oppose the truth at present is to that of those who opposed Jesus Himself. The Scribes and Pharisees expected a Christ, a son of David; but those who knew the Scriptures looked for a Son of God. This is proved by the confession of Nathaniel, "Thou art the Son of God; Thou art the King of Israel," (John i. 49), and also that of Peter, "Lord, Thou hast the words of eternal life, and we believe and are sure that Thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God," (John vi. 69). The Jews said - Is not this Jesus of Nazareth the son of Joseph? And our late brethren say - Is not this Jesus the Son of Mary? The Jews said - We know that this man is a sinner. Our late brethren say - A constitutional sinner. Jesus claimed to be the living Bread which came down from heaven. This claim is opposed by the saying that He was of the earthy Adam as much as those to whom He said - Ye are from beneath. Jesus laid claim to be the Son of God before His resurrection, as evidenced by His question to the boy whose eyes He had opened - Dost thou believe on the Son of God? - and the answer which He gave Himself - Thou hast both seen Him, and it is He that talketh with thee. This is made thoroughly void by all who believe in a "God Manifestation" in sin's flesh, for the flesh they say is the flesh of Adam, and therefore not the Son of God. And the Spirit which dwelt in Jesus was the Spirit of God, or the Spirit of Christ, and could not be properly called His Son, and thus the fair inference comes that the Father's Only Begotten Son was only a son of Adam after all, and the real father of Jesus had no son. Is it not certain that if Jesus were here He would denounce this "God Manifestation" theory as dishonouring to both His Father and Himself? The personality of the Father, as distinct from the Son, is so completely obscured that the Father is made to be His own Father, and His own Son by turns, and then the Son is made to be His own Father and again His own Son. All this confusion, worse confounded is at once set aside by recognising the sublime doctrine which the Father himself proclaimed from the foundation of the world, viz., that He would have a Son. This Son he repeatedly acknowledged, and therefore he had an individuality pertaining to Himself distinct from His Father. Jesus laid claim to be David's son and David's Lord, which certainly He had no right to prefer, had He been a descendant merely as the professed brethren say. When put upon oath by the high priest as to whether He were the Christ the Son of the living God or not, He frankly and openly confessed He was, and that here-after he would see Him sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven. The high priest said what further need of witnesses, ye have heard His blasphemy. And we say to our former brethren, who have cast out our names as of evil doers, leave in haste the company of the chief priests and Pharisees lest the same spirit which rebuked their folly and wickedness also find you fighting against God. Bro. Handley followed at considerable length, and at the close drew from his pocket the confession of his faith, which was in the possession of Bro. Roberts before he (Bro. Handley) was immersed by him. This document is very valuable, as a refutation of the charge preferred against Bro. Handley of creeping into the Christadelphian community. It is manifest from this that Bro. Roberts himself was the one who introduced the "wolf" into the fold, and is the only one responsible for what he now denounces as "damnable heresy." On Sunday, January 4th, Bro. Hayes spoke to the brethren in the morning at the breaking of bread on the subject of covenant, and in the evening lectured to about 60 persons on the Parable of the Ten Virgins.

On Sunday afternoon, January 11th a meeting of the brethren was held for further consolidation, which was effected on the basis of a belief in an uncondemned Christ. A code of rules was adopted, a number of presiding brethren appointed, and the meeting was adjourned for the completion of further appointments. One of the sisters has, during the past few weeks, returned to the Temperance Hall Ecclesia, but her loss has been more than counter-balanced by the accession from that body of three brethren, several others being also expected ere long to follow their example. The members at the Temperance Hall appear to be pursuing a very inconsistent and tortuous policy, after effecting a wholesale ejection, a retail return on the part of some has been solicited, and an intimation given that no difficulty would be made about their readmission whether they recanted or not. A still more reprehensible act is also charged against them. A family of five were immersed and received into fellowship at the Temperance Hall; after immersion a "Renunciator" had an interview with the family, when, to his surprise he found that the condemnation of Christ had not at all been made a test point in their examination. The expression of their belief that Jesus was the Son of David had been considered as quite satisfactory, though the father of the family admitted that if pressed he should have sided with the view of Christ's non-condemnation. Our brother thereupon told them that they had evidently got into the wrong fold. What the issue will be remains to be seen. There are many, we understand, still remaining members of the Temperance Hall Ecclesia who are harboured with similar inconsistency. They are, however, as a matter of course those who have not "the courage of their convictions."

LONDON. - Bro. Watts, writing Jan. 4th, says: We have taken a very convenient room, holding about 150 people, nearly as large as the Upper-street Hall. We met this morning for the first time, and fourteen of us broke bread together, and as it was our first meeting we made it principally devotional, believing that it is as necessary to grow in grace as in knowledge. I think we shall muster twenty-three in fellowship very shortly. The whole of those who will be with us are of one mind upon the uncondemned Christ being the teaching of the Word. I lectured, as announced, when twenty-three were present. These are small things as yet, but I hope they will grow, and above all that we may grow strong in the Lord, and in the power of His might."

LEICESTER. - The brethren and sisters' here were cheered by the visit of Bro. Handley on Sunday, the 4th January. In the evening he delivered a lecture on the Relationship of Jesus Christ to the Father, and to the human family. On the Monday following there was a social tea gathering of the brethren, when brethren Hayes, Farmer and Ellis, from Nottingham, were present. Addresses were delivered by brethren Hayes and Ellis on some of the Scripture testimony relating to the question in agitation in the Christadelphian community. The remarks of the speakers shewed conclusively that since their minds had been enlightened upon the true position of Jesus the Christ of God, in the scheme of redemption, that many parts of Scripture formerly obscure have become remarkably illuminated. Among these may be mentioned those which treat of the Almighty as the redeemer. It is in this the height and depth, the length and breadth of the love of God has been manifested, not that we loved God but that He loved us and gave His only begotten Son that we might live through Him. In this the self-styled wise and prudent have been made foolish. They have failed to see that the part the Almighty, as the kinsman, behoved to perform was to raise up an heir of the world out of one, and she as good as dead, for she was legally dead when He said the seed of the woman shall bruise the head of the serpent. An heir under whom the first Adam could obtain inheritance, not Adam's son, but Adam's Lord's son. From Abraham also, and he as good as dead, He has made to spring as many as the stars for multitude and as the sand on the sea-shore innumerable. From David too, whose house was not such as could yield a redeemer, hath God according to His promise raised up, who is a light to enlighten the Gentiles and also to be the glory of His people Israel. A Son to David to perpetuate his name, and a lord to David to inherit his own throne by right on which David was honoured to sit for a short time as servant. The brethren are active and diligent, and doubtless will soon see that the things that have happened to them will turn out to the furtherance of the Gospel of Christ. In this hope they have felt much encouragement by the visits of brethren from a distance. Bro. Weale, writing January 16th, reports the immersion of Clara Lester, 21, and Alice Bose Lester, 18.

NOTTINGHAM. - We have the pleasure to announce the addition of another member to the Ecclesia in this town, in the person of Hannah White, wife of Bro. White, who, after passing a satisfactory examination, was baptized into the saving Name, and received into fellowship on Sunday, Jan. 4th. There are some other applicants for the ordinance, whose cases are under consideration. On the evening after Christmas Day a tea meeting was held in the Synagogue, which was numerously attended. Bro. Handley, from Maldon, was present, and delivered an address to those assembled, as did also Brethren Hayes and Glover. Bro. H. Turney, from Stourbridge, was also among the visitors. About 130 persons sat down to tea, including friends of the brethren and sisters and interested enquirers. The number present increased in the course of the evening to nearly 150, forming the largest gathering that has yet assembled on a like occasion, with the exception of that which took place when the Synagogue was first opened, rather more than twelve months ago. After the addresses just mentioned had been given and some anthems sung, opportunity was given for the asking of questions, which resulted in several being put on a variety of Bible topics, which were answered somewhat in detail by Brethren Hayes and Handley. The following lectures have been delivered in the Synagogue since our last - namely: Sunday evening, Dec. 21st, "The Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus," Bro. Hayes; Dec. 28th, "The Return of the Lord," Bro. F. Turney; Jan. 4th, "Does the Almighty God intend to burn up the Saints' Inheritance?" Bro. Ellis; Jan. 11th, "Who or what are the "Spirits in Prison?" Bro. Hayes. The attendance at all the meetings continues good.

AMERICA. - We have received some long letters from different parts of the States of a very encouraging character, fully endorsing the view of the Redeemer as set forth in these pages and expressive of pleasure that such a publication as the Christadelphian Lamp has been started.

Co-operation is promised.