

# The Christadelphian Lamp

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

Vol. 1.

MARCH, 1874.

No. 5.

---

## CONTENTS

|         |   |               |
|---------|---|---------------|
| Page 2  | A Treatise On The Two Sons Of God             | Editor        |
| Page 8  | Isaiah and Ezekiel Concerning Tyre            | Editor        |
| Page 10 | The Curse of The Law                          | S. G. Hayes   |
| Page 13 | The Nature of Christ (Continued)              | David Brown   |
| Page 15 | A Fortnight with The Brethren in Scotland     | William Ellis |
| Page 17 | Practical Illustration of Genesis XX          | Eclectic      |
| Page 17 | On Christian Temperance                       | Eclectic      |
| Page 17 | On The Will                                   | Eclectic      |
| Page 18 | Letters To The Editor                         |               |
| Page 20 | Answers to Correspondents                     |               |
| Page 21 | And His Name Shall Be Called Wonderful (poem) | D. B.         |
| Page 21 | Reference Tablet No. 2                        | W             |
| Page 22 | The Signs of The Times                        |               |
| Page 28 | Intelligence                                  |               |
| Page 31 | Extracts From Letters - America               |               |

-----

Adam was in circumstances where he could have gained eternal life upon a principle of faith and obedience, but failed to retain those circumstances by disobedience.

Jesus, the second Adam, was born in the circumstances where He could gain eternal life for Himself. He continued in these and at the end gave His life a ransom for the human family that they might be brought back to a position similar to that which was lost by the disobedience of the first Adam.

-----

**“Withhold not good from them to whom it is due,  
when it is thine hand to do it.”**

Proverbs 3:27

-----

# A TREATISE ON THE TWO SONS OF GOD.

## CHAPTER I. ADAM.

By the historic light of divine truth we go back through the darkness of nearly sixty centuries to take our stand in Eden of the East. In this flight of thought the mind is crowded on every side. Countless millions of the dead flit quickly past, and all the sea and land seem one vast grave o'er which the living still tread their chequered way to the great unseen. The picture is rich with the dress of trees and flowers, but it is the drapery of a well-grown burial place.

Myriad queries press upon us. What are the things we see? "What are these rocks and rivers, these forests, these fish, and birds, and beasts? The voice of science gives each and all some dry name, and labels the elements of which they are composed. But what are those elements, whence came they; how did they assume their present shape? The latter may perhaps be answered, but the former never by children of the dust. Imagination divides and subdivides to infinity; and then a voice cries, All is spirit. Matter was spirit and may be spirit again; spirit is but another name for matter. And what is spirit? To this no answer is returned.

We have soon reached the limit of human inquiry and human discovery. We stand in dumb amazement before the boundless incomprehensible. "The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made." What things are clearly seen and understood? "His eternal power and Godhead." The things seen testify of their Creator and Upholder. It is the revealed only can profit us, the contemplation of all beyond is unprofitable and vain. The first man is the object of our present interest. There is only one book to which we can turn for information. From the dark void our world had been evolved and furnished for its new inhabitant. There was no man; none to survey its wealth and beauty, none to rule its birds and beasts, its fishes and its creeping things.

It seemed fit that he who should have dominion should be of the earth itself. Under the formative power of the Eternal it was to be the well-spring, the womb of life. It was formed to bring forth: it was made to be inhabited. The agents of Eternal power who shaped and fashioned it were commanded to complete their great labour in the making of a new being in their own image a little lower than themselves.

We are simply informed of what was about to be done, but of the secret of the work nothing is told. How the dust of the earth would be moulded into the new creature called man it is useless to inquire. With the patriarch we can only say he was fearfully and wonderfully made. His visible and definable self is even now but imperfectly understood. When formed he was named Man. His composition was styled flesh, bone, blood, and breath. Though living and powerful he is but "a vapour." In death he ceases to be; he evaporates. He observes and thinks, but how he does not know. He differs from all living things in that he possesses an inborn sense of a Creator whom he must worship in some shape or conception. Like all other beings he dreads death. By nature he experiences no desire to leave his habitation; he clings to the earth, whence he sprang, as naturally as he clings to life.

When the Heavenly Powers had made man, the Highest pronounced him very good. It was not said he was partly good and partly bad; the judgment upon him was complete and uniform. This goodness referred to his material self, for at that time he had no more moral character than a new-born babe.

### EYE.

The constitution of the man required an extension of divine power. The man was relatively imperfect. He was incomplete without the woman. The Almighty purposed to fill the earth with a population of his new-made offspring; and ordained that the work should be carried out upon a principle of mutual love. To effect this He created the woman from the man.

This production seems almost more marvellous than the formation of the man. But there are things in which we can make no comparisons; things we know absolutely nothing of except the terms by which their existence is conveyed to our minds. God has not thought proper to tell us anything more than that the man was cast into a deep sleep, his side opened, a rib severed from it, and of that rib woman was made. We may figure the man in his painless sleep; imagination sees the incision, the extraction, and the healing. From the rib the woman rises into view like magic things upon the canvas, or the white sails of ships from out the haze that robes the sea, developed by the sunlight; but in reality we know nothing at all. Pencil and pen have traced the fancied figure of the first lord of creation and his beauteous bride; and the universal mind dwells with pleasure on the innocence and happiness of the first pair.

Looking at the father and mother of all living, we consider them as one. Their nature is the same, and also their destiny.

### **THE TWO TREES.**

In some undiscovered spot, probably not far from Palestine, the Creator chose a garden, well watered, and planted with trees bearing fruit suitable for the sustenance of life. The genius of the prince of poets has revelled here in all the luxuries of poetic vision. But few parts, perhaps, of the panorama can be looked upon as faithful to the original.

The sacred historian bestows only a few simple words upon the scene. A river went out of Eden to water the garden: and from thence it was parted, and became into four heads. The name of the first Pison, that is it which compasseth the whole land of Havilah, where there is gold; and the gold of that land is good; there is bdellium and the onyx stone. And the name of the second river Gihon, the same is it which compasseth the whole land of Ethiopia. And the name of the third river Hiddekel; that is it which goeth toward the east of Assyria. And the fourth river is Euphrates.

The only tree mentioned by name is the fig tree, of whose leaves they made themselves aprons. The tree of life and the tree of knowledge of good and evil were in the midst of the garden. We are not told what these were, it is only the moral and physical purpose of their existence that is pointed out.

It appears probable that of the first of these two trees Adam and Eve ate regularly until their expulsion from the garden, and that this eating sustained life in a remarkable degree; that so long as they continued to eat health and vigour were maintained, and the natural tendency to decay, which is inherent to corruptible bodies, was retarded; but when they ceased to eat the course of their nature proceeded gradually and brought them back again to dust.

No command is given against the eating of the tree of life, but of the fruit of the tree which stood in the midst of the garden, the tree of knowledge of good and evil, of that fruit they were forbidden to eat or touch on pain of death, not instant death, but, as is seen from what occurred, of expulsion, decay, and death, in the order of their nature.

### **TRANSGRESSION.**

The next proceeding in this primeval drama is more suitable for the assent of faith than the progress of investigation. A few bare facts, and those of the strangest order, are set down without any sign of surprise by the narrator, and no after writers on the sacred page have added a single touch to the picture which might relieve us of this unknown difficulty, unknown in all the range of historical knowledge.

The speaking of brute beasts, but more especially their participation in high moral things, and the eternal destiny of myriads of the human race, is a phenomenon on which there may be speculation, but about which it is hardly possible to reason.

The only positive mention of the temptation by the serpent, that we recollect, is that of Paul, in which he expresses his deep anxiety for the Corinthian believers. "But I fear," he says, "lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ." Whether the apostle understood what Moses had recorded in a literal or in an allegorical sense he does not say. Perhaps this is one of those matters presented to us in the scriptures about which the true wisdom is to be silent. It seems at all events to furnish no side or entrance to examine or to penetrate, with assurance of discovering a key to the mystery.

It would not profit our readers to transcribe the conjectures of various writers who have sought to maintain the literal or the figurative view; their fancy might be amused, but this treatise has other ends in view.

Moses afterwards introduced a serpent to the camp of Israel, but that was a serpent of brass, a likeness of the fiery serpents of whose bites they were dying by thousands. This was not the serpent that bit them, but it had a resemblance to it; the serpent of brass was intended to heal, not to bite. He was, therefore, not a biter, but a healer, not a poisoner but a good physician. He was an antidote to the venom of the biter, and is understood to typify Him who was lifted up, upon whom to look in faith is to be healed of the death-wound inflicted in the Garden of Eden.

Moses briefly and simply relates the dialogue which led to the death-sentence on every child of Adam. The worldwide and eternal mischief turns upon a deception of the understanding of the woman, half willing to be beguiled. The serpent desired to entice Eve to taste the fruit. She was very anxious to do so, and only restrained by divine prohibition. Persuasion and appetite at length overcame law; she

plucked and ate. At her instigation her husband also partook of the fruit, and being head, though second in the transgression, is said to have brought sin into the world.

These actions were the first explanations of sin. Till then sin was a word not understood; a word, in fact, not imported into our world. Sin is henceforth defined as "the transgression of the law."

### **KNOWLEDGE OF GOOD & EVIL.**

The eating of the forbidden tree produced an unexpected effect on the minds of Adam and Eve. The eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked. This knowledge must have existed before, but it was not attended with any sense of shame, a feeling observed in all races, however primitive their habits.

The transposition from innocence to modesty, which takes place gradually in every individual of the human family, came, in the case of Adam and Eve, as quickly as the act that produced it. It is a moral transition which we cannot explain. The record does not inform us that they had been previously informed of this result. It is inexplicable.

A sense of nakedness naturally induced a desire for secrecy and covering. The broad tough leaf of the fig tree was employed as a rude means for hiding their persons, but, like most devices for the concealment of crime, became the evidence of its commission. The two aprons were two public notices of trespass visible to all eyes except those whose guilt they were invented to cover. Those whose deeds are evil love darkness rather than light. The first sinners sought the shade and obscurity of the thick trees of the garden; they dreaded the light of heaven, and most of all the eyes of their former companions. Their own eyes were, probably, painful to each other. The eye and the voice of justice bring trembling to the evil doer.

The short questions of the divine messengers proved the crime of Adam and his wife, and their answers confirmed the truth of the proverb - he who excuses accuses himself.

### **THE SENTENCE.**

Death had been pronounced and probably explained when the occupants of Eden were placed under law. The loss of consciousness and resolution into dust were not however to be the sudden consequences of sin. The effect of disobedience was designed to be endured. But in death both knowledge and feeling are totally destroyed. A long life of sorrow, partly relieved by divine interposition, was the real punishment for the breach of divine law.

The man and woman were intended to replenish the earth; but no child was born in the bright days of their innocence. That clause in the judgment, threatening to greatly multiply sorrow, intimates that procreation would not have been altogether free from trouble; not only the pain, but also the conception was to be increased.

The wrath of God seems to have fallen with more severity on the woman than on the man. Adam, says Paul, was not deceived, but the woman was in the transgression. It should seem that Adam sinned from despair; rather than separately witness the judgment of God against his heart's love, he resolved to share her fate. But this heroism and devotion were not sufficient to expiate his crime. His fault was that he sinned under the full light of knowledge.

The terrors of the penalty reached him as the husband, father, and provider for his wife and family. The earth, whence he was taken, became his adversary. The rich and abundant produce which had started spontaneously from the soil was restrained and mingled with thorns and thistles. These obstacles are known in all climes where the subsistence of man depends on the cultivation of the ground. They are daily restrained by hard toil, and the bread is won by the sweat of the brow. Man does not know why they spring; but their presence reminds him of the first capital offence.

An easy tendance of the garden amused the leisure and refined the taste of the first human pair; but the desire to attain by unlawful means to a higher and happier state threw them into a life-long conflict with the obstacles they had provoked.

The judgment against the serpent is brief, and not easy of explanation. The impression received by Adam and Eve from the sentence is not hard to be understood. They knew that they had been formed from the dust, and to be told that they should return to dust again could leave no room for the idea of intermediate existence. Once they were not; again they were not to be. Post mortem life, recognised throughout Europe and the world, in shrines, burning lamps and prayers for the dead, who are really pretended to be alive, must have been absolutely unknown to the first individuals of our race. Their literal extinction was as certain as their literal existence. But the return to the ground is not, strictly speaking

perhaps, any part of the penalty. The law of all corruptible bodies brings them sooner or later to their original elements: they all terminate in dust.

### **CHERUBIM AND A FLAMING SWORD.**

Part of the sentence was expulsion from the garden. This appearance is altogether strange. We are again confronted with phenomena beyond our knowledge. We figure to our minds a stationary display of fire, ready to flame out to the destruction of those who should attempt to regain the lost Paradise. The tree of life was always guarded by this flaming sword. The preservation of the tree looks like a sharpening of the pains of disobedience. There was the standing inducement to return, and the standing threatening flame against all intrusion.

The sacred historian has not said when these things ceased to be. Again we know nothing, and all inquiry and imagination are useless. It is some slight consolation to suppose these are things which it would not be well for us to know. As little is really known of the cherubim who accompanied the flaming sword, as of the sword itself. They appear to be beings of human form, of superior power and intelligence, frequently engaged in the affairs of our world; but no farther can we go. This display of defence around the Edenic Paradise may be classed with the wonders of the burning bush, the smoking fiery summit of Sinai, and many others.

### **COATS OF SKINS.**

The sacred penmen do not always chronicle events in the exact order of their occurrence. Moses speaks of the coats of skins before the expulsion from the garden; but the summary dismissal from the tree of life favours the idea that God provided this covering after he had driven the sinners out. The order of these facts is perhaps not of much importance to us; the significance of the arrangement is of greater interest.

This provision of skins for the partial habiliment of Adam and Eve was a direct rejection of their own attempt. They would discern in it that their own scheme was displeasing to God, and entirely unfit for the object in view. That object was not merely the hiding of parts of their bodies, else fig leaves or any other garment might have answered the purpose. Neither fig leaves, nor skins, nor the shades of darkest night could conceal the shame of sin. No plan but that designed by Him against whom they had trespassed could bring one spark of relief and consolation to their guilty minds.

The skin robes are not to be considered as articles of dress, but as types of God's means for the covering of moral nakedness. In this light we see the impossibility of acceptance with God in an unclothed condition: and all are unclothed, whatever may be their investiture, unless clothed with the garment provided by the Almighty for their covering.

Besides these considerations the coats of skins imply the death of the animals to which they belonged. This is the first instance of the shedding of blood in connection with the recognition and forgiveness of sins: for, after the conditions of heaven had been obeyed, a sense of satisfaction would ensue. From the subsequent teaching on sacrifices it may be safely concluded that the animals whose skins made the coats of Adam and Eve were lambs or kids; types of the divine Lamb appointed for the purifying and covering of all who would find favour in the sight of God.

The coats of skins were not worn over the aprons of fig leaves. These were first put off; and that preliminary act would signify the putting away of sin. This implies repentance and sorrow for their crime. The putting on of the coats made by God signified their reinstatement in divine favour; it indicated their provisional righteousness, and gave hope that the tree of life might yet become accessible. The cherubic flames reminded them that no transgression unforgiven could taste its fruit; all such having no right to enter the paradise of God.

If the first crime had been unpardonable, no covering would have been appointed; no atonement made. The sentence, "Ye shall surely die" gives inference that continued obedience would have been rewarded by translation, and avoidance of the dark valley of the shadow of death. But certain death is not necessarily eternal death. No way of escape was made for Korah and his company; the cities of the plain also suffer the vengeance of eternal fire. Adam was on probation in two conditions: the first trial began in innocence; the second under repentance and pardon.

### **BLOOD.**

The shedding of blood and the pardon of sin are made fast in one indissoluble bond, essential in their relationship. It was this inevitable connection that was before the apostle's mind when he reminded the Hebrew saints that almost all things under Moses' law were purged with blood, and that without the

shedding of blood there is no remission. To spill blood in sacrifice is to give life, for the life of all flesh is in the blood thereof. To purge with blood is to blot out the stain of sin; that is, to obliterate death. Its application washes out the spots of transgression and confers the right to new life. Hence, when this has been accomplished, the washed and sanctified person is exhorted to keep himself unspotted from the world.

The loss of life is a literal fact; the giving of life as a ransom by shedding of blood is a literal fact also; but the application of that blood to the mind and heart of man born in sin is an act of faith; therefore the just are said to live by faith.

Every offering to be effectual must be clean. To bring an unclean offering was an abomination in the sight of God. There were two classes of animals, the clean and the unclean; of the latter mankind in every age have been prohibited by the Almighty to bring sacrifices to Him. If the typical offerings were so jealously guarded, how much more the anti-type: and to every mind it must occur that the clean makes clean, but the unclean defiles.

Nothing "is unclean of itself. But the distinction made by Jehovah points to the fact that no offering which is legally unclean can cleanse a subject who is legally defiled. All those beasts and birds legally appointed by Jehovah for sacrifice were specially described, and to bring any other was to add sin to sin. But the physical nature of the unclean things was quite as good as the physical nature of the clean things: they were all very good.

It was not physical but legal defilement which man needed to atone for; it was not for any violation of his material self that he sought pardon; but it was for a breach of Jehovah's law. The breach of law did not make man constitutionally worse, nor does the observance of law make him constitutionally better. This relationship to the future purpose of his Maker is changed; but he himself as a created being remains the same.

It was not to remedy any inherent or contracted defect of nature that the scheme of atonement was designed; it was to provide for an entirely new nature; a putting off and a putting on. The Almighty is not like man; He does not require to improve His work: all He makes is perfect of its kind; but there are various kinds, and the higher we ascend in the scale of creation the more exalted is the work which meets our view.

In relation to this globe man was the last work of the Creator and the noblest. From invisible spirit, condensed by Omnipotence through untold ages, to rude rocks and mighty depths, from tiny herbs to towering forests; from the first shades and forms of life through all the terrors and grandeurs of myriad grades, we mark the measured paces, the increasing beauty, and the boundless wisdom of His works whose ways are past finding out.

## CAIN AND ABEL.

The first child born represented the disobedience and ingratitude of his parents. As a tiller of the ground Cain's profession was a daily memorial of the anger of the Lord. Cain was the first murderer; the type of the majority of mankind, a hater of his brother. Abel is a specimen of the God-fearing few who, like himself, have been ever since, the envy and the prey of the other class. Christ seems to allude to Cain when he rebuked the Jews as being of their father the devil, a murderer from the beginning.

Cain was not willing to recognise his sinful state inherited by birth, nor to offer blood as an evidence of hereditary and personal guilt. Like all envious and selfish men, he reserved the choicest things for himself, and presented to God as little as he could of that which cost him least. The collateral obedience and goodness of his brother increased his wicked disposition, and at length he conceived a plan for getting rid of his hateful presence and example. That first murder struck two discordant strings which will vibrate through all time: sympathy for Abel and abhorrence for Cain.

The fruit of the ground was good to bring before the Lord; but it was not enough. It could not speak of sin and death; it pointed to no life as a price for redemption. Abel brought more than this. He spared not the choicest of his flocks and herds, and was rewarded with the answer of a good conscience towards God. "And the Lord had respect unto Abel and his offering." Man had offended God, but God had not left man without a way of reconciliation. He had blessed him with those things suitable to find acceptance in His presence: all the goodness and the mercy were His.

Cain refused to take one of those animals which lay at the door of his fold. No blood of sacrifice spoke to God in favour of Cain; but the blood of Abel cried unto the Lord. This is mentioned in two places, Gen. iv. 10 and Heb. xii. 24. The latter passage draws a comparison between the blood of Abel and the blood of Jesus. "And to Jesus, the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel."

There can be no comparison between things totally different. For one thing to be said to be better than another, it is necessary for the two things to be of the same kind, and to be intended for the same use. The blood which flowed from Abel's veins when Cain slew him, was not sacrificial blood. It did not speak good things but bad. Comparison lies betwixt good and better, not betwixt bad and better; the inference is then that Paul referred to the blood of Abel's offering. This brought down the respect of the Lord; but could not blot out transgression. These better things belonged to the blood of God's Lamb who taketh away the sin of the world.

### **NOAH'S SACRIFICE.**

Two thousand years had produced a population of rebels against the government of heaven. The earth was filled with violence; all flesh had corrupted His way. The Almighty resolved to destroy man and beast, and to begin the work of peopling the world afresh. Divine forbearance has its limits, and that limit was passed by the scoffers of Noah while, for one hundred and twenty years, he preached righteousness and prepared the ark for the safety of himself and family.

After the end of one hundred and fifty days the waters abated, and the ark rested in the seventh month, on the seventeenth day of the month, upon the mountains of Ararat. The first work of Noah, after emerging from the ark, was to build an altar unto the Lord, and to take of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl and to offer burnt offerings on the altar. This event, added a new link to the chain which bound man to acknowledge his proper standing in the eyes of his Maker. The clean sacrifices again pointed onward with the finger of hope to that Divine Offering without blemish and without spot. The Almighty expressed His pleasure at this act: we read that the Lord smelted a sweet savour, and the Lord said in His heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for mans' sake. While the earth remaineth, seed time and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease. And God blessed Noah and his sons, and said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth. And the fear of you, and the dread of you, shall be upon every beast of the earth, and upon every fowl of the air, upon all that moveth upon the earth, and upon all the fishes of the sea; into your hand are they delivered.

After this declaration, which placed Noah in a position similar to that of Adam, Jehovah repeated His injunctions with regard to blood. He then chose the rainbow as a token of peace betwixt Himself and the creatures of His hand.

### **THE OFFERING OF ISAAC.**

At the advanced age of seventy-five, Abraham departed out of Haran and came into the land of Canaan. He is one of those Bible characters who has left a more distinct impression on the world's heart than all the heroes of profane history. The sacred record is remarkable for this, its figures never fade.

A small group of Old and New Testament celebrities, with the matchless Nazarene for their central star, have been, and will ever be vividly before mankind. The best stories, the most thrilling facts outside the Bible, have but lightly struck the chords of human joy and piety; but the tones are deep and ceaseless that echo from the lyre touched by the sacred hand. The sale of Joseph, the meeting of his brethren; the fiery furnace; the prophet thrown to the lions, are written for all time. The offering up of Isaac holds a high place in these unfading memories.

During the long period of Abram's sojourn in Canaan and in the Philistine's land, his faith had been severely tried. He was now sinking under the weight of years, Isaac, the child of his old age, the special gift of God, born to him out of due time, sweetened his declining days, and promised to continue the honour of his house. Abram might now have walked gently down the hill and rested in dreamless sleep in the still dark valley of death to await the promised seed whose voice should break the silence of the ancient graves.

But the Almighty had a new and crowning trial in store to test the faith of His friend. He commanded him to slay and burn his only son! "Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah, and offer him there for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains that I will tell thee of."

The narrator records no hint of question or hesitation. Abram had once presumed to ask the Almighty for some sign by which he might know that He would fulfil His word. The sign was given: a burning lamp passed between the pieces of his sacrifice, and in a deep sleep the fortunes of his unborn sons passed before him in vision. His trust in the Almighty was implicit and unwavering.

"He rose up early in the morning, and saddled his ass, and took two of his young men with him, and Isaac his son; and he took the fire in his hand, and a knife. Who can describe the old man's feelings

through the previous and two following nights! He suppressed his anguish, the beloved lad went in cheerful innocence like a lamb to the slaughter. They went both of them together. And Isaac spake unto Abraham his father, and said, My father: and he said, Here am I, my son. And he said: Behold the fire and the wood; but where is the lamb for a burnt offering? And Abraham said: My son, God will provide Himself a lamb for a burnt offering; so they went both of them together.”

Abraham is the only instance of a resemblance to the Father of Jesus Christ, each offering up his only son whom he loved. “And they came to the place which God had told him of; and Abraham built an altar there, and laid the wood in order, and bound Isaac his son, and laid him on the altar upon the wood.” The implicit obedience of Isaac was equal to the firm faith of his father, and cast a well-defined shadow of the meekness and obedience of the true lamb.

“And Abraham stretched forth his hand and took the knife to slay his son.” There can be no doubt he would have struck the blow had not the angel of the Lord called to him to stay his hand, and to do the lad no harm. “Now I know,” said the angel, “that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, from me.”

That moment a heavy load fell from Abraham’s heart, and at the same instant he realized the pleasant reward of unbounded trust in God.

It is usual to regard Isaac as a type of Christ; but in the apostle’s notice of this circumstance in Hebrews he neither affirms nor denies it. His comment shows that the offering was a means employed by the Almighty to prove the faith of Abraham; and this agrees with a portion of the passage already quoted from Genesis. We do not think Isaac typical of Christ as an offering. Isaac, though bound and laid on the altar, was not offered in reality; he was only offered in the obedient purpose of his father’s heart. This thought is suggested by the fact that there is not a single example of an offering being ordained by Jehovah of any individual already under sentence of death as Isaac was, being a son of Adam; and by the fact also that he was not really slain. Isaac may have fore-shadowed the intention of God to make a human being the means of atonement; but, if so, this was done without slaying him as a typical sacrifice.

It is an easy matter to find, or rather to make, allegories and correspondences; but the safest plan is to keep close to those already made by the New Testament writers. Departure from this rule has produced a well-known volume largely filled with human fancies. While perhaps none of our readers would assent to but few of these correspondences, it is not out of place to intimate the need of caution, lest from another point of view we also fall into the same extreme.

The firmness of the patriarch was founded in the belief that God was able to raise Isaac up, even from the dead; from whence also, Paul adds, he received him in a figure. It is true that to Abraham’s mind his son was as good as dead; but it has been suggested by some writers that Paul’s allusion was not to this; but that it was to the extraordinary conditions of Isaac’s birth. - Rom. iv. 19.

[To be continued.]

---

## **ISAIAH AND EZEKIEL CONCERNING TYRE, (Continued from February, page 3.)**

All but complete destruction befell Tyre at the hands of Alexander, yet she rose again after a brief period to wealth and power, and in 315 B.C., was able to hold her own against Antigonos, who laid siege to her for eighteen months. Mark Antony, the lover of Cleopatra, made her a present of the city; which finally lost her independence under Augustus. Still by reason of its advantageous situation, Tyre did not lose all importance in the Romans world.

In 193 A.D. she took an active part in the contest between Septimus Severus and Prescemius Niger, which brought back some of its ancient distinction. The Saracens made themselves masters of Tyre in the seventh century, and held it until 1192 A.D., when it was taken by the Crusaders. In 1516 the conquest of Selim 1 and other circumstances ruined its trade, which was chiefly in its famous purple, and now all that remains of this once proud, populous, and wealthy city is a mass of wretched ruins, among which some three thousand to four thousand people eke out an existence by trifling exports of tobacco, cotton, wool and wood; besides a few poor fishermen whose nets spread, as the prophet predicted, over the bleak rocks.

Jehovah does not pull down one nation and set up another without marking the causes which bring about the change. To wicked men those causes may sometimes appear to be inadequate to the results; but from God’s point of view - from the standpoint of eternal truth and justice - it is far otherwise. Those

nations who have been blest with most light and doubtless the most responsible before God. Hence we find God deals mercifully with those who have dealt mercifully with Israel, severely punishing such who have trodden upon their neck. It is only natural that the peoples adjacent to Israel should possess clearer ideas concerning the true God, than those further off whose "ignorance God winked at, and suffered them to walk in their own ways." Tyre was favoured in this respect. Hiram and Solomon were close friends. When Solomon built his temple Hiram sent him skilled workmen and vast quantities of material, and it is thought that Solomon married Hiram's daughter. Instead of Israel teaching the neighbouring peoples, who were idolaters, they seem to have been the means of corrupting her religion.

Tyre was pagan in her worship. There was no vice with which her people were not stained. The pagan deities of Egypt and other nations were the objects of religious homage in Tyre. Her merchant princes bowed down to stocks and stones. From the prince to the slave all worshipped objects which could neither see, nor hear, nor walk; the work of men's hands. Many were guilty of crimes too foul to be described. Besides the custom of mutilating their limbs and bodies in the worship of Isis and Osiris; they were guilty of the horrible practice of sacrificing their sons and daughters to Molech and other gods.

"In all the emergencies of state, and times of general calamity, they devoted what as most necessary and valuable to them as an offering to the gods, and particularly to Molech. But besides these undetermined times of bloodshed, they had particular and prescribed seasons every year, when children were chosen out of the most noble and reputable families. If a person had an only child, it was the more liable to be put to death, as being esteemed more acceptable to the deity, and more efficacious for the general good. Those who were sacrificed to Molech were thrown into the arms of a molten idol, which stood in the midst of a large fire, and was red with heat. The arms of it were stretched out, with the hands tuned upwards, as it were to receive them, yet sloping downwards so that they dropped from thence into a glowing furnace below. To other gods, they were otherwise slaughtered and, as it implied, by the very hands of their parents. What can be more horrid to the imagination than to suppose a father leading the dearest of all his sons to such an infernal shrine, or a mother the most engaging and affectionate of her daughters, just rising to maturity, to be slaughtered at the altar of Ashteroth or Baal! Such was their blind zeal that this was continually practised; and so much of natural affection, still left un-extinguished, as to render the scene ten times more shocking from the tenderness they seemed to express. They embraced their children with great fondness and encouraged them in the gentlest tones that they might not be appalled at the sight of the barbarous process, begging of them to submit with cheerfulness to this fearful operation. If there was any appearance of a tear, or a cry unawares escaping, the mother smothered it with kisses that there might not be any show of backwardness or restraint, but the whole be a free-will offering. These cruel endearments being over, they stabbed them to the heart, or otherwise opened the sluices of life, and with the blood warm, as it ran, besmeared the grim visage of the idol." - Ency. Britannica.

In the eighteenth of Leviticus there is an enumeration of sins of which the nations of Canaan were guilty, and Moses says that for these the Almighty cast them out of the land. "And the land is defiled, therefore do I visit the iniquity thereof upon it, and the land itself vomiteth out her inhabitants." Israel were warned that if they committed the like, "the land would spue them out also, as it spued out the nations that were before them." Of all the crimes specified by Moses Tyre was guilty. These were sufficient to bring her to desolation. Israel was driven out for the same offences, and her land lies desolate to-day as a witness against her.

Tyre had also offended God by her envy and greediness. When Nebuchadnezzar had sacked Jerusalem Tyre rejoiced at her fall. "Because that Tyrus hath said against Jerusalem, Aha, she is broken, that was the gates of the people; she is turned unto me; I shall be replenished now she is laid waste. Therefore thus saith the Lord God behold I am against thee, O Tyrus, and will call many nations to come up against thee, as the sea causeth his waves to come up." Because of such rejoicing Ammon and other nations, as well as Tyre, were brought low.

The prince of Tyre was obnoxious to the divine displeasure because of his loftiness and religious pride. The Spirit on this account commanded Ezekiel to "say unto the Prince of Tyrus, thus saith the Lord God, because thine heart is lifted up, and thou hast said, I am God I sit in the seat of God . . . Behold, therefore, I will bring strangers upon thee . . . and they shall defile thy brightness; they shall bring thee down to the pit, and thou shall die the death of them that are slain in the midst of the seas."

EDITOR.

# THE CURSE OF THE LAW.

SUNDRY objections having been raised to statements made in an article on the above subject, which appeared in the first number of this Periodical, we gladly avail ourselves of the present opportunity of explaining and vindicating what was therein advanced.

1. No proof has yet been offered that it was a transgression of the Mosaic Law to hang or be hung on a tree, on the contrary, it is in effect admitted that there is no such enactment. While we are not contending for a particular "form of words" in the case, we do object to the phrase, which has been so repeatedly made use of in the course of this controversy, namely, "The Mosaic Curse," just as if there was but one curse under the law of Moses, and that curse was death. This fallacy is the basis of the objector's arguments and vitiates all his reasoning: he has not proven his premises. In the case of Jesus the curse was not something that followed the hanging on a tree, but it was by His being placed in that ignominious position that He was "made a curse." The same remark applies to those who were hanged on a tree after being slain. The curse did not result in the hanging, but the hanging was the curse. "He that is hanged is accursed of God." Deut. xxi. 23. (margin, the curse of God). To speak of a man who occupies that position as "accursed" is therefore not equivalent to saying that a man was cursed as the result of hanging on a tree. Neither is there the parallel between the curse in the case of Jesus, and that of those referred to as cursed in Deut. xxvii., which it is sought to establish. In that chapter the curses are denounced against those who should break the law by committing some offence, and thereby render themselves liable to a penalty which varied according to the degree of guilt. Jesus had committed no offence, neither did He break the law by hanging on a tree. The placing of Him in that ignominious position was the act of His enemies, and thereby was He "made a curse," or an accursed one; though really not a malefactor, He was treated as if He had been the vilest of criminals. And if Jesus had not been thus ignominiously treated He could not have been accounted a person accursed, for being innocent of transgression the law had no hold upon Him and could not condemn Him, inasmuch as He was obedient in all things even unto death. That Jesus was "made a curse" by hanging on a tree is clear from what the Apostle says in Gal. iii. 13, for he there quotes the passage from Deut. already referred to as proof that such was the case. Again, the curse denounced against the man who shall rise up before the Lord and build the city Jericho, and the curse denounced upon "every one that hangeth on a tree" are not analogous. The objector has here failed to perceive the distinction which exists in the words used in the two cases, and has thus confounded things that differ. Jericho and all its inhabitants (with the exception of Rahab and those that were with her in the house) were separated or devoted to destruction, on account of their iniquities, cursed in this sense. In Gal. ii 13, the Apostle uses the Greek word *καταρα*, signifying simply a curse, execration. "No man (says the Apostle Paul) speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed." 1 Co. xii. 3. In which place the word used is not *καταρα*, but *αναθεμα*, answering to the Hebrew word *cherum*, which signifies to destroy utterly, also to separate anything absolutely from its common use or condition and to devote it to Jehovah, so as to be incapable of redemption. Jesus was not accursed in this sense, except indeed by those who did not speak by the Spirit of God. A penalty followed the curse in one case but not in the other. The man who should build Jericho was not only denounced as accursed, but, adds Joshua, "he shall lay the foundation thereof in his first born, and in his youngest son shall he set up the gates of it." Josh. vi. 26. This terrible threatening was literally fulfilled in the days of Ahab, as recorded in 1 Kings xvi. 34. "In his days did Hiel the Bethelite build Jericho: he laid the foundation thereof in Abiram his first-born, and set up the gates thereof in his youngest son Segub, according to the word of the Lord which He spake by Joshua the son of Nun." The attempt to prove that Jesus infringed or broke the law is a complete failure; while to admit that He was an accursed one by the mode of His death is a totally different thing to believing that He came under the curse of the law by transgressing it. The death of Jesus was sacrificial, and resulted neither from Adam's sin nor from any transgression of His own. He voluntarily surrendered His life in obedience to the will of His heavenly Father, as He said: "Therefore doth my Father love me because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father." Jno. xx. 17, 18.

As to the charge of inconsistency, being based on false premises, it is of no account whatever.

2. In this paragraph the same mistake is made by the objector as in the former one. The man hanged was not cursed as the result of being hung, but the curse consisted in the hanging on account of the ignominy which attached to it. So great was this, that the body must be taken down and buried the same day. It is quite true that the curse fell on the one who was hanged and not upon the hangman, but this does not prove that the curse was the result of the hanging, neither does it prove that the curse was death. Hanging on a

tree was extra to the sentence of death on a criminal as proven, by what is written in Deut. xxi. 22: "And if a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be to death, and thou hang him on a tree," etc. In the event of his being hung on the tree his body must not be allowed to remain all night upon the tree, but if put to death in some other way, burial the same day was not commanded. The curse applied in the one case, but not in the other. It is clear, therefore, that the curse was not death. The form of execution might be hanging on a tree, nevertheless the curse consisted not in being put to death, but in the mode in which death was inflicted. But of this we shall have more to say when we come to the 4th paragraph.

**3.** It is indeed difficult to understand how Jesus could obey the will of God by infringing His law, and the difficulty has not been removed by the quotation made from Elpis Israel. The fact is that Jesus did not infringe the law of God. To say that He did is to make Him a transgressor and to bring Him under condemnation, which, in view of the many emphatic declarations contained in the Scriptures that He was without sin cannot for one moment be admitted. The supposition put forward does not meet the case of Jesus. He was not placed in such a position as to be compelled to break one law in order to pay obedience to another. Before the position assumed can be of any force it must first be proved that hanging on a tree was a transgression of the Law of Moses. We repeat that the objector has not proven his premises.

It is not written. Gal. iii. 13, that Jesus suffered the curse of the law; the statement there is that He was "made a curse," which applies not to His death but to His hanging on the tree. Neither does the law say cursed is he that dieth on a tree, but cursed is he that hangeth on a tree.

The objection to the phrase "passive act" is not taken away by the statement that Jesus was "mentally active," nor is the expression "passive operation" any improvement on the phrase "passive act" both are alike self-contradictory, illogical, and absurd. In the matter of crucifixion Jesus was passive and His enemies were active. He might have resisted, but He did not resist either by word or act. "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and He shall presently give me more than twelve legions of Angels? But how then shall the scriptures be fulfilled that thus it must be?" Matt. xxvi. 53 54

**4.** That hanging on a tree applied to the dead as well as the living is perfectly clear, and has already been proved. It is not an assumption but a fact, and here are some further illustrations in point. The five kings of the Amorites were delivered into the hands of Joshua by God, and therefore they were under sentence before judgment came upon them. Joshua slew them before they were hanged on trees, thereby shewing that the curse was not death, but hanging on a tree. (Josh. X. 5, 8, 10, 24, 26.) These kings were not Jews, and not being under the Law of Moses, could not be held as transgressors of it. The curse came upon Gentiles as well as upon Jews. Rechab and Baanah his brother were slain before they were "hanged up over the pool in Hebron, nor were they slain irrespective of sentence against them, for David "commanded " them to be put to death. In this instance also it is manifest the curse was not death. (2 Sam. iv. 9, 12.) From the foregoing passages it is clear that the hanging on a tree was consequent on the sentence of death, or the being devoted to destruction. It was something additional, and therefore the curse itself could not be death. Were the curse in question death, the passage in Deut. xxi. 22 would be made more forcible if it read, Cursed is every one that dieth on a tree.

That Jesus was hung on a tree before His death is most readily conceded. But the question is, was He cursed to death by the law as a transgressor? We answer No, the curse in His case was not death but hanging on a tree. And this curse coming upon Him while alive only served to make the ignominy of it the greater.

**5.** To the charge of contradiction we plead not guilty. There may be an apparent but there is no real contradiction, the "extraordinary conclusion," so called, is sufficiently explained in the answers to the eleven questions given below. It is asked,

**1.** Does not Gal. in. 10, shew that all Jews were cursed by the law through not keeping it in every point?

Yes, all Jews except Jesus, who, having kept the law in every point, could not be cursed by it as a transgressor.

**2.** Did not the full curse of the law come upon everyone who failed to fulfil the law in every point? (James ii. 10.)

This is in substance the same as the foregoing, and may be answered in the same way.

**3.** Was not the full curse of the law death?

Yes.

**4.** Was not then the curse, from which Jesus had to redeem the Jews, death?

Not Jews only, but Gentiles also. Gal. iii. 22. Ro. xi. 32.

**5.** Would submission to a curse, anything short of death, have redeemed Jews from the curse of death?

It was necessary that Jesus should die in order to redeem both classes, and not the one class more than the other.

**6.** If the curse of the law which Jesus underwent was that of hanging on a tree, how could that have redeemed Jews from death?

If Jesus had not been hanged on a tree He could not have been accounted an accursed one, or, “made a curse,” but it is not contended that the bare fact of His hanging on a tree redeemed any one from death.

**7.** If Jesus was cursed by the law as the result of being hung on a tree, why does the Apostle follow the statement that He was “made a curse,” by saying, “For it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree?” Is not this intended to explain by what means the curse came? Jesus was cursed, or “made a curse,” by the law in the way mentioned above, but this curse was not death. The quotation from Deuteronomy is in perfect harmony with our position, and destructive of that assumed by the objector.

**8.** Does not this show that Jesus was cursed simply through being hung on a tree?

No, because if He had not been previously accused and condemned He would not have been placed in such an ignominious position.

**9.** What other curse than death followed, His hanging on a tree?

Death certainly followed His hanging on a tree, but His death was sacrificial and not the result of His being cursed by the law as a transgressor.

**10.** Was not the curse of the law suffered by Jesus, death?

Answered above.

**11.** And as this curse came upon Him while alive, was not His life claimed by the Mosaic Law before He died?

No.

Ergo, He did lay down a life free from condemnation.

S. G. HAYES.

The following very pertinent remarks are from Macknight:-

“Having become a curse for us. Christ’s dying on the cross is called His becoming a curse, that is, an accursed person, a person ignominiously punished as a malefactor; not because he was really a malefactor, and the object of God’s displeasure, but because he was punished in the manner in which accursed persons, or malefactors, are punished. He was not a transgressor, but He was numbered with the transgressors. Isa. liii. 12.

“It merits the reader’s attention that, in this passage (Gal. iii. 13) Christ is not said to have suffered the curse of the law, but to have become a curse for us. The curse of the law of nature which was published in the Law of Moses, being eternal death, is a curse which no one can suppose Christ to have suffered. But He became a curse, that is, an accursed person, a person most ignominiously punished for us. That this is the true import of the phrase, having become a curse, is evident from the passage in the law by which the apostle proves his assertion, It is written, Accursed is everyone who is hanged on a tree. For as the accursedness of one who is hanged on a tree doth not consist in his suffering eternal death, but in his being ignominiously punished, so Christ’s having become a curse for us, did not consist in His suffering eternal death but in His having been most ignominiously punished as a malefactor for us. And in regard He suffered this most ignominious punishment in obedience to God, it was as just and reasonable that this one great act of obedience should procure for all mankind the blessings mentioned in the preceding note, as that the one act of disobedience committed by Adam should have brought sin and death on all his posterity. This argument the apostle hath prosecuted with great strength of reason. Rom. v. 12 - 21.

“Accursed is everyone who is hanged on a tree.” This is cited from Deut. xxi. 23, which, as Chandler observes, runs in the Hebrew thus, He that is hung is the curse of God. The apostle adds, on a tree, from the former part of the verse: His body shall not remain all night on the tree. And although he leaves out the words, of God, it makes no alteration in the sense of the original passage. The phrase curse of God, doth not mean that the person who is hung on a tree is accursed of God eternally. For many righteous persons have been hung on a tree. But the meaning is, that the man who is hung on a tree, is punished with the greatest temporal punishment, which God, as the law-giver and ruler of the Israelites, ordered the judges, His substitutes, to inflict on notorious offenders against the state. The Hebrews, as Grotius observes, did not use the punishment either of the cross or of the gibbet. But malefactors to be punished with strangling, were strangled standing. More atrocious malefactors they stoned to death, such as idolaters, blasphemers, etc., then hanged them on a gibbet for some hours, thereby exposing them to the greatest ignominy. Hence in the law they are said to be accursed, that is, most ignominiously punished, who were hanged on a tree. But if it was so ignominious to be hanged on a tree after death, certainly it was much more ignominious to be hanged thereon alive. Besides, according to the customs of the Romans, crucifixion was of all punishments the most ignominious, being appropriated to slaves; and

therefore Christ, who was hanged on the cross, may justly be said to have been made a curse or an accursed person, in the eye of the world, as He died by the most ignominious of all punishments.” (Translation of the Apostolical Epistles, by James Macknight, D.D., vol. 2, pp. 260 and 261).

[An article on Circumcision and Baptism will shortly appear from the same pen as the above on the Curse of the Law].

-----

## **THE NATURE OF THE CHRIST** **BY DAVID BROWN, LONDON.** **(Continued from Page 72)**

### **FIRST PROPOSITION.**

Jesus was a Son of God by direct creation from the Virgin’s womb, and Adam was a Son of God by direct creation out of the dust of the ground, but Jesus was the Father incarnate by His spirit, therefore Adam was the Father incarnate by His spirit.  
The result in each case being, a Son in mortal flesh.

### **SECOND PROPOSITION.**

Adam, being a Son of God by direct creation, transgressed the law of God and fell from his first estate, the Grace of God, and was condemned to death under the curse and wrath of God but Adam was the Father incarnate by His spirit, therefore The Father incarnate, as Adam, transgressed and fell from His first estate. His own grace, and was condemned to death, under His own curse and wrath.

### **THIRD PROPOSITION.**

Jesus, being a Son of God by direct creation, through faith and obedience, attained unto eternal life, but Jesus was the Father incarnate by His spirit, therefore The Father incarnate, as Jesus, attained unto eternal life.  
There is no flaw in this reasoning out of the involved conclusions and yet they are absolutely repugnant to our sense of right, and must be rejected as contrary to the simplicity of the truth, as it is in Jesus.  
Let us go a step further and deal with Father incarnation in a condemned nature, and what do we come to? –

### **FOURTH PROPOSITION.**

Adam, being a Son of God by direct creation, by transgression came under the curse and wrath of God as a federal head, and was condemned to the operation of a law of sin and death written in his members for all in him; therefore “all in the Adam die,” but, Adam was the Father incarnate by His spirit, therefore The Father incarnate as “the Adam” was “dead” while he lived in the flesh, and subject to His own curse and wrath, because of transgression.  
And so death passed upon all men, for that all in Him (the Father incarnate) have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; hence The Father incarnate as “the Adam” was the first sinner, and by Him sin came into the world, and death by sin, and has reigned from the Adam throughout all generations of his race, over all who have not sinned after the similitude of the Adamic transgression.

## FIFTH PROPOSITION.

Jesus, being a Son of God by direct creation, but (by reason of His inception in the Virgin's womb) in the condemned nature of the first Adam, and counted as "dead" in that nature, under the curse and wrath of God, as a child of the Adam sinner was sentenced to death in the Adam, but Jesus was the Father incarnate by His spirit, therefore, The Father incarnate, as Jesus, needs a Redeemer Himself to deliver Him from the hereditary curse upon every child of the Adam, "dust thou art and unto dust shall thou return," and cannot otherwise escape from the power of the law of sin and death, from the bondage of corruption, or be at liberty to work out His own salvation, and then present himself as "a living man," to render up His natural life, a freewill offering, as a ransom for others.

Such being the deductions from the doctrines of the Father incarnation, and of Father incarnation in a condemned nature, we have no alternative but to admit that the Word of God is rendered of none effect by this tradition; it has been weighed in the balances of the Sanctuary, and found wanting in all the essentialities of Gospel revelation, and may be, and ought to be, at once and for ever, dismissed to the limbo of vanities as a damnable heresy, which will cause men to stumble and fall, and be snared and taken, and the sooner the brethren are delivered from the burden of this strong delusion, the better it will be for their continuance, in well-doing, sitting at the feet of Jesus, clothed, and in their right minds.

As to "mere manism," or the existence of Jesus in a condemned nature as a child of Adam without Divine germination, though the creation of spirit power, it is open to the same objection as "Father incarnation in a condemned nature," and makes the work of the Christ for the salvation of sinners an absolute impossibility from the predominating influence of the law of sin and death, and His own hereditary inability to save Himself in accord with God's way of righteousness. "Hear and your souls shall live, and I will make with you an everlasting covenant, the sure mercies of David," a covenant based on the fact that God will find a ransom, and bring into force the Davidic covenant by a Beloved One in whom His soul shall delight, whose life shall not be prejudged and forfeited because of original sin or actual transgression, but can be offered up as a ransom for many, which the Holy Spirit witnesseth in these words: "I will visit Him with the stripes due to the children of Adam" - - - "He shall be bruised for their iniquities" - - - "for the transgression of my people shall He be stricken" - - - "when thou shall make His soul an offering for sin He shall see a seed, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in His hands."

Not one of these texts give any countenance to the 'condemnation' theory, or warrant us to determine the apostolic utterances in any way inconsistent with their testimonies of our Lord's holiness of nature and character, and to his personal right to eternal life by acceptance of the Father, at the period of his immersion and anointing of holy spirit without measure. Hence it follows that, 'being made a curse for us,' must not be construed as 'being made a TRANSGRESSOR for us,' but as "numbered with transgressors" of the will of God, to reconcile us to Himself by Jesus the Christ, and therefore "God hath both raised up the Lord, and will also raise us up by His own power." And again, "For such an high priest became us, who was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens (of the future age). Who needeth not, daily, as the (Mosaic) high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first, for His own sins, and then, for the people's; for this He did once when He offered up Himself" must not be construed as 'offering for His own sins,' but to put away the sins of others by this sacrifice of Himself, inasmuch as He died as a lamb without blemish and without spot, in harmony with these Scriptures: -

"Who verily was fore-ordained before the foundation of the (nation) world, but was manifest in these last times for you who by Him do believe in God."

"So the Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." Heb. ix. 28.

"Lo, I come to do Thy will, O my God, Thy law is within my heart." Ps. xl. 8.

"Forasmuch then as the Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh."

"For the Christ hath also once suffered for sins, the just one for the unjust that He might bring us to God."

We conclude from the remarkable reiteration of the same idea in these spirit words, that the Christ of God suffered not as a transgressor, but as a sacrificial victim on behalf of others, and that in resurrection after the power of an endless life he attained to the high priesthood, having by the grace of God tasted death for every man, "that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God to make reconciliation for the sins of the people," and in this way He unites in Himself the victim and the offerer in the true holy of holies, within the veil, that is to say, the Divine Nature, "whither for us the Forerunner hath entered."

Can therefore the Christ be the minister of sin? God forbid!

“He shall see of the travail of His soul and be satisfied, by His knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, for He shall bear their iniquities.” “He bare the sin of many, and (by His righteousness) made intercession for transgressors.” Isaiah, liii.

If sin had laid hold of Him in, by, or through the first Adam, the Lord Jesus could not have obeyed the tenor of Isaiah’s prophesy, and a greater anomaly forces itself on our regard, viz., that God by His spirit in direct action for the manifestation of Jesus, as the child born, originated Him under the curse of the Edenic law, and gave Him up to death under the curse of the Mosaic law, and since under both laws the penalty of transgression is death without reprieve, He becomes under their joint operation, doubly damned, or sentenced to final extinction by two immutable things in which it is impossible for God to lie; and we are asked to believe that His righteousness delivers Him from this seizure of death at the beginning and close of His mortal career, and suspends in His case the unalterable laws of God’s righteousness, which sweeps away all generations of the children of men to moulder into dust as the heritors of death and the grave through the Adamic transgression, concerning whom the spirit of God testifies “none of them can by any means redeem his brother, or give to God a Ransom for him, that he should still live for ever, and not see corruption.”

To speak thus of God’s ways and thoughts, whose creative spirit originates all things “very good,” is to offend against the generation of His children, and to ascribe to Him with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning the blasphemy of Milton’s Apostate Angel, “Evil, be thou my good.” There is no unrighteousness with God, and though He hath caused the wrath of man to praise Him by permitting His covenant people, stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, to be the betrayers and murderers of the Just One, and restrained the remainder of wrath, by exalting Him at His right hand to be a prince and a Saviour to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins; yet His own wrath abideth for ever upon every soul of man who stands in the offence of the first Adam as the representative and progenitor of unborn generations. The Lord Jesus the Christ, as the representative and progenitor of the generation who shall serve God in the glory yet to be revealed, stood in His own obedience, and in the grace and mercy of God from first to last, and hence every soul of man who stands in His obedience, receives mercy and grace through Him as the Redeemer of their souls, because He delivered Himself from going down into the pit, and His life saw the light, and then, full of grace and truth, He was God’s messenger with man, and interpreter of His deep things, one among a thousand, yea, chiefest among ten thousand! to shew unto man His uprightness, as the power of God unto salvation unto every one that believeth, that God might be gracious unto the believer, and say: “Deliver him from going down into the pit, I have found a Ransom.”

“For this purpose the Son of God was manifested that He might destroy the works of the devil.”

“Hereby perceive we the love of God, because He laid down His life for His brethren.”

“Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins.”

“And this is the record that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son.”

“These sayings are faithful and true, and the Lord God of the holy prophets sent His messenger to shew them unto His servants - and He is (now) the root and offspring of David, and the bright and morning star.” Amen.

“No man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed.” - Amen and Amen.

-----

## **A FORTNIGHT WITH THE BRETHREN IN SCOTLAND. (CONTINUED FROM PAGE 90)**

On the following Monday the time was occupied for the most part in calling on several of the George Street brethren, with the view of telling them what led to my change of mind upon the descent of Jesus Christ.

In the evening I went a little distance from Glasgow to visit a brother whom I had always reckoned amongst the reasonable of the brotherhood. I was not long in his company before I learned that in the matter as to whether Jesus Christ was sin’s flesh, or simply flesh and blood, he was beyond the pale of testimony and reason. This brother doubtless thought he was doing what was right in refusing to hear my reasons for a change of mind; but he might at least have done himself the justice of knowing what I had to say for myself.

Beith. - Here I spent an evening with Bro. Gillies, who showed a disposition to prove all that could be advanced from the scriptures concerning Jesus Christ being flesh and blood of the seed of Abraham, but

not necessarily a constitutional sinner. Wednesday evening was spent with the brethren meeting in St. Enoch's Hall, in Glasgow. Thursday was spent among some of the friends there also, and in the evening went to Coatbridge, eight miles off, and gave a lecture to a small audience upon the passage, "Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousands of His saints." There are a few interested in the truth in the locality, as well as a very active and willing brother, and we hope to hear soon of a small gathering of those who love the Lord's appearing, and who desire to be found waiting for him.

Friday morning I left for Wishaw, where for several years I have been most kindly received, and on this occasion experienced no difference, except that the time at disposal was very fully occupied in the discussion of the points of difference amongst the brethren.

The difficulty here, as in every place more or less, centres around the assumption that because Jesus was made of a woman, it followed that he was a descendant of the woman alone. This is an assumption which altogether ignores the relationship of the father. And from the law of redemption as given to Israel, and illustrated in the case of Boaz, who built up the house of Elimelech by marrying Ruth, it is manifest that the Almighty father, as the kinsman, built up the house of the first Adam by raising up a second Adam from Mary his daughter, who had no power to bring forth of herself. Therefore I argue that the descent of this son belongs to his own real father, the Almighty God, and at the same time that he was a son to Adam but not out of his loins any more than Obed was out of the loins of Elimelech. The brethren manifested the greatest interest in the matter, and I feel satisfied had those in other parts looked as calmly and fairly as the brethren in Wishaw we should not have seen the wide-spread division which has been fostered and pushed precipitately upon the brethren in various parts. The brethren heard all that could be advanced in the short time, and will certainly give it consideration. In the hope that we all profited by the interchange of our thoughts upon a matter so full of moment to all of us, I parted from them for Glasgow on Saturday morning, where I learned that the brethren in George Street had favourably entertained my offer to spend Sunday evening with them, and had arranged that the best way to use the time was by a discussion of the chief questions in dispute.

On Sunday afternoon I learned that my opponent was likely to be Bro. Smith, and as I had already been in his company five times during the fortnight, it seemed difficult to fix upon any new phase of the subject not already disposed of. The Christadelphian for December, page 532, furnished a convenient starting point. It is there stated that the meaning of the passage, "He hath made Him sin for us," is equivalent to making Him flesh and blood. The Apostle says that it was He who knew no sin who was made sin, and as the being made sin was after He knew no sin, and not before, it follows that Jesus had a sinless existence before He was made sin, and the making of him flesh and blood could not be the meaning of the Apostle, for Jesus had no probationary life before he was born of Mary.

But upon the brethren's own admission, there was no change upon Mary's substance that could be called the making sin of Him who knew no sin. If Jesus had an existence as a being before He was born, and that in the act of begetting this spiritual existence was changed into sin, then this transformed spirit into flesh was not a descendant of Adam.

This is the point where I feel certain our esteemed brother Dr. Thomas failed to perceive the Apostle's meaning, and hence the confusion which is manifest wherever the subject of the putting away of sin is introduced in his writings. Bro. Smith admitted then publicly that this passage, "God made him sin," evidently meant that God made Him an offering for sin. This admission virtually gives up the case, for this is all that we contend for. For if Jesus was made a sin-offering, or an offering for sin, it must have been for sin committed by someone, seeing He Himself committed no sin. There were animals slain by or caused to be slain by God at the foundation of the world, and these were typical of God's lamb, otherwise He could not have been designated the lamb slain from or at the foundation of the world. The only sin committed before the animals were slain in type was the disobedience of Adam and his wife, and therefore we conclude it behoved the Christ, as the anti-type of those creatures slain for the covering of the guilty pair, to be slain for the covering of the actual transgressions of Adam and Eve, whether they should personally benefit by the sacrifice or not.

The death of Jesus Christ sacrificially could have benefitted many more than will be benefitted by it, else there is no point in such expressions as, "Destroy not thy brother with thy meat, for whom Christ died."

"They shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them." If Jesus Christ had not any property in those men, their destruction was an act of injustice ; but the word bought explains how He established a property in them, and the word died explains what he gave for them. In this we see how Jesus by His sacrifice has acquired a property in all men, although they have no property in Him apart from faith and obedience.

WILLIAM ELLIS.

## EXTRACT FROM PRACTICAL ILLUSTRATION OF GENESIS XX.

The evil of a lie consists in the deceit of it. That man tells a lie, whatever his words may be, who conveys an impression to the hearer, which the speaker intends that the hearer shall understand in a way that is contrary to fact; or to put the observation into fewer words, that man tells a lie who speaks in order to deceive; and there are a thousand ways in which we may contrive to tell no literal lie, and yet may tell one in substance, and may have all the benefit, as well as all the sin, of having uttered a falsehood; let us not then deceive or prevaricate; let us not give a false colour to facts, nor try to put anything in an unfair light, but let us aim to have, in every respect, "the testimony of our conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity we have our conversation in the world." - B. R. The Christian Observer, January, 1802, p. 7.

The 16th verse of this chapter as it reads in the C. V. is not easy to understand. Boothroyd renders it thus - And to Sarah he said, "Behold, I have given to thy brother a thousand pieces of silver, to purchase veils for thee, and for all who are with thee;" thus was she reprov'd. The following is Boothroyd's note on the passage. - Geddes renders 'even for every one married.' The sense which Geddes gives he supports by the original Arabic word. That married women wore veils when they went abroad, of a peculiar kind or colour, is certain; and by the present Abimelech made, it is implied, that Sarah and others had not the veils appropriated to those married. Kitto, in his Biblical Cyclopaedia says, The veils mentioned in Scripture were, no doubt mostly analogous to the wrappers of different kinds in which the Eastern, women envelope themselves when they quit their houses. These are of great amplitude, and among the common people, of strong and coarse texture, like that in which Ruth carried home her corn. Ruth iii. 15.

ECLECTIC.

---

## ON CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE.

It is easy to lead a very sensual life, and yet be accounted a very temperate man, even among religious people! Sensuality has range enough, within the limits of things lawful, and the customary bounds of what passes among men for moderation, to stupefy and deaden the soul, and interrupt holy communion with God. The questions which a man ought to ask himself, who wishes to ascertain whether he has reached the true standard of Christian temperance are of this nature: From what sources do my chief and most desired enjoyments proceed? Is my religion anything more than a mere restraint, arising from checks of conscience, for which I expect to be indemnified by animal gratifications? Is God my chief joy, my supreme good, from the possession of whose favour arise my liveliest comforts and satisfactions; while without it nothing can give me ease or contentment? Am I, in a word, always disposed to rejoice in the presence of God, and sincerely grieved at whatever interrupts my communion with Him?

The Christian Observer, July 1802, p.p. 428-9.

ECLECTIC.

---

## ON THE WILL.

What is want of power, in the moral sense of the word, but want of will? One man tells you, he cannot help getting drunk; another that he cannot help swearing; but does not everyone see at once the difference between such cases and that of a man who, being lame, tells you that he cannot help limping? Let the drunkard know, that someone has mixed poison in his liquor, and he will presently show that he can refrain from drinking, if he will. Let the swearer stand in the presence of the King, and you will see that he can avoid swearing. The only thing he wants to give him equal power at all times over his profane habit is to fear God as much as he does the King.

The Christian Observer, May 1802, p. 298.

Let the above remarks be brought to bear on the daily government of temper. Eph. iv. 31. Prov. vi.32.

ECLECTIC.

# LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "CHRISTADELPHIAN LAMP."

DEAR BRO. TURNEY, - It has given me great pleasure to receive your new publication. I feel assured that the new monthly luminary will be a welcome visitor to all brethren who desire to exercise free and unbiased enquiry into the great truths connected with the One Faith.

You might have seen in the Christadelphian, about four months ago, that I had withdrawn from fellowship with the brethren at Swansea. It had, however, no reference to the present controversy among the brethren, but related to matters of a secular nature, which were not in harmony with my convictions of what was right. A short time previous to my leaving, an unpleasant circumstance occurred with the Ecclesia at the Mumbles, which resulted in a division, and gave me an opportunity to fellowship with the brethren assembling in the old meeting place.

These disputes are trying and disagreeable at the time, as they break the ties of friendship, and all kind words are forgotten, and brethren indulge in strong language and misrepresentation, a sample of which may be seen in the two last numbers of the Christadelphian, in which the Editor seems to think that all the virtuous and good are in his favour, while those who differ from him are fleshly, satanic snakes, etc.

I think it due to Bro. Clement to state, that when this question respecting the Nature of the Christ was first introduced, he distinctly warned the brethren not to be influenced by any of the surrounding circumstances, but to examine the evidence carefully, to respect no man's person, but to be honest to their own convictions.

If the Editor of the Christadelphian should be right, we must abide thereby, notwithstanding the unfair treatment we have received from him. After due and careful enquiry, the whole of the Ecclesia were unanimous in favour of the views held by Bro. Turney. We are now endeavouring to make them known in the neighbourhood, and also at Neath. The Ecclesia in the last mentioned place is also of the same mind, and cannot rely upon a Saviour who was under condemnation.

Our present number is about sixteen, the majority advanced in years, but like Caleb, their faculties are not blunted either by age or influence. Bro. Clement delivers an address nearly every Sunday evening to a good audience.

On Sunday, November 16th, when the Editor of the Christadelphian was at the New Room, the brethren say the audience was the largest for three years past.

Last Sunday, the 30th, Bro. Clement being at Neath, I had to take his place, on which occasion about fifty persons were present. There are a few who are enquiring, whom we hope to see yielding obedience to the truth, so as to become heirs of glory, honour, and immortality.

We are not discouraged by the course of events, nor the breaking up of old associations, however sorry we are for the Truth's sake. We earnestly hope when the Master comes we may be found acceptable in His sight who will judge every man according to his works. - Yours truly, in the One Hope,

HENRY EVANS.

---

Dear Bro. Turney, - You will doubtless have noticed, as will many of your readers, on the cover of this month's Christadelphian, a reply by the Editor to J. J. Andrew, to a question in reference to the paper from the Tranent Ecclesia, published in the Lamp. Bro. Roberts says, "if it is not exactly a forgery, it is published in a way that imparts a considerable element of that character to it;" and again "it was not issued by the Tranent Ecclesia at all." As to the first statement, if he and J. J. Andrew had waited to see the conclusion of the article, your foot-note would have disposed of it, and with regard to the second, I wish to state that the words you give in italics at the commencement of the paper, formed part of the original document.

It was received by a managing brother of the Halifax meeting from the Edinburgh Ecclesia with the request that it should be submitted to our meeting and then sent on to another; only two persons here saw it, the receiver and myself. I copied it out in order to show it to the Doctor, whose visit was then pending. It was thrown aside in my book-case and forgotten till it came to light during a recent removal. As I am concerned as well as yourself in the charge of "forgery," I shall be glad if you will insert this in your next impression. - Very faithfully yours,

THOS. SWINDEL. Feb. 4th, 1874

Dear Brother, - The "Grantham Intelligence" in this month's Christadelphian demands from us a few remarks which we hope will appear in the next Lamp, as a protest against the above named "Intelligence."

It only needed the finishing stroke applying, which, thank God, came in the shape of the "new heresy," to bring about a division here. We had become surfeited with mere manism" and teaching that made Jesus take His blood into heaven - disbelief in a literal Tree of Life - and the wholesale repudiation of Scripture styled "garbled passages" which stood in the way of such teachings; surely such a state of things wanted altering.

Well, parties holding these crotchets are described in this month's Christadelphian as the "Truth in possession of the room;" it seems passing strange that the Editorial remarks appended to the Chicago Intelligence, in October issue, about mere manism being blasphemy, " should have (at the time) given great offence to the parties now called "the truth." They i.e., "the truth in possession" must have gulped down their angry feelings to join with the Editor of the Christadelphian in crushing the "new heresy;" this they can never do. Five of us having got ensnared by the said "heresy" commenced meeting for breaking bread, etc., in Bro Edson's house, Nov. 23rd. We are thankful for our emancipation from those holding so many crotchets, but especially when such freedom and liberty are guaranteed by an "uncondemned Christ."

Out of self-respect we make this statement, being unwilling for the disparaging remarks in this month's Christadelphian to pass unchallenged

Your brethren in Israel's Hope,

Isaac Turney, Wm. Ebson, Jos. Wooton, Alex. Shaw, Jno. Shaw,

Grantham, Dec. 4th, 1873.

---

### To the Editor of the "Christadelphian Lamp"

Dear Bro. Turney, - I would have wrote you prior to this (but was prevented by indisposition) concerning an article that appeared in the Christadelphian Lamp, "said to have been issued from the Tranent Ecclesia."

We consider it right to inform you that this was not the case; the "remarks" referred to a private letter (one of a number) sent by me to Bro. Wood, Joppa, five years ago, and how this should have turned up at this particular time, and in this new character, I am at a loss to know.

I regret the publication of it because of its faulty character; and more than that, I am quite sure it is unfitted to advance the cause which we have so much at heart; and I say further, that my experience, since I wrote that, has led me to change my views of human nature considerably. "Very good "as it was from God, but now evidently under serpentine influence, it has become its own seed; and now I think in this our own evil day, we are not far off the mark, when we see that seed the full grown devil, the liar, the deceiver, and murderer, that is what flesh has become, and therefore we have no good thing to say of it. Another reason is, that I look on this question seriously as one that ought not to be found in the hands of a novice and requires those skilled in the truth to divide it rightly. And I am convinced that much of our present trouble comes upon us because of the inability of brethren (generally) to declare the whole counsel of God, and the kingdom of His dear Son.

This is an age of extremes, the balance of things is rarely found, and it is essentially needful to have the child-like spirit, the spirit of the Christ, in order to obtain a knowledge of the deep things of God, and I know of no better human production than that of "Phanerosis," the work of our late Bro. Dr. Thomas, and had this work followed "Elpis Israel" in close succession it would have given us a better foundation for the truth concerning the Anointed - (it did follow, I believe, but was unknown to most of us).

Patience, then, is needed on the part of some towards their weaker brethren, and in closing I would strongly recommend the work already alluded to, for it would save us from falling into those dangerous extremes, we are so apt to.

The promise is to Abraham and to his seed, and to all that are afar off, and to as many as the Lord our God shall call. Let us see that we fail not because of unbelief. You will be kind enough to put this matter right, as to the character of the remarks.

Were I able, I should endeavour to make my faith known concerning our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, for whose coming we pray. Tranent, 3rd February, 1874. Bro R. STRATHEARN, F. C.

## ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Our correspondent D. C. says, I am not very clear about that scripture which saith "As in Adam all die so in Christ shall all be made alive." "Is not the one all as equally universal as the other?"

Here it has to be noticed that the all who die in Adam die in virtue of being his descendants. Jesus Christ had no descendants by ordinary generation. Connection with Him or relationship to Him is predicated upon faith in what He has accomplished, and obedience to what he has commanded. If there had been no purchase made, if no ransom had been given, if no property had been established in the Adamic family by Him, there could not have been any basis for faith and obedience. In other words, if there had been no foundation laid there could be no superstructure reared. But the laying of the foundation is not the rearing of the structure. To discharge the debt of a prisoner cannot benefit him if either he is not aware that it has been discharged, or, if after he is told it has been discharged, he refuses to credit the message. In the first case he would perish for lack of knowledge, and in the second for rejecting the testimony that his debt was paid. Jesus Christ, in giving Himself a ransom for all, established a property in the all. They became His by right of purchase; but none of them had acquired any property in Him. Jesus Christ, having by the act of self-sacrifice acquired a property in the all who were dead in Adam, acquired also the right to make any use of His property He pleased. Now, the use He has proposed to make is to raise all who are disposed from a state of death to a state of life, from one of mortality to one of immortality. Out of the 'all' who were dead, therefore all who accept the gift of life upon the conditions which Jesus as the giver has made are thereby put in Him, and all of those who are thus put into Him are found of Him at His coming without spot or fault of any kind, shall be made alive, and no one else. To suppose the all in Christ to be co-extensive with the all in Adam is totally to mistake the Apostle's meaning, and to ignore the principle of faith and obedience.

On the other hand, to suppose that all who think that they are in Christ because they think they have complied with the conditions which He has laid down, is to ignore His right to call His professed servants into His presence that He may determine who of them have obeyed His instructions that He may reward every one according to his works. The all in Christ who are to be made alive is limited to those who are approved by Him as the blessed of His Father who are invited to inherit the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world. Your supposition, as expressed in the question, "If Adam forfeited or lost life for all, did not Christ give His life a ransom for all," is that Adam lost eternal life for all, and that Jesus Christ brings all the Adamic family back "to possession of eternal life the same as Adam lost. But this is not the case, Adam never had eternal life to lose. He was in circumstances where he could have gained eternal life upon a principle of faith and obedience, but failed to retain those circumstances by disobedience. Jesus, the second Adam, was born in the circumstances where He could gain eternal life for Himself. He continued in these and at the end gave His life a ransom for the human family that they might be brought back to a position similar to that which was lost by the disobedience of the first Adam. The supposition of being in debt £10, and a friend of yours discharges it in your stead or for you, is based upon the same idea answered above. Adam was without the capital of eternal life to begin with, he contracted the debt, death; Jesus, the second Adam, began life with capital similar to the first Adam, and gained the additional capital of eternal life. He discharged the debt contracted by the first Adam, by giving His natural life which He got at the first. But the discharging of the debt of the first Adam could not also give him possession of the acquired capital of the second, but simply put him in a state of freedom from debt, similar to what he was in before he contracted it. And thus it is that the first Adam, when typically redeemed in Eden and his descendants, when actually redeemed by the that Anti-type of all the sacrifices were only brought to a salvable state in which they have to exercise faith in the Lamb of God as the only sacrifice, and obedience to Him as the only Lord who bought them, with His blood. Forgiveness of sins has reference to sins which have been committed since the sacrifice was offered, or to sins committed by a believer after having obeyed the truth. All men every-where now under law to Jesus Christ as the Lord who bought them, and die either because they have not the means of knowing Him, or because they do not obey the truth that He has come and brought life and immortality to light by His gospel.

-----

**“And His Name shall be called, Wonderful, Counsellor,  
The mighty God, The Father of the future age,  
The Prince of Peace.” Isaiah IX.**

Wonderful! is thy Name and birth!  
Thy life was wonderful on earth,  
O Jesus, Son of God!  
Accepted, righteous, without spot,  
Stripes due to rebels was thy lot,  
Beneath the Father’s rod.

Counsellor! for thine Israel,  
Removed from scenes of human ill,  
Thy Word is power Divine.  
Thy voice does never plead in vain,  
God’s promises are all, Amen,  
In thee, the Father’s shrine.

Mighty Eloah! thou dost stand,  
Strong to prevail at God’s right hand,  
For mercy and for grace;  
The weakest saint who seeks thy prayers,  
Thy help obtains, thy favour shares,  
Until he sees thy Face.

The Father of the future age!  
Redeemed from weary pilgrimage,  
Thy glorious Sons shall sing;  
In full assurance of the Rest,  
Prepared for them thy love hath blest,  
Hosanahs to their King.

Prince of the peace! whose vital flow  
The soldiers of thy Cross shall know,  
When their last fight is done:  
Come from the presence! to impart  
Its joy to every sorrowing heart;  
Proclaim the victory won!

D. B

-----  
**REFERENCE TABLET, No. 2, BY W.**  
**(Continued from February, Page 25)**

1. Paul prayed that the hearts of God’s Sons might be comforted, that they might be knit together in love, and that they might come to a full assurance of understanding. So as to be able to acknowledge the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ. Col. ii. 2.
2. If God had never had a Son, there would have been no mystery of the Father.
3. If God had never had a Son, there would have been no mystery of Christ.
4. All who receive Jesus have power to become Sons of God. John i. 18.
5. Men become Sons of God by faith in Christ Jesus. Gal. iii. 26.
6. Sons of God must contend earnestly for the faith formerly delivered to God’s Sons. Jude 3.
7. God calls persons by His Gospel to become Sons, in order to inherit His Kingdom and Glory. Rom. i. 7.
8. God’s Sons will possess the dominion and the greatness of the kingdom about to be established under the whole heavens. Dan. vii. 18, 22.

9. If a man be in Christ Jesus, God's only begotten Son, and walks not after the flesh (though he be in the flesh) but after the Spirit; such an one is not under condemnation. Rom. viii. 1.
10. When the morning stars sang together all the Sons of God shouted with joy. Job. xxxviii. 7.
11. God has had many Sons in all ages, adopted or begotten; but He never had an adopted Son yet, who, after such adoption, remained under the Adamic condemnation. Rom. viii. 1.
12. Among all God's Sons He has only one begotten Son, styled the Son by pre-eminence, as contrasted with the many Sons He is destined to bring to glory. Heb. ii. 10.
13. Sons of God are made free from the law of sin and death. Rom. viii. 2.
14. "The Son" makes them free, so they are free indeed. John viii. 36.
15. God's Sons thus become servants of righteousness, having their fruit unto holiness, the end of which is Life Everlasting, and therefore shall not come into condemnation. Rom. vi. 18, 22. John v. 24.
16. It is not possible to be a Son of God, and at the same time to be under the Adamic condemnation.
17. Jesus was Son of God from His birth, nay, by begetting, and therefore was never under the Adamic condemnation.
18. God's Sons have passed from death unto life. 1 John iii. 14.
19. The death of God's Sons is precious in His sight. Psalm. cxvi. 15.
20. A man can be a descendant of Adam, having been in his loins when he sinned, and yet can become an adopted Son of God by faith in His only begotten Son, and thereby be made a new creature, without undergoing any change in his nature or constitution. 2 Cor. v. 17. 1 John iii. 2.
21. God's Sons will have the honour of executing the judgments written against those who have not kissed "the Son" or who have not availed themselves of the Redemption that is in "the Son," and who, therefore, as a consequence, have not been brought from under the Adamic condemnation. Psalm cxlix. 9.

-----

## THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

Though no actual outbreak of hostilities has occurred between the great powers of Europe since the terrible Franco-German war, which ended so disastrously for the former country, there have, nevertheless, been many indications of coming troubles among the nations. Questions social, political, and religious press for solution, and can be only finally settled by the arbitrament of the sword.

France, though defeated and humiliated by her powerful neighbour, and for a time apparently crushed almost beyond the power of recovery, has not only succeeded in paying off the huge indemnity with which she was burdened as the consequence of the late war, but has reorganized her army, and repaired her disasters beyond the most sanguine expectations. But all this does but tend to arouse the warlike spirit of the nation, only waiting for the opportunity to avenge her defeat. Armies and implements of war of all kinds increase, not only in France, but in most other countries, and constitute a standing menace to the world.

Notwithstanding the prolongation of the power of Marshal Macmahon, as president of the Republic, for a period of seven years, the hopes of the Monarchists are by no means destroyed. Indeed, it is said that M. Dahirel, a member of the Extreme Right, recently presented a petition in committee, signed by no fewer than 120,000 persons, demanding the restoration of Henry the Fifth. In a country like France, which has witnessed so many political changes, and in the course of a few years has tried almost every possible form of Government, it would be nothing remarkable should the present regime be suddenly overthrown by a coup d'état and a Monarchy established in its place. A Ministerial crisis has recently occurred, and another is threatening; there is evidently no stability in the present order of things. A Republic is accepted by many, not because they approve of its institutions, but because they dread further changes. Spain, for so many years a stronghold of the Papacy and the seat of the Inquisition, continues to be torn by internal dissensions, with apparently very little prospect of bringing them to an end. Latterly the Government troops have gained some decided advantages, but still the Carlist insurrection lingers on, and continues its ravages in various parts of the country. The Cuban difficulty remains, and very recently threatened to add to the already formidable troubles of Spain, by involving her in a war with America.

Russia, according to her "manifest destiny," continues her career of conquest and annexation in Central Asia, slowly but surely, always advancing and extending her out-posts. Her system of railways has been enormously extended since the Crimean war, and in many parts it is noticed more with a view to possible military exigencies than to the requirements of commerce. At the present time there are great

rejoicings in the Russian capital, on account of the marriage of the Duke of Edinburgh with the daughter of the Emperor Alexander. It is thought that this alliance between two such powerful empires as England and Russia will tend to cement a lasting friendship between them, and constitute a fresh guarantee for the peace of the world. No idea can be more fallacious. Russia has a wonderful career of conquest marked out for her in the "sure word of prophecy," which nothing can prevent or retard for a single day. Russia must conquer and Europe be laid prostrate at her feet.

Germany is engaged in an anti-papal war, which, under the auspices of the great chancellor, Prince Bismarck, increases in severity and importance, and seems likely to lead to complications with other countries, especially France. Though a religious war, it is not doctrinally such, its object being to curb and restrain the intolerant spirit of the Romish Church and to compel the clergy of that communion to pay obedience to the laws of the State. It shows the old spirit of the Great Harlot to be unchanged and as rampant as ever, setting itself up above all law and everything that would oppose it. The measures put in force by the Emperor's Government have already resulted in the imprisonment of an Archbishop for contumacy, and may not unlikely lead to the arrest of others. The fear is that these strong proceedings may cause an insurrection, and thus give France the coveted opportunity to attack Germany, and endeavour to recover her lost prestige as the great military power of the Continent. Fourteen millions of Roman Catholics excited to revolt against the State by a band of fanatical Priests, would constitute a formidable embarrassment, even to the great German Minister and the powerful empire which has been mainly built up by his iron will and determination. Though in a temporal sense, the Papacy has been reduced to a nullity, still spiritually it wields enormous power over the millions who are intoxicated by drinking from the wine-cup of its abominations.

The following shows the strides the Papacy has been making of late years: -

**ROMAN CATHOLIC STATISTICS.** - It appears from the "Roman Catholic Directory for 1874," just issued, that whereas there were 1,862 Roman Catholic Priests of all ranks in Great Britain in 1872, there are now 1,893. Sixty new priests have been ordained, of whom 11 were Jesuits; but as there were 39 deaths the net gain is only 21. In 1872 there were 1,245 public churches and chapels; there are now 1,253 - an increase of 8. There are 21 colleges, 86 monasteries, and 268 convents. Of the priests, 511 are "regulars," that is members of the great Orders of the Church - Jesuits, Dominicans, Franciscans, Passionates, and Redemptorists, etc.; and the remaining 1,382 are "seculars." In England alone there are 1,162 secular priests, and 470 regulars; 20 colleges, 78 monasteries, and 247 convents. The diocese of Salford, which comprises the hundreds of Salford and Blackburn, has 109 secular and 40 regular priests; 80 public churches, chapels, and stations; 33 other chapels of communities, etc.; 1 college, 11 monasteries, 17 convents, and 181 schools of all classes. It is also stated that in this diocese there are 11 Roman Catholic county magistrates, 12 Roman Catholic borough magistrates, 28 Roman Catholic members of municipal corporations, Local Government Boards, Poor-law Boards, and School Boards; and 2 Roman Catholic religious inspectors. The returns of some of the Roman Catholic schools in some of the dioceses are not given; but the number of those which are given is 522. As this does not include any of schools in three of the largest dioceses, the real number must be considerably greater. There are 20 archbishops and bishops in Great Britain, but of these one archbishop and one bishop are retired, and two others are auxiliary bishops. There are 33 Roman Catholic peers, 47 Roman Catholic baronets, 6 Roman Catholic members of the Privy Council, and 37 Roman Catholic members of Parliament all of them sitting for Irish constituencies; and there are 18 Roman Catholic chaplains to the forces. In addition to the 1,253 public churches and chapels, there are 247 private chapels in convents or in the houses of Roman Catholic noblemen or gentry making a total of exactly 500 places in England and Scotland where mass is said. The following clippings from the Telegraph, in connection with what has been said above, will be read with interest, at the present time:-

Nominally France is at present under Republican institutions, but in reality what we witness across the Channel is a Restoration without a King. The "Gouvernement de Combat" is composed of men who were bitterly hostile to the Empire and they show their hatred by exaggerating the repressive laws and usages of that regime. The Duke de Broglie and M. Baragnon have not occupied the Home Office for nothing. No doubt they can plead that their policy is supported by the majority of an Assembly which holds in horror any appeal to the constituencies. Defeated at every election, they are still indisputable masters in the Versailles Parliament. And it is their resolve to consolidate an accidental conquest which makes them direct the enormous means at their disposal towards the great end of ensuring the return of like men to the next Chamber. The Bill for the extinction of self-government in the Municipalities, the fantastic proposals all designed to manipulate the constituencies, the engines in course of manufacture having in view the suppression of freedom as regards the distribution of religious and political writings,

have for their end the reproduction of a class majority and the restoration of an arbitrary method of rule which has overthrown so many Governments. The attack on religious liberty is gross. We are aware that on the fall of M. Thiers the Protestants in M. Dupanloup's diocese immediately felt the little finger of authority, and found themselves obstructed vexatiously in a hundred ways. Now we see that the Prefects are interpreting the law of colportage or hawking to suit their employers. M. Baragnon is a fanatic by conviction or calculation, it matters not which; and he must have instructed his subordinates to harass the Protestants. A Prefect has refused to permit a regularly authorised hawker, in the pay of the Protestant Church, to pursue his calling, on the nominal ground that his occupation hurt the booksellers, but doubtless because he sold tracts and books not agreeable to the Bishop. The complainants point out that the law had been complied with in every respect, yet nevertheless the arbitrary decision of a Prefect overrode the law; and they have a right to conclude that the Gouvernement de Combat have taken the preliminary steps towards real persecution. Those who do not scruple to go beyond the laws which followed the coup d'état may well be suspected of a tendency to borrow weapons from the armoury of Louis XIV. and his Jesuit councillors.

The growth of armaments on the Continent is unfortunately no novelty, but a common place. All the nations are on the most friendly terms with each other, yet mere friendship has never stood in the place of big battalions and abundant guns. The German army, of course, is maintained in all its mighty strength. France naturally seeks to reorganise and augment the forces of which she can dispose, and they are more numerous perhaps to-day than they were in July, 1870. The commanders of eighteen corps instead of seven, with which the war began, have been recently appointed, and the whole machine has been recast on a fresh basis. Italy has just followed in the common track, nominated chiefs for her own corps d'armée, and shown an almost feverish desire to be strong and well-prepared for the unforeseen. Russia, considerably moved, like all the world, by German successes, has effected a large measure of reorganisation, increasing her establishment by more than one hundred major-generals, who, with their staffs, have been named. The Russian War Office has imitated the now famous Prussian model in the formation of brigade staffs, evidently with the intention of rendering the troops more mobile and better suited to the pressing exigencies of modern warfare, which imposes great responsibilities upon subordinate officers. The most marked advance, however, has been made in the Artillery. The battery in Russia consists of eight guns. Each brigade was composed of four batteries, but now the number has been augmented, while the calibre of several batteries has been increased. In consequence of the new arrangements the foot artillery alone will consist of 2,256 guns, mostly 9-pounders, while there are 144: horse artillery pieces. The guns employed in Asia and those attached to the irregulars are not included in the aggregate. Thus, it will be seen the Northern Power is determined to be prepared for any emergency. Next year the principle of compulsory service will come into play, and Russia, speaking broadly, will be organised on the Prussian system.

**RUSSIAN POLICY IN KHIVA.** - In the Government Messenger of St. Petersburg is published in addition to the text of the recently made treaty with the Khan of Khiva, an important official article with regard to the policy of Russia and the objects of the recent treaty. From this article I take the following extract:

"The chief difficulty of the expedition consisted in the fact that the existing bases of all Central Asian Governments are so weak and unstable that a strong blow might have terminated the very existence of Khiva as a separate State. Such a result would by no means have met the views of the Russian Government, which has hitherto made unremitting efforts to support the independent existence of the other neighbouring Khanates of Bokhara and Kokan. After the occupation, Khiva was found to be so much under the influence of the Turcomans, and so much exposed to their attacks, that the complete evacuation of the country would have led to fresh Turcoman assaults, and, as a result, to new and larger Russian expeditions - in which case no endeavours would avail to preserve the Khanate. It thus became necessary to construct a fortress for a strong garrison to protect the caravans and also the Khan himself. For this purpose the best position would have been the south coast of the Aral Sea. But that was impossible on account of the swamps. It was, in consequence, necessary to erect such a fortress on the Amu Daria and also to guarantee communications with the province of Turkestan. The navigation of the lower Amu is bad, and in winter ceases altogether - the steppe only remaining for communications. There seemed, then, no choice but to unite to our possessions the waterless steppe extending from the fort to the Turkestan Province. If any other real guarantee for our future safety could have been found, it would have been preferred; but, however unprofitable and troublesome such an acquisition of territory may prove, it appeared inevitable, since even the Khan thought he could fulfil his obligations to us, and keep up the desired friendly relations only on the necessary condition of being near our fort and troops. His

wishes went even further than this, for he urgently entreated us to leave Russian troops in Khiva itself. The expedient actually adopted was the only one practicable by which we might guard our boundaries, protect our trade, and avoid new and larger expeditions, as well as the final annihilation of the separate existence of Khiva as a State - which such expeditions would involve, and which would not tally with our political projects in Central Asia."

I learn from St. Petersburg that the article in the treaty, bestowing a portion of the territory on the right bank of the Amu Daria upon Bokhara, has been already put in force.

**BISMARCK AND THE POPE.** - Nothing more grave or momentous can be imagined than the home political "situation" obtaining here at the present moment - a situation brought about by the overweening masterfulness of two great forces in the State religion and bureaucracy, which, after the faithful observance towards one another for many years of mutual tolerance, and even consideration, have allowed themselves to be egged on to open hostilities; to a struggle the end of which no man can foresee, and the mere preliminary throbbings of which are fraught with menace to law and order, to Germany's domestic peace, and to the scarcely achieved unity of the fatherland. Let me endeavour to strip the issue of the fine rhetorical trappings with which it has lately been so redundantly decked by both parties, and exhibit it in its naked uncomeliness. Prince Bismarck has come to the determination of putting down Papistry in Germany. The Papacy has resolved to break up the young German Empire. The statesman, convinced that the toleration of an imperium in imperio is incompatible with the realisation of his scheme for governing Germany, as well as that spiritual resistance, cannot for long stand up against physical might, and being, moreover, of a temperament that does not permit of his doing things by halves, is bent upon destroying the papal supremacy, once for all within such parts of this realm, as are inhabited by Roman Catholic populations. The Pope, aware that his civil power is on the decline throughout Europe, and that a direct political defeat of the first class may reduce the Roman Catholic Church to the rank of a mere sect, fights his enemy with every weapon that he can lay hold of, in or out of the Church's arsenal. Prince Bismarck, keeping Russia's example steadily in his mind's eye, believes that he can control any and every church within the Prussian and, ultimately, the German dominions, by whatever machinery may best please his fancy or convenience; that he can, for instance, in dealing with Roman Catholicism, strike out the word "Roman," dispense with a hierarchy, and, turning the old Catholic faith into a "religion of Mr. Reinkins," govern it by means of a Consistory, or Board of Control. His view of the whole matter is that of an ultra-layman. Of course, it occurs to those who are not under the immediate influence of his irresistible personality, that what Russia can do without the least inconvenience to herself, politically or socially, is absolutely impossible to Prussia. Persecution in Russia is only one of many forms of "what the Emperor wills;" and, the Czar resembling Juan Fernandez in that "his rule there is none to dispute," it is manifestly absurd to compare his executive capabilities to those of a constitutional Monarch like William I., hampered as the latter necessarily is by Parliamentary mechanism, public opinion, and many other trammels. Again, Prussia possesses no Siberia; and Siberia is the prompt and easy solution of many a State riddle in Russia, which, propounded to Central-European statesmen, would yield to them good store of headaches. Russia makes up her mind to put down the Pope in Poland; forthwith she exiles the Archbishop of Warsaw, and keeps him in exile safe for a decade; warns the priesthood that any of its members found holding any communication with Rome shall be forwarded to Siberia with punctuality and dispatch, and forwards them thither accordingly whenever she detects one of them contravening her decrees, which she does with great ease, having organised a magnificent system of espionage to that end. All this she performs, and more; and she gets her own way, no organisation being strong enough to withstand successfully the pressure of irresponsible despotism having at its command practically unlimited material forces. But such a procedure is as impracticable in Prussia as it would be in England. There be many reliefs of despotism in the way the Government of this country is actually administered - resulting, probably, rather from the interpretation put upon their prerogatives by those in power than from any particular shortcomings in the Constitution itself; but the Russian method of manipulating people's lives, property, and consciences can no more be adopted here by the very strongest Government that ever held office, with a million of Mausers to back it, than can torture be revived by the *jus primae noctis*. The press is hectoring, bullied, oppressed, and sat upon by the authorities; but it is a power, and one that the present rulers of Prussia are afraid of, or they would allow it freer scope of action. Public opinion is another power of which account must be taken in all large questions, though it is curiously indifferent to small ones. Eight millions of Catholics cannot be overridden by fifteen millions of non-Catholics - even if the latter wished to override them, which is not the case - whatever may happen in a neighbouring country to three millions of Catholics, persecuted by sixty millions of sectarians, living and breathing machines at the beck and call of a single man. These considerations lead one to the opinion that Prince Bismarck,

transcendently clever man as he is, may have miscalculated his own strength, or underrated that of the Roman Church, in entering upon this very terrible and unrelenting campaign against the Papacy. After all, nobody ever yet succeeded in putting down men's consciences; and it is on the consciences of many millions of men that the Pope relies to wage a war against Prince Bismarck which cannot but convulse Germany from north to south and east to west, unless one of the combatants gives in, which, as the quarrel now stands, appears to me as likely as the conferment of a cardinal's hat upon Mr. Whalley.

Two autograph letters appeared in the Telegraph in October last, of which it is certain that History herself will keep copies. The first was addressed from the Vatican by his holiness the Pope to the Emperor William of Germany, and the second was sent from Berlin by his Imperial Majesty. The Pope's letter bore the date of the 7th August last and was doubtless never intended for the wide publicity which it has now obtained. It commences with a formal "Your Majesty," and proceeds without circumlocution to the subject of the acts of State recently directed from Berlin against the pretensions of the ecclesiastical malcontents in the German empire. His Holiness does not mince matters. He begins by accusing the German Government of "aiming more and more at the destruction of Catholicism." Seriously pondering over the causes which may have led to the recent measures, Pope Pius declares that he cannot discover any reasons. And the bewilderment of the Holy Father is all the more complete because he is "informed" that the Emperor William himself "does not countenance the proceedings of his Government, and does not approve the harshness of the acts adopted against the Catholic religion." The Pope goes on to hint that he has in his possession letters from the Emperor William tending to demonstrate that such acts could not have the Imperial approbation, and then he asks, "If your Majesty does not approve your Government continuing in the path it has chosen of further extending its rigorous measures against the religion of Jesus Christ, whereby the latter is most injuriously affected, will your Majesty, then, not become convinced that these measures have no other object than that of undermining your Majesty's own Throne?" His Holiness proceeds to explain that he speaks with frankness, because "my banner is Truth," and because it is "one of my duties to tell the truth to all, even to those who are not Catholics." "For," writes the head of the Roman Catholic Church, "everyone who has been baptised belongs in some way or other - which to define more precisely would be here out of place - belongs, I say, to the Pope." The letter concludes with the hope that his Majesty will receive these observations with his "usual goodness," and "adopt the measures necessary in the present case;" after which a pious postscript follows, which may be termed a modified benediction, in so far as it expresses the chastened hope that "God may enfold your Majesty and myself in one and the same bond of mercy." The character of this epistle stamps it as one of those secret and personal appeals with which his Holiness has oft times sought to divert the tide of events. Had it been intended *urbi et orbi* there would have been probably more statesmanship in it, and less of that obvious innocence of conviction and simple good nature which makes all men tender to Pio Nono, whatever they think of the Papacy. It is such a letter as must either ruin the reputation of the Vatican for sagacity, or force us to believe that the Holy Father remains to a great extent his own Foreign Secretary despite all the care and anxiety of Antonelli and his Ministers. It contains the imprudence of insinuating that the Emperor is nothing in his own empire, as well as the indignity of advising him to reverse the policy of his Government for his own personal advantage - points which gossip might perhaps inspire, but certainly not wisdom. If the Holy Father penned such a missive *proprio motu*, it was excessively injudicious; if his advisers draughted it for him, it was nothing less than suicidal. In any case it was sent, and was handed over, without doubt, to the stern criticism of Prince Bismarck.

The answer which the Emperor has made - either of himself, or more probably with the assistance of his great Minister - even as a piece of composition, is a notable State document. The heart of Protestant Christendom will thrill to more than one passage in this memorable manifesto of Royal Power, asserting as it does the supremacy of national law and the liberty of the emancipated conscience. Since Luther nailed his thesis on the church door, and Albert of Brandenburg thundered for the treaty of Augsburg with his culverins, there has been no such ominous echo in the corridors of the Vatican.

The Emperor William took twenty-seven days before replying, doubtless that no suspicion of haste or temper might attach to the response. On the 3rd of November he wrote to his Holiness expressing his satisfaction that an opportunity was afforded of personally correcting the grievous error of those who had informed the Holy Father about German affairs. His Majesty gives Pope Pius to understand that a Constitutional Monarch cannot be separated from the measures of his reign because those measures do not pass into action without the consent of the Sovereign. And then, in answer to the statement that reasons appeared lacking to account for the recent policy towards Roman Catholic prelates, the Imperial correspondent pens the subjoined momentous declaration: "A portion of my Catholic subjects have organised for the past two years a political party which endeavours to disturb, by intrigues hostile to the State, the religious peace which has existed in Prussia for centuries. Leading Catholic priests have,

unfortunately, not only approved this movement, but joined in it to the extent of open revolt against the existing laws. It will not have escaped the observation of your Holiness that similar indications manifest themselves at the present time in several European and in some Transatlantic States. It is not my mission to investigate the causes by which the clergy and the faithful of one of the Christian denominations can be induced actively to assist the enemies of all law; but it certainly is my mission to protect internal peace and to preserve the authority of the laws in the States whose government has been entrusted to me by God. I am conscious that I owe hereafter an account of the accomplishment of this my kingly duty. I shall maintain order and law in my States against all attacks as long as God gives me the power." Lest there should be any room to misunderstand the resolute language which we have here quoted, the Emperor further emphasises his clear and fixed determination to "extort obedience" from all priestly rebels "by worldly means."

It will be observed that his Majesty does not condescend by a single word to reply to the insinuation about the safety of his throne. Believing probably that there were astuter councillors upon this head at Berlin than the Vatican, he passes completely over that appeal to self-interest which has been so often addressed to Royal personages by the Papacy; and he retorts upon his Holiness by expressing the conviction that, being now in possession of the facts, he will use his authority to put an end "to agitation carried on amid the deplorable distortion of truth and the abuse of priestly authority." As for the statement of the Holy father, that the religion of Jesus Christ was in question, the Emperor writes: "I attest to your Holiness, before God, it has nothing to do with these intrigues." But the sentence which will ring through Christendom as the noblest and proudest comes at the end of the letter. It is that which answers the covert claim of the Vatican to possess indirectly and hold, as it were, in reversionary fee all those souls which have received baptism. Says his Majesty of Germany, speaking herein for all and every division of the Reformed Churches "The creed which, as must be known to your Holiness, I, like my ancestors and the greater portion of my subjects, profess, does not permit us to accept in our relations with God any other mediator than our Lord Jesus Christ." Now, whatever part the strong hand of Bismarck had in other paragraphs of this memorable composition, we may certainly recognise here the Lutheran Emperor speaking for himself and for the finished work of the Reformers. The yoke of Rome upon the neck of European Governments broken before, is in these right royal and puissant words for ever spurned in fragments to the winds; and the upshot of the Holy Father's private epistle is that all the world henceforth knows that German law is to rule in Germany, and not Pope, Prelate, or Jesuit.

Perhaps, however, the publication of this correspondence is the most remarkable part of the transaction. What Pope Pius would be most likely to write, and what the Emperor William must answer, might have been easily foreseen; but the step of giving to the whole world the two communications clenches the new policy like Luther's hammer-strokes. Henceforth the vast power of the new Empire is formally committed to the task of carrying out the supremacy of national law over ecclesiastical pretentious; and, subtle though that organisation be with which Germany contends, the strength of the victorious Protestant Government is also immense. To appreciate the Royal reply, and the feelings which it must have aroused at the Vatican, we must remember that the interviews at Vienna and Berlin between the three Monarchs of Central Europe have occurred since the Pope wrote; and that while the world reads the answer which the Holy Father has got, the Comte de Chambord's cause is becoming less hopeful in France, the Carlist enterprise makes no progress, and the German Emperor is on his way to Vienna. There are two notable dates of history which come to the mind while we peruse the stirring letter of his Majesty. One is 754 A.D., when Pepin laid the keys of the Italian Pentapolia on the altar of St. Peter, and thereby founded the temporal power. The second is 1610 A.D., when Pope Paul claimed all the world outside Christendom as his fief, and gave in accordance with his pretension, half of Africa to the King of Portugal, and half to the King of Spain. Those eras mark the beginning and the culmination of that arrogant supremacy which made Emperors the vassals of Rome, and the continent its wash-pot. But three hundred and fifty years ago the "State" awoke; and the Conscience of Civilisation first pronounced that the great phase which the German Emperor uses now, namely, that there is no Mediator but one between man and Heaven. It was a cry of yearning then, but now it is spoken by the most powerful Monarch of the age, with a vast army, a united nation, and the applause of modern opinion to echo the defiance. It is not necessary to dwell upon the significance of this; those will know best whom it chiefly concerns.

## INTELLIGENCE.

**BIRMINGHAM.** – Bro. Jones, writing Feb. 16th 1874, says: The progress of the truth has been very satisfactory during the past month. The process of consolidation has been completed, and the number of brethren and sisters now meeting in Islington is about 50, with a prospect of further increase shortly. The statement made in the Christadelphian last month concerning the return of Lizzie Perkins to the Temperance Hall is not altogether true: she was over-persuaded by her mother to attend there one Sunday morning, but since then she has united with us, and there is no doubt as to her firmness in the truth. The Lectures on Sunday evening have been well attended. Bro. Lester, of Leicester, and Bro. Handley, of Maldon, have lectured this month, and Bro. W. Clement, of Mumbles, is expected next Sunday.

**CULLEN, SCOTLAND.** - Feb. 7th, 1874. The few isolated brethren in this locality, within a radius of twelve miles, who number eleven, have not been uninterested in the controversy which has been raging amongst the brotherhood concerning the nature and sacrifice of the Christ. At first we had all a somewhat imperfect and one-sided view of the subject at issue, owing to our preconceived notions regarding it, and the fact that we had only seen what was written by those who contend that the Christ was under condemnation and had therefore to offer for Himself, but we have now seen what has been written by those who are opposed to this teaching, and the result in my case, after having given the matter my most serious consideration, is that I am I glad of the opportunity of making it thus publicly known to all whom it may concern that I firmly believe the scriptures to teach that Jesus the Christ in the days of His flesh was the Lamb of God, without blemish and without spot, which taketh away the sins of the world. That He was holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners. Were it not so, as a certain Bro. says, “The Atonement would have been rendered absolutely valueless, and the foundation of Redemption have been undermined. I must allow that my previous knowledge of this momentous subject had been but superficial, else I could never have believed that Jesus died for His own sins as well as for those of His people, when I could have read such statements as the following: “And ye know that He was manifested to take away our sins, and in Him is no sin. Hereby perceive we the love of God, because He laid down His life for us.” I cannot but wonder how I was blind to the glorious truth contained in the above quotation, but I thank God I can now intelligently say, I believe that Jesus was and is the Christ, the Son of the living God, and the fact of His being His Son is now clear evidence to my mind that He was not a sinner by constitution, for He proceedeth forth and came from God. Yet this does not at all clash with the truth that He was bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh that He took not on Him the nature of Angels but that He took on Him the seed of Abraham, for thus constituted

He was “God manifested in the flesh,” and altogether fit to be made a sin offering for us, He Himself having no sin, constitutionally or otherwise. Let us stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, working out our own salvation with fear and trembling, to the end that when Jesus comes again we may be the subjects of that eternal redemption which His sacrifice hath put within the reach of all who believe and obey the truth. - G. LILLIE.

**CRIMOND,** 11th February 1874. – Dear Brother, - In a former communication I gave you some idea of the likely result in the small Ecclesia here, from the diversity of mind regarding the “Sacrifice of Christ.” I shall now briefly give you an account of our position from that time up to the present. Prior to the recent dispute our number was nine, (with the exception of one or two occasionally from Fraserburgh,) who met alternately at Balfatton and Fetterangus, but after an honest investigation of the truth, whereby we might distinguish “Truth versus Error,” the result was, that five adhered to the truth as advocated by Bro. Turney, the other four to the things as set forth by Bro. Roberts; I do not mean by this that we divided for the favour of man, but wherever I find brethren speaking the truth (as seemeth to me) to be according to the Oracles of God, they and I are one. Before we finally separated, the truth at issue was at various times discussed, but the breach that was made appeared rather to enlarge than diminish. On a given Sunday, Bro. O. Reid, from Newpitsligo, met with us with a view to a reconciliation; we had a few hours’ interview, when we who are esteemed as heretics freely stated that we had no fellowship with those who believed that “Christ had to offer for Himself.” Thus we remain divided with no appearance of re-union. Our meeting place is Fetterangus, in the house of Bro. Keer. Since I came to understand the truth, I always believed that among all the different things treated of therein, it did not teach two diverse things on any one doctrine. However far short I may come in being able to harmonize it to the satisfaction of others, I am persuaded that there is no disjoining, but one beautiful and complete harmony throughout; but if the truth teaches that Christ had to offer for Himself, then I should be compelled to allow that it contradicted itself with a vengeance; but I am confident that it teaches no such heresy. Nay, for all the quotations of scripture that are tortured to substantiate that theory, there is not one passage in the whole Word of God -

that I have found to support it; were such a one produced I would gladly receive it, and until such is produced I must conclude that the doctrine is a bare assertion founded on assumption, and that assumption, so far as I can perceive, is, that because Christ came in the flesh, therefore it must be sinful flesh. To my way of viewing the truth, sin is the transgression of law, but according to the other theory, Christ would have been a sinner by constitution. If that was the nature of Christ, it is unparalleled by all that preceded or came after him. May division cease, the truth prevail, and unity and brotherly love be established, is the earnest desire of your brother in the faith. - A. TARVES.

**DEVONPORT.** - 48, Gloucester Street, 6th Feb., 1874. The brethren and sisters here have been much cheered and strengthened by a visit from Bro. Handley during the early part of the present month. He arrived on Monday evening, the 2nd instant, when some of the friends spent an hour with him at the house of Bro. Moore. The result of this meeting was that the only brother at Devonport who had doubts on the nature of the Christ had them all removed. He, with us, now sees that the Saviour of men was not, like ourselves, under condemnation. On Tuesday evening the brethren and sisters assembled in their meeting room, to the number of about 34, to give our brother a right hearty welcome to this place. It was then requested that the evening should be spent to our mutual edification, and for this purpose Bro. Handley gave us two short addresses; the first was on the necessity of a righteous life. He said (and with him we quite agree) that Christadelphians, of all men, should "crucify the flesh, with its affections and lusts," remembering the words - "Without holiness no man can see the Lord." After a few questions and replies on certain passages quoted on this topic, Bro. Handley was desired to offer a few remarks on the Nature of the Christ. We heartily endorse what he said. All here are quite satisfied that the Scriptures, both in type and literal language, teach that the Lord was not from the loins of Adam, but really and truly the Son of God. This fact makes all the difference between Him and ourselves. The idea that one dead, that i.e., under sentence of death, can give his life, or die, to save others, among the brethren here finds no place. On Wednesday evening the brethren again assembled, when the phrase, "sinful flesh," was considered. Let the friends who argue that flesh is sinful tell us if they do not profess to serve God now with the same flesh that they served the world with before. If it is full of sin how can they do this? It runs now, or it should, in another road - our affections, desires, etc., which were once in opposition, are now in harmony with the will of God. "Lust conceived" is sin. "Sin is the transgression of the law," "the wages of which is death." On Thursday evening a public lecture was delivered by Brother Handley (announced by placard on the walls), the subject being "The Baptism of John, whence was it, from heaven, or of men?" His preaching against the immortality of the soul. There was a good attendance, and from conversation with some present we learn that, if not prepared to abandon orthodoxy, they see that there is something radically wrong in the preaching and worship of the sects to which they belong. I pray and trust that our Heavenly Father will bless the meetings to the edification of the brethren, resulting in an "earnest contention for the faith," coupled with a holy life, leading them to be "living epistles known and read of all men," and that the "good seed" may fall into good ground, bearing fruit to the Master's glory. - W. DASHPER.

**GRANTHAM.** - The brethren in this place were, up to June last, either wholly gone or fast drifting into what is called "mere manism," but we thank God the "new theory" came out and has saved us from that miserable fate. "Mere manism" has never been proved to be true, and it would be a sad day for the truth if ever it could be. It wants no proving that Jesus was made in the nature of man "for the suffering of death," neither ought it to want proving that if He was made under the Adamic condemnation also He would have been unable to assist us by that death, seeing that no such sin can redeem his brother. We had a separation here about three months ago. The undersigned five, out of the original eight, commenced meeting on the 23rd November last at Bro. Edson's house, for the breaking of bread and mutual up-building in the truth, - John Shaw, Alex. Shaw, Isaac Turney, Wm. Edson, Joseph Wootton.

**LEICESTER,** January 16th 1874. - Dear Editor and Brother; I have the pleasure of asking you to put on record in the "Lamp" the introduction into the saving name of the Christ of two sisters of Bro. Lester, by obedience to that form of doctrine referred to by Paul in his letter to the believers of Galatia. Their names are respectively Clara Lester, 21, and Alice Rose Lester, 18. The immersions took place on Friday, January 9th inst. The new sisters are fully in sympathy with the doctrine of a Christ free from the law of sin and death, sometimes denoted the Edenic curse. Since our withdrawal from the Brethren who hold the doctrine of Jesus being under that condemnation, we have taken a room in the Temperance Hall, and have invited the public to two lectures by Bro. Handley, the first of which was fixed for Sunday, January 4th; subject, "The relationship of Jesus Christ to the Deity, to the human family, and to the curse pronounced in Eden on our first parents for transgression." This was fairly attended, but the subject probably would not be one very striking to the popular mind, although of paramount importance to ourselves, and to those who hope for salvation according to the Scriptures. His second lecture on Sunday, the 11th was a

continuation of the same subject, "The two Adams - Sin and Death by the first, Righteousness and Life by the second;" the attendance in this case was good. On Sunday next Bro. Hayes has consented to lecture for us; his subject will be "The School Board question - Bible or no Bible." The recent School Board election gave rise to the selection of this subject, conceiving that it may be the means of drawing an audience, and serve as a fulcrum to apply the lever of the truth with some effect. On Monday, January 5th, a tea meeting was arranged for, and most of the brethren from Silver Street were, I believe, invited, thinking it may be the means of eliciting conversation on the question in controversy. The tea arrangement was satisfactorily carried out, but none of the brethren above referred to put in an appearance; this was much to be regretted, for many strong arguments from the treasures of the Spirit were brought to bear, which I had not seen before. I may mention one as a notable example, this was advanced by Bro. Ellis: That Jesus was heir to the throne of Israel, or the throne of the Lord, not so much in virtue of his Davidic descent as from the fact of his being the Son of God whose throne it was, so that he was born a King; this has great cogency, taken in conjunction with the fact of David in Spirit calling Him Lord; and, to my mind, strengthens the position that the Sonship of Jesus to the Father is the key to His relationship to all the promises made to Him, and through Him to His people.

**LEICESTER.** - 12, Horsefair Street, Feb. 12th 1874. Dear Editor and Brother, - Since my communication of last month, which unfortunately reached you too late for last issue of the Lamp, I have pleasure in saying that our efforts in making the truth heard in Leicester have been on the whole a success. We have had good and attentive audiences, and that interest we hope to see kept up; we intend to spare no effort within our means to attain that end. A lecture given by Bro. Ellis, on Sunday January 25th, Subject, "Who is that old serpent called the Devil and Satan that deceiveth the whole world?" brought together a large audience, for which we had barely accommodation: I need hardly say that the question as propounded was scripturally answered, showing that whoever or whatever opposes the truth and the purposes of God, whether in regal purple, surpliced sanctity, or plebeian fustian, is in the scripture sense both Devil and Satan. On the following Sunday, a lecture by Bro. Handley was about as well attended, his subject being "The Baptism of John, was it from heaven or of men?" It was shown most satisfactorily, I think, that a prominent feature of John's work was to break down and assail a false notion of immortality which, in that, as in our day, had gained credence in the popular mind; showing, moreover, that the Jew had more apparent ground for his belief on that point, in view of the promises to Abraham and his seed, than any Gentiles had. The editor of the Christadelphian was invited by us some short time ago to give a lecture setting forth his views on the relationship of Jesus to the law of sin and death, as contra-distinguished from what we hold, but he declined on the ground that the controversy had well be dead; he sent his printed lecture of "Slain Lamb" as a substitute, saying in effect he had nothing further to advance. - Yours in the faith, CHARLES WEALE, Secretary.

**LONDON.** - Bro. Nichols reports: "On Sunday, January 25th our first Social Meeting was held. Nineteen brethren and sisters (including sister Handley) were present. Twenty sat down to tea, and a very comfortable and profitable assembly it was. In the evening Bro. Watts finished his month's course of Lectures; subject: "The Ancient Gospel preached to Abraham." Although at present we have not many strangers, we are one and all resolved to help each other in the struggle against the tremendous odds on the so-called "orthodox" side. Our determination is to work well and pull strong; invoking the blessing of the Almighty upon our efforts. We hope soon to report the immersion of two who are anxious to unite with us in hope and love; upholding the Truth of an uncondemned Christ. On Saturday evening, 7th February, two were added to our number by immersion, thus strengthening our little band, and increasing the number now in fellowship to 23. The names of the two believers are respectively, Mr. C. H. Alexander, and Mr. G. Turner. We hope they will prove fellow-helpers in the grace of God."

**NOTTINGHAM.** - There have been three immersions since our last notice, namely, Mr. Rogers, of Derby, brother in the flesh to sister Sarah Rogers, of Wisbeach, George Atkinson, aged 38, and William Smedley, 28, both previously unconnected with any religious denomination. The brethren have been much cheered and encouraged by the visits, and the sojourn among them for several days of Brethren Handley, Moore, and Clement. Bro. and Sister Ellis (late of Liverpool) have come to take up their abode in this town, much to the satisfaction of the brethren generally; being old and tried friends of the Truth, their presence is felt to be an acquisition of strength to the Ecclesia. The meetings continue to be well attended, not only by the brethren and sisters, but also by the general public, several among the latter being regular attendants. On Sunday last, February 8th ninety assembled and broke bread together, on which occasion Bro Moore, of Stoke, near Plymouth, gave a very interesting account of the fortunes of the Truth in his locality from the beginning up to the present time. Bro. Clement followed in the way of exhortation much to the edification of all present, whose attention was arrested by the apt and forcible manner in which he illustrated his remarks. The sight of a Mason's yard, on rising in the morning,

suggested an appropriate topic of discourse. The following lectures have been delivered: Sunday evening, January 18th "Who is the God of this world that blinds the minds of those who believe not?" Bro. Ellis. Jan. 25th "Health and cure for all. A Divine remedy. The true Balm of Gilead." Bro. Handley. February 1st "The undying worm and the unquenchable fire." Bro. Hayes. February 8th "The one Gospel of the Old and New Testament." Bro. Clement of Mumbles. February 15th "The greatest of all Battles, when, where and by whom fought?" Also by Bro. Clement, who has kindly consented to deliver a third lecture on Wednesday evening, when his subject will be, "When, where, and what will be the reward of the Righteous?"

## **EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS - AMERICA.**

**CANADA, HAMILTON.** - Bro. Powell writes: "I am exerting myself to get the Lamp into circulation, for the reason that it is the nearest to my own views, which I have earnestly contended for since I saw a part of Bro. Jardine's able explanation of his views of the Nature of Christ."

**WATERLOO.** - Bro. J. S. Adam writes: Quite a number here will send in their subscriptions for the Lamp. We at first sympathised with Bro. R. Roberts, but we were misled by his unjust treatment and misrepresentation of Bro. Turney and his followers; but upon investigation we find there is something in "Bro. Turney's theory."

**BUFFALO.** - Bro. James Elliott writes: We in Buffalo have received your pamphlets and have carefully read them, and we feel assured you have the truth. You have proved by Scripture, to our satisfaction, that Jesus was free from condemnation and sin. To most of us this is a new light, and we see the importance of being on the right side of it. A number of the Ecclesia on this side of the Atlantic have had trouble, though the point of difference has not been the same as that on your side. The editor of the Christadelphian has been asked to give his opinion and to help to sift the question, but the request has not been heeded. We feel pleased at the able manner in which the question of the "Sacrifice of Christ" has been handled; at first we were opposed to you, but we had only seen one side then. Our numbers I am sorry to say, have been reduced to 12, owing to a division, though not on this question."

**RIVERSIDE.** - Bro. Bingley writes: "I stated to you in my last letter that I could not endorse some points. This remark arose partly from the bias Bro Roberts gave, but now I can say that I heartily accept the "new light" which I more or less hazily discerned before, but now can most clearly see." The foolish cry of "heresy" cannot keep it back; true, much dust may be raised, but when it settles the eyes will see clearly. May love, gentleness, yet firmness characterise all your movements. It is not partisanship, but truth we are after. If not we shall be trusting too much to an arm of flesh. Let us prayerfully desire the truth even in this last day.

**JEFFERSONVILLE.** - Dear Bro, Turney, I have at last determined to gratify a desire which sprung up at first hearing of your "new departure," as some are pleased to term the expounding of a glorious truth, not to sympathise, but to rejoice with you in "the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free." I do, however, sympathise with those who "Have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge." It does seem so strange that men of intelligence will persist in a theory no less opposed to common sense than to the "Law and testimony." If, as they assert, condemnation is fastened upon us by virtue of being in Adam's nature, how is it possible for us ever to escape it? Nothing short of a change of nature could release us, and surely none will have the hardihood to assert that Deity will immortalize a being upon whom rests the sentence of death by a just and righteous law! James Evans, of the "Marturion," has discovered that Christ escaped the death sentence by dying out of it; and still he believes the truth concerning resurrection and judgment. viz.: that the dead are to come forth from the grave in the same (flesh and blood or Adamic) nature that by his theory condemned them to death!!! Beautiful consistency truly. Inconsistency, however, is the peculiar characteristic of this condemnation heresy. There is nothing more absurd than the idea that Christ, while under sentence of death as a rebel and sinner against God, could develop a character of holiness. R. D. Logan.