

The Christadelphian Lamp

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

Vol. 1.

SEPTEMBER, 1874.

No. 11.

CONTENTS

Page 2	A Treatise on the Two Sons of God (Continued)	Editor
Page 8	Brother William Ellis and The Editor in Scotland	
Page 12	John XIII. 8-10 Poem Jubilate Deo	
Page 13	Social Duties - Masters and Servants	Editor
Page 16	Notes on Scripture	
Page 16	The Deluge	Joseph Wood
Page 18	Answers to J. Grant's Questions	Brother Wm Ellis
Page 19	Letters to The Editor	
Page 20	By Thy Words Thou Shalt Be Judged	
Page 21	Courage and Candour	John O'Neil
Page 23	Goliath With His Head Cut Off	
Page 24	Our Warfare	Editor
Page 25	Intelligence	

When the high priest of the Jews made expiation for sin, he laid his hand on the head of the victim, thereby transferring, as it was understood, the sins of the people from them to it. As soon as this was done the animal was regarded as *the sin*, or the sin-bearer. In the Hebrew it is called *the sin, the bullock the sin*, or the sin-bearer. So also of Christ, the great sacrifice. The sinless victim becomes, for the time being, to be regarded as *the sin* because the sins have been laid upon Him. He bare our sins: God hath laid on Him the iniquities of us all. The sins and iniquities having been transferred to Him they became His, not ours, and by His death they are taken away. He dies for us. He gave His life as ransom for all. But the transfer of sins on to Christ did not make Him really a sinner; had it been so, He could not have risen again; His death would have been as final as the death of the unredeemed. He voluntarily suffered the chastisement of our peace, and endured stripes due to the children of Adam.

“A wise man will hear, and increase in learning; and a man of understanding shall attain unto wise counsels.”

Proverbs 1:5

A TREATISE ON THE TWO SONS OF GOD.

(Continued from August, page 6)

THE ASCRIPTION OF SIN TO CHRIST.

CHAPTER VII. - CONTENTS: The Ascription of Sin to Christ - The Holy Spirit in Relation to Sinful Flesh - The Seed of the Serpent - The Woman's Seed.

Any portion of sacred writing which has the appearance of discord with any other portion thereof, ought to be carefully examined; and, to aid investigation, the serious thought of God's word being in contradiction to itself should not for one moment be permitted.

In every translation of the Bible there are many errors, and in those called original copies of the Hebrew text we have no guarantee for complete accuracy. But the first object should be to harmonize, by sound reason and fair criticism, the text as it stands; for if a too ready inclination to solve difficulties on the ground of textual error be admitted, the mind will gradually relieve itself of the burden of close examination of all passages pertaining to the difficulty, and take a short cut to its explanation by making the supposed necessary alteration of the words.

The patient labours of God-fearing biblical scholars are continually making plain and harmonious many passages which once presented what looked like insuperable obstacles; and it is only men who are wanting in faith and patience, that on account of present inability to understand some things, cast aside, as unworthy of reliance, the whole volume.

The title under which our present chapter is opened refers to certain seeming contradictions in doctrine, and these are of a most important and solemn character, inasmuch as they belong to Him who is the foundation of our faith, the staff of all our hopes. Let us not imagine however, that this foundation is or can be defective, - that this staff may turn out to be a broken reed; but let us see whether our ideas of their solidity and strength are in unison with the facts in the case.

In that memorable exposition of things concerning Himself (Luke xxiv. 27, 44,) the Lord Jesus declared that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the Psalms. It is in the Psalms that we find numerous passages which attribute sin to Christ; and the question is, how are these statements to be received, so as not to disagree with others more numerous and equally plain, which teach the perfect innocence of Jesus, declaring that in Him was no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth.

The answer, that Christ committed no sin, only partly meets the difficulty; for if in His bodily composition He were the subject and partaker of sin then sin was in Him, and by no fair honest reading of the word could it be affirmed He was undefiled.

The eleventh verse of the twenty-fifth Psalm reads thus: For thy name's sake, O Lord, pardon mine iniquity; for it is great, Psalm xxxi. 10. For my life is spent with grief, and my years with sighing: my strength faileth because of mine iniquity: and my bones are consumed. Psalm xxxviii. 4. For mine iniquities are gone over my head; as an heavy burden they are too heavy for me, Verse 18. For I will declare mine iniquity, Psalm xl. 12. For innumerable evils have compassed me about: mine iniquities have taken hold upon me, so that I am not able to look up; they are more than the hairs of mine head: therefore my heart faileth me, Psalm li. 2. Wash me the thoroughly from mine iniquity, Verse 9. Blot out all mine iniquities.

These statements are held by some persons to refer to Christ. There can be no doubt that certain portions of the Psalms, from which they are extracted, do point to Him, for the Apostles quote them with that intent; but whether the words above given are to be so understood is not positively stated. We see, however, no objection to this application if it be rightly understood; but when made with the avowed intention of proving sin to be in the Messiah, we are bound to demur.

Let us first give a correct definition of the term iniquity, in order that we may know what is signified by the use of that term in allusion to Christ. "INIQUITY - Latin, iniquitas - absence of, or deviation from, equal or just dealing; want of rectitude; gross injustice; unrighteousness; wickedness." - Webster. Now, what is to be said to these things as regards Christ? If there were iniquity in Him in the days of His flesh, then it consisted either in the absence of, or deviation from, equal or just dealing; or else in the commission of gross injustice, unrighteousness, or wickedness; that is to say, He was guilty either of a sin

of omission or of commission. Iniquity is not a physical property; it is a wilful neglect of duty, or an actual transgression of law.

We ask, who will dare to affirm these things of the Lord Jesus Christ? But, if these passages from the Psalms are applied to Christ, in order to prove Him under sin, and sin to be in Him, the result is either that an absurdity is asserted, as in the contention for iniquity as a physical property, or else sin is laid to His charge.

Take another verse, Psalm xxxviii. 5, My wounds stink and are corrupt, because of my foolishness. Parts of this Psalm are thought to refer to Messiah, and some include the words of this fifth verse. But who would accuse Jesus of foolishness? And who would be ridiculous enough to pretend that foolishness is a physical property; something in human flesh, or any kind of flesh? Yet, the views we are combating and exposing have no other choice, in deed no other is sought for.

It is maintained by some scholars that several of these passages from the Psalms are found in an improper connexion; that they do not accord with the subject and sentiments of the immediate context; and that they properly belong to other Psalms. Upon our own knowledge. However, we are not able to affirm or to deny it.

Having assented to the proposal that the passages named may allude to Christ, that iniquity, sin, and foolishness are in some sense affirmable of Him, it will be asked, what explanation have we to offer? We answer, there are two explanations which appear to us as satisfactory; the first out of the peculiarity of the Hebrew language; the second from the doctrine concerning sacrifices.

“Dans le stille des Hebrewux, ma rebellion signifie quelque fois la rebellion qui s’excite contre moi.” (Saurin). That is “In the Hebrew style, my rebellion sometimes the rebellion that is raised against me.”

Again, says the same writer, “In the Hebrew style they say my wrong instead of saying the wrong done to me.” This information throws much light upon the passages in question; yet it is not, in our opinion, more satisfactory the second explanation.

When the high priest of the Jews made expiation for sin, he laid his hand on the head of the victim, thereby transferring, as it was understood, the sins of the people from them to it. As soon as this was done the animal was regarded as the sin, or the sin-bearer. In the Hebrew it is called the sin, the bullock the sin, or the sin-bearer. So also of Christ, the great sacrifice. The sinless victim beomes, for the time being, to be regarded as the sin because the sins have been laid upon Him. He bare opur sins: God hath laid on Him the iniquities of us all, The sins and iniquities having been transferred to Him they became His, not ours, and by His death they are taken away. He dies for us, He gave His life as ransom for all. But the transfer of sins on to Christ did not make Him really a sinner; had it been so, He could not have risen again; His death would have been as final as the death of the unredeemed. He voluntarily suffered the chastisement of our peace, and endured stripes due to the children of Adam.

Sins are transferred to Christ by imputation; in this way they were transferred to the animal victims. To bear sin in His body, means to bear the punishment due for sin, that is, death. To make His redemption effectual it was needful to bestow on Him power to buy, and to subject Him to similar trials under which Adam failed. There are the plainest proofs that this was done; first, by His being God’s son; second, by His committing no offence against God’s laws.

Some of the Psalms cited could not justly be applied to David, for he was a man after God’s own heart, with few exceptions. Indeed, no theory but that of imputed sin will give to them a satisfactory explanation, but that theory removes all difficulty.

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN RELATION TO SINFUL FLESH.

The phrase, “sinful flesh,” is not placed at the head of this article because it is either scriptural or rational: it is neither. It is now used to represent a grave and foolish error; and, in connexion with the other phrase which precedes it, namely, the Holy Spirit, we shall endeavour to shew what this error is, or rather that what we are about to speak of is an error.

But, before proceeding to the subject itself, a remark or two upon sinful flesh will be needful. Some of our readers may challenge the statement that sinful flesh is not a Bible expression, and direct our attention to Paul’s words in Romans viii. 3. We do not deny that the form of words is there in the English translation, but we affirm that those words are not a proper rendering of the Greek in that text. Sinful is an adjective assigning a certain quality or property to the flesh; but in the Greek there is no adjective. The original word is a noun in the genitive case, and the two words are sin’s flesh, not sinful flesh.

A due consideration will shew the reader, who has not studied the matter, how important this difference is; he will perceive that, instead of flesh being sinful in quality, it is, according to the Apostle’s actual words, a property or possession belonging to sin; therefore it is not sinful flesh, but sin’s flesh. This

mistranslation being rectified, the reader may take his Concordance, which will reveal to him a remarkable fact, namely, that the words sinful flesh do not occur once throughout the Scriptures. Possibly he may have heard or read that “sinful flesh is the English idiomatic equivalent;” but if he is able to read the two Greek words used by Paul, he will smile, and be thankful that it is not himself who has made this assertion. To make statements of this sort needs no moderate degree of ignorance on the subject; such an “equivalent” could only be produced by some such marvel as a “passive act,” to the better understanding of which it is necessary to elucidate it by a “passive operation.”

But to the

subject. Among Christians in general there is a belief, more or less serious, that, in the matter of religion, man can do nothing without the aid of the Holy Spirit, popularly styled the Holy Ghost. By this Agent his mind must be stirred; he must receive faith and understanding; must be endowed with wisdom from on high, and strengthened with a resolution to bring forth fruits meet for repentance. And the necessity for this assistance from the Holy Spirit lies, it is taught, in the defiled state of man’s nature; he is a fallen creature and can do nothing for himself, but is entirely dependent on the promptings of the Holy Ghost.

In confirmation of this, and as a specimen of recognised authority, we transcribe Dr. Clarke’s comment on John iii. 5: “To the baptism of water a man was admitted when he became a proselyte to the Jewish religion; and, in this baptism, he promised in the most solemn manner to renounce idolatry, to take the God of Israel for his God, and to have his life conformed to the precepts of the divine law. But the water that was used on the occasion was only an emblem of the Holy Spirit. The soul was considered as in a state of defilement, because of past sin; now, as by the water the body was washed cleansed, and refreshed, so, by the influences of the Holy Spirit, the soul was to be purified from its defilement, and strengthened to walk in the way of truth and holiness.

When John came baptizing with water, he gave the Jews the plainest intimations that this would not suffice; and that was only typical of that baptism of the Holy Ghost, under the similitude of fire, which they all must receive from Jesus Christ, see Matt. iii. 11. Therefore, our Lord asserts that a man must be born of water and the Spirit, i.e., of the Holy Ghost, which, represented under the similitude of water, cleanses, refreshes, and purifies the soul. Reader, hast thou never had any other baptism than that of water? If thou hast not had any other, take Jesus Christ’s word for it, thou canst not, in thy present state, enter into the kingdom of God. I would not say to thee, merely read what it is to be born of spirit; but pray, O pray to God incessantly till He give thee to feel what is implied in it! Remember, it is Jesus only who baptizes with the Holy Ghost, see chap. i. 33. He who receives not this baptism has neither right nor title to the kingdom of God; nor can he, with any propriety, be termed a Christian, because that which essentially distinguished the Christian dispensation from that of the Jews was, that its Author baptized all His followers with the Holy Ghost.

Though baptism by water into the Christian faith was necessary to every Jew and Gentile that entered into the kingdom of the Messiah, it is not necessary that by water and the Spirit (in this place) we should understand two different things; it is probably only an elliptical form of speech for the Holy Spirit, under similitude of water, as in Matt. iii. 3, the Holy Ghost and fire, do not mean two things, but one, viz., the Holy Ghost, under the similitude of fire pervading every part, refining and purifying the whole.

In making inquiry into the Papal custom of saint-worship, that worship is found to rest entirely on the belief of the immortality of the soul, for it is not the bodies of the saints that are prayed to, but their souls. But when it is proved that the soul is mortal, not immortal, what becomes of all this worship, and intercession for the souls of dead saints? It is worse than useless.

We should be very sorry to be thought to deny that there is any Holy Spirit, but we have good reasons for not believing in its operations on the minds of men to enable them to believe and live in the Christian faith. Furthermore, when it is proved that human nature is not that defiled thing which some affirm it to be, what need in there of these promptings and co-workings of the Holy Ghost to make it capable of believing and obeying the gospel? Here is a great and prevalent error arising out of the unproved and unprovable proposition that man is made of sinful flesh.

If this were true we should be inclined to admit the reasonableness of the great individual work allotted to the Holy Ghost. Such a power would appear needful. But admitting it, we should still be involved in difficulty as regards the written Word, which is explicitly said to be sufficient to make one wise unto salvation; sufficient to thoroughly furnish unto every good work.

A matter which is based altogether on individual feeling, as is the gift of the Holy Ghost, must be very deficient and unsatisfactory as evidence of the possession of divine truth; for we observe persons of greatly varying beliefs all claiming the same heavenly gift; logically, therefore, the justification of one would be the condemnation of the other.

But when we turn to the Apostles and their friends, on whom the gift was bestowed, we are not confronted with any such obstacles. They were all able and willing to demonstrate that they possessed super-natural power. We do not read that they made so much of feeling they had received the gift, as that they used it for their mutual edification, and as proof that they were preaching and teaching a doctrine not learned from man, but from God. It should seem that the pretended bestowal of the Holy Ghost is rather an impediment than an aid to the reception of the gospel by men of a reflective cast of mind; inasmuch as it is said to be enjoyed where reason can shew that the doctrines of the Bible are neither understood nor known.

The Quaker doctrine of "the light within" is part of this subject; but we do not intend to go into a detailed consideration of that phase of the question. It appears that this "light" is, on the whole, nothing more than what men call "conscience," a capital guide in general matters of good and evil, but inadequate to the inculcation of the glorious gospel of the blessed God; also, of very little use in the acquisition of science or of art.

The Apostle teaches that it is in the exercise of our senses that we learn to discern between good and evil. "The senses," scientifically so called, are the only avenues by which facts and arguments can enter into a man; but it is alleged that these are so defiled and depraved that no good can result from their action, unless moved and controlled by the Holy Ghost.

We have, however, never heard it contended that the Holy Ghost was essential to inform and guide man in finding out the laws by which the Almighty governs the universe - gravitation, attraction, repulsion and motion. And what has confessedly been done without this agency cannot be matched by anything that has been done with it, if we exclude the miracles and powers of Christ and the Apostles. In these we admit its presence and operation, but the general claim to it we deny as destitute of evidence; and we also deny the existence of that which is made the sole ground of its essentiality, that is, the sinfulness of human nature.

The power of the Holy Spirit being indispensable from such a cause amounts to the charge of sin, in a cruel shape, against God, and the exercise of a force which in justice had been superfluous; for if God had not created human nature just what it is, according to this argument there would have been no need for the intervention of the Holy Ghost. We anticipate the plea that man defiled his nature; but there is no evidence whatever to sustain this theory; it is only imaginary; and a calm investigation of the divine record concerning man prior to transgression will quickly explode it as utterly untenable. Is it not beyond confutation that the same mental movements, the same moral proclivities which carried the first man over the divinely-drawn boundary line, are precisely the same movements and proclivities which from then till now have been the spring of all wilful sin? We firmly believe that, on the whole, man is as capable of doing his Creator's bidding today as at any epoch of his existence, when he comes to know what God requires.

The legal disabilities under which man groans are universal; sin hath reigned unto death; and by one man sin entered. But the physical disadvantages are not of universal application. Millions live, flourish, and die, with all the organic soundness and pleasure of life which can be derived from a corruptible nature, and it should not be forgotten that corruptibility was as true of man before sin as after it. Mortality is the specific effect of the law of a corruptible organisation; but decay and dissolution are the necessary results, at some time, however remote, of all corruptible things.

As to whether the gospel can be understood, believed, and obeyed, without this mysterious mover, is easy of decision. It was obeyed of old, long before its disciples, in one recorded instance, had any idea of the intended effusion of the Spirit, see Acts xix. 2. From the account of the conversion of Cornelius and his household, it appears that the Spirit fell on them after the exposition of the word, but before their obedience in baptism.

It is written that faith comes by hearing; it is the mental realization of things hoped for; the conviction of things not seen. This mental realization comes from a clear knowledge of things promised; the conviction is the consequence of their settled belief. The things promised are described nowhere except in the Word of God; the necessary realization and conviction must, therefore, arise from the perusal of the Word, the only requisites for which are the desire, ability, and time to do so.

There is another kind of faith: but that is really a miraculous gift; we mean faith which can remove mountains. This is not the faith of the gospel which is set before us for obedience unto eternal life. It appears to us that the notion of the Holy Ghost assisting sinful flesh is but an example of how one error arises out of another, and that it is, therefore, most important that we should thoroughly examine the first premises of our belief.

THE SEED OF THE SERPENT.

Reference is here made to the animal in Eden which conversed with Eve; and the phrase, "the seed of the serpent," is undoubtedly to be taken in a figurative sense. The serpent stands for the father of all the disobedient, or rather for all who are involved in the disobedience of the first man. Those who are "born again," being adopted into the family of God through Christ, are not henceforth the serpent's seed, but the seed of Him by whom they are thus begotten to newness of life: in a word, they are the seed of God.

On this question no statement has been made which, to our mind appears more repugnant than that "Jesus Christ was the seed of the serpent." But if we believe that such an utterance would not be put forth, except in ignorance of the subject, our feelings are much modified. Adam became the seed of the serpent when, at the instigation of his wife, he tasted the forbidden fruit. He was then the offspring of the principle inculcated to Eve by that beast which was pronounced more subtle than all the beasts of the field which the Lord God had made. But this legal degradation did not poison Adam's blood; it did not necessitate that all his children should be physically or morally debased. Abel and Cain were brothers, and the murderer became the father of Enoch, who walked with God 400 years, and was not, for God took him. Murderers do not necessarily beget murderers, nor thieves thieves; but it is probable that the child of an habitual thief will become a thief, through example.

The consequences of allowing the first transgression to corrupt the moral and physical nature of man, and still to hold him amenable to all the decrees of God, make God appear unreasonable and cruel. If the moral nature were depraved from its original standard, man is deprived of the powers needful, on his part, for reinstatement in peace with God. It were enough for this primal breach of the peace between heaven and earth that it should be followed by such consequences as could be removed at any time by the application of redeeming power. But when we consider the nature of that power, it was evidently not designed to operate a return to the physical condition supposed to have been lost, but to remove, first, all legal disabilities contracted; and, second, to produce, not the imaginary original nature, but an entirely new and superior being. What Adam was to the serpent's doctrine, namely, a serf, all mankind are to Adam, apart from their individual wills. But in neither case has poison contaminated the blood. Yet, this is a doctrine that has found as wide a currency as the doctrine of the immortality of the soul; it is, in fact, an "orthodox" notion, while those who reject it are foolishly accused of going back to orthodoxy! A certain writer, who died not long since, has some lines in which he depicts this depressing and injurious idea:

The heart's a black pollution;
Pest is in the breath;
Each limb's a dark conspirator,
Compassing our death;
The mind's a moral ulcer;
The veins with venom roll;
And life is one great treason
Of sense against the soul.

The seed of the serpent, germinating in all the thoughts and actions of man, is the most convenient excuse for all short comings. But though the tongue may charge them all to that account, the conscience smites and stings with the knowledge that they might, if we would, have been avoided. It is in such a doctrine that pious canting hypocrisy finds a grateful refuge, and assures its salvation according to the measure of the acknowledgment of its innate and helpless depravity.

But while the inborn sense of right condemns this doctrine, the contemptibleness of it becomes more and more manifest by analytical examination.

Assuming, then, that some dire "poison, called sin, venomed all humanity, and debased them morally and physically, we come to inquire what it is they are compelled to do which is bad, and what it is they cannot perform which is good? Cannot a man refuse to lie, to swear, to get drunk, to commit adultery, to speak evil, to backbite, to give short weight, to sell a bad article, to deceive, to be idle, not to pay his debts, to be extravagant, to be a glutton, to be a brawler? In all matters of which our laws can take cognisance, nobody is ridiculous enough to contend that what is right cannot be adhered to. It is when we enter the domain of piety that our inborn feebleness, nay, helplessness, is thought to be discovered. Well, then, what is it here that man can and cannot do? Can he not read his Bible: is it impossible to understand its general drift; can he not obey its first requirements; does anything bar him from the practice of devotion; is it impossible to increase in knowledge; can he not refrain from being hasty, and practice patience; does anything hinder prayer; nay, where is there a single thing commanded of his Creator that

this poor poisoned creature cannot do, or cannot avoid? Reader, when thou hast discovered such, be sure and send it to us.

The application of the precious blood of Christ for the washing away of sin is not material but figurative; there is no real washing; the heart is said to be sprinkled by faith. Even immersion in water is not intended to effect a literal purification of the flesh, but to bring back the answer of a good, or enlightened conscience, towards God, in return for an act of obedience required by Him. This idea of fixed poison, or serpent's seed, cannot be too vigorously exposed and emphatically denounced; it produces, as nearly as possible, what we may imagine the reality would be; it cripples all energy, paralyses all effort; it, in effect, blasphemes the goodness of God, impugns His wisdom, and turns His mercy into gall; while the creature of His hand is changed to a prone puppet, and lashed for his inevitable movements. The impression magnetises the man into the very obliquity he deplores, and evokes the tears and lamentations of a hypocrite. Arise, thou charmed sleeper, and Christ shall give thee light!

THE WOMAN'S SEED.

Seed stands for that which is begotten, as well as for seed properly so called. Hence, "the chosen seed;" except the Lord of Sabaoth had given us a seed," and so forth.

The stress laid by Scripture on the fact that Christ was "made of a woman," is intended to exclude the idea of human paternity, but not of all paternity. It bars off the natural in order to prepare our minds for the divine. It implies the appointment of "another seed" outside the male line: "that which is begotten in her is of the Holy Spirit." This "holy thing," begotten by God, may be properly called God's seed, and this seed being born of Mary, is also her seed or son. "She brought forth her first born son," yet this child is called "the son of God."

There was no virtue in the woman that the Christ should proceed from her and not from the man also; so that had it been requisite for Him to appear in what has been called "unclean flesh," His being of the woman was of no advantage, for her flesh was like the flesh of the man. While, therefore, Jesus is called "her seed," we must look for another reason than that of identity of flesh in excluding the participation of the man in his production.

Nothing can be more evident, to one who calmly looks at this matter, than that the intervention of God was not designed to create an off-spring whose flesh should differ from that of ordinary generation; but that it was done so that He might be in the likeness of "sin's flesh" without being made sin's flesh in His birth. All we are "made sinners" in this way, or by this means; if, therefore, the promised seed was not, as we have lately been told, a sinner by any means, he was clearly not an inheritor, as we are, of all or any of the consequences which follow therefrom.

The woman's seed, or that which she conceived, had no relation to sin, or to sinners, except, first, in being made a sin offering; and, second, in partaking of the nature common to us all. And no doctrine is more insisted on by the Scripture than that of His necessary separation and stainlessness, in order that He might put away sin, or, in figurative language, "bruise the serpent's head." But, if he were the serpent's seed, then the serpent bruises his own head, which falsifies the prediction which assigns that work to the seed of the woman, and presents to us an unheard-of spectacle.

The elect are chosen from the world, or out of the seed of the serpent, but when the transfer has been made, they are no longer allied to their former brethren in sin. To use another scripture figure, they are translated from Satan into the kingdom of God's dear son. It will not be maintained that he is now under Satan, hence they, being his brethren have already been delivered, but their perfection is a future work. Wild by nature, they have been grafted on to the true olive, they are not now a degenerate seed, but a seed of Deity begotten by the word of truth. What they have become by adoption, their Elder Brother and Redeemer was by birth and obedience. By the mother He was related to them; by the Father separate from their fate in order that He might buy them all off; to do this He gave Himself. We have no account of Christ being adopted; but we have all received the adoption of sons. Moses was faithful as a servant; but Christ as a son over His own house. God decreed Him to be His son that we, through Him, might receive the atonement; so that we are now no more servants or slaves, but sons, and can, like Christ, cry Abba, Father.

No son of Adam is perfectly righteous before God, though some are said to have been righteous, and to have walked in all the ordinances of the Lord blameless; nevertheless, these noble exceptions were as much in bondage to sin, through Adam, as Judas himself; and their righteousness could never release them; they were at best but obedient slaves and needed one free-born to ransom them from the power of the grave.

All the seed of the serpent are under “the law of sin and death” but the woman’s seed are not under that law; for the Spirit’s law of life in Christ Jesus has made them free from the law of sin and death. This “law of life” was always in Christ, there was never a point of time when it was not in Him after His birth; on the other hand we have not a tittle of testimony that He was ever under the other law. This shows the relative positions of the two seeds, and makes it evident that those who say that Christ was the serpent’s seed, neither understand what they say, nor whereof they affirm. To defile Christ seems to some the only way of exalting Him, and contrasts very badly with their simultaneous profession that He was God. Whatever it is that defiled mankind Christ was free from that, whether it were law or individual deeds. Perfect obedience, on the basis of an undefiled existence, made resurrection unto eternal life sure; but obedience, on the basis of an existence defiled would, as regards a future life, be labour in vain. Hence it is imperative to redeem mankind before they can begin, with any chance of success, the race for eternal life. Make the tree good and then its fruit will be good; let us see that God put Christ into a right way at first, that we must be put into that way, and then it is easy to understand how, by proper conduct afterwards, both He and we may gain the prize.

To make the Redeemer a slave, and get out of the difficulty by saying that if God so willed it we ought to believe it, is to abandon the reason God has given us wherewith to understand His purposes. God never wills what is contrary to justice, and common sense tells us that such an idea is at once unjust and absurd.

The woman’s seed is styled by Isaiah, chap. liii. 1-2, the seed of Jehovah, “To whom is the seed of Jehovah revealed? For he shall grow up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground.” The Hebrew word is badly rendered here arm: the after words, grow, plant, and root, show that it should be seed, not arm. It is the same word given in Genesis, where the seed in the ground is spoken of. The same letters do mean arm, but not in such a connexion as this in Isaiah. This was a holy seed, and when developed was called a holy thing. We are pained to see that “the seed of Yaweh” is not yet “revealed” to all professing to be His brethren; but hope it will be by unprejudiced attention to the “report.”

In the “seed of Elohim,” mentioned by Malachi in chapter ii. 15, there is a probable allusion to Christ; as also in the seed of Ail, spoken of in Hosea.

(To be continued.)

BRO. WILLIAM ELLIS AND THE EDITOR IN SCOTLAND.

(Continued from page 256).

Monday, 29th. We said good bye to Sister Steele, took the 3.30 train for Wishaw, and made our way to Bro. Hodgson’s house. We overtook him in the street, but did not know him. He and Bro. Ellis being old personal friends, the introduction was simple enough. A few minutes more found us welcomed to his house by himself and wife. Bro. Ellis briefly explained the object of our visit, and Bro. Hodgson at once proposed to take us up to Bro. John Kay’s. Bro. Dunn was sent for and we all took our seats in a private room. The matter was then formally gone into, at considerable length. Bro. Hodgson afterwards spoke, and said that our remarks had given him a much clearer idea than he had before; he would read our Lecture again, and give the question his attention. Several questions were asked, and answered. Bro. John Kay expressed himself highly pleased with our exposition, and said he had never read anything that had given so much satisfaction as the Lecture. Bro. Dunn also approved of the ideas explained. Here, as everywhere else, extraordinary reports, both of ourselves and doctrine, had been circulated; but the personal interview produced an opposite effect, as thus far it has done in every case. At a late hour we returned to Bro. Hodgson’s, and after some general and very agreeable converse, we retired.

Tuesday, 30th. Bro. Kay proposed that we should go to Lanark, and thence to see the Falls of Clyde. This occupied most of the day. The scenery, hereabout, is of a very high order. After something like a mile’s walk, we got down into a deep ravine. At the bottom is the village of New Lanark. There are several very large mills built of stone, seven or eight stories high. Dale founded this, about 85 years ago, and it was here that his son-in-law, Robert Owen, made his attempt to establish a society, on the social principle. A common nursery was erected, and the young were to look after the aged. All wages were to be paid to Owen, and he was to provide all requisites. But the system fell through almost before its birth; and Owen, who had shewn his faith in it by spending all his fortune, went to America, and by lecturing tried to inspire

Bro. Jonathan to inaugurate the system there. Success, however, stood aloof, and the idea is now gone to the winds.

After passing through two gates a good distance apart, kept by porters, we gave up our tickets, and were taken in charge by a guide. The Clyde lies to our right, in places over a hundred and fifty feet deep, between jagged perpendicular rocks. The second fall is 84 feet, in three ledges at short distances. The water roars like thunder, and looks like a flood of molten silver. The pits at the foot of the falls, though the bed is of hard rock, are sunk by the weight of the fall to depths, varying from 30 to 70 feet at summer level. Great masses of rock partially obstruct the channel, and enfeeble the torrent as it dashes along the gorge. At the opposite side, standing about level with the face of the rock, are the ruins of Currie Castle, an erection of the eleventh century protected at the back by the Clyde, and in front by a moat. Having feasted our eyes at various points commanding the best views, we turned our faces towards Lanark, and arrived about four o'clock. Bro Kay had gone in quest of Bro. Murray, farmer, at Lockart Mill, and brought him up to Lanark to see us. As the train for Wishaw did not leave till 6 p.m there was time for tea and conversation. Bro. Murray expressed himself to be in agreement with us, and requested Bro. Ellis to forward to him the Lamp with all back numbers, if possible. Also the Lecture. This makes twenty-three complete sets of the Lamp sold by Bro Ellis since we came to Scotland. Bro. Murray was very anxious we should lecture in Lanark on our return, but we were not in a position to make any definite arrangement. In the evening we had a visit from Bro. Bonn and the Misses Kay, Bro. Ellis explaining some important points.

Wednesday, July 1st. Bro. Dunn pressed us to go up to his house this morning, that his wife might also hear the matter. We accepted the invitation, and spent a couple of hours. The result was complete satisfaction to himself and her. He showed his approval by ordering all the back numbers of the Lamp, and becoming a subscriber. He bought the Lecture also. We had decided to leave Wishaw this morning but Bro. Dunn was extremely anxious we should go out to see Bro. James Stoddart, at Newmaines, two and a-half miles off, so we accepted Bro. Hodgson's kind invitation to dinner, intending to set out afterwards, weather permitting. While at Bro. Dunn's, we saw the Christadelphian for July, and noticed some strange statements as to the progress of what is called Renunciationism. It was said to have obtained a footing nowhere, except in Nottingham, Maldon, and Plymouth. This is an error, and must be known to be one to the Editor of that paper. We say, first, that wherever there is a doctrine believed by one man, there that doctrine has gained a footing; and where no man believes the doctrine, there it has no footing. But what is the fact touching this matter? We can prove that more than half the whole brotherhood have received it. How the matter really does stand will be patent to all who read the Lamp, particularly the journal of this tour. We may, however, just point out, that the Birmingham meeting had 54 in fellowship, some weeks back. Here is another proof of a man "looking below the surface," and overlooking things at his own nose end. But did Bro. Roberts not know of this meeting of 54? This is a repetition of the old popish trick of trying to hide the truth to save consequences. Let us have the truth, and let consequences take care of themselves. We found Bro. Stoddart very unwell, and from his work on that account. In the little conversation we had with him he admitted that one slave could not set another free. We were slaves; it was needful therefore for the Redeemer to be free. So far we were agreed, and as our time was short we returned to Wishaw, and took tea at Bro. Dunn's, in company with Bro. John Kay. Bros. Dunn and Hodgson accompanied us to the station, and we left Wishaw for Glasgow about half-past seven, taking up our abode at the Victoria Temperance Hotel. After refreshing ourselves with a wash, Bro. Ellis sallied forth to announce our arrival to several brethren.

Thursday, 2nd. The first place of call this morning was upon Bro. O'Neil, manager of a Founders' Blacking Co. Two hours were spent in explanations and inquiries, the result being that Bro. O'Neil clearly saw through our view, and said he had never before perceived it. He had been desirous to join others in procuring the Lamp, and other writings, so as to get a fair view, but they did not seem willing: he now undertook to do it for himself and Bro. Ellis promised to send him all the back numbers. "Well," said he, "you are a very different sort of a man from what I was given to understand." Bro. O'Neil was now anxious for us to see others. Early in the afternoon we looked in upon Bro. T. Nisbet, engraver on wood, and found Bro. David Smith, steel engraver, with him. They heard what we had to say, patiently, and asked several questions, which we answered. As far as we were able to judge, our explanations were favourably received. One or two matters, they said, they had not heard before. Knowing we intended to lecture in the Victoria Hall, on Sunday, they said they should come to hear us. By way of change, and recovery from the fatigue of repetition, we strolled away, and seated ourselves in George's Square, to view the idle and the busy world. Thence we threaded our way through some dismal streets, where mortality seems to delight in dirt, whiskey, and barefootedness. We spent a little time in the Cathedral, and its crypts, viewed the splendid stained windows, and then away to the Necropolis, or city of the dead.

A small patch, in a corner at the foot of the high hill, is, or was, allotted to the despised sons of Israel whose memory is perpetuated in Hebrew characters on their tombs. Some touching verses of Byron are chiselled on the face of the pillars which support the gates. Since this, Israel has risen high; he is no longer inferior to his Gentile brother, either in life or death. The tiny burial place is long since full, and his once despisers have assigned him more room and more honour. Climbing high, tier after tier, are the slabs, obelisks, and other monuments of the dead, and presiding, as it were, over all, from a lofty pillar stands John Knox, the great Scottish reformer. The Necropolis is on a large mound of rock, rising higher than any other part of the city, and commanding an immense prospect in the direction contrary to where the smoke drives.

From this we traversed the chief thoroughfare of the city, by tramway car, and made our way to Bro. Owler's house. He is sub-editor of the Glasgow News. There was little time for going into any subject, owing to his night duties; but the conversation we had, resulted in his expressing a wish to see the Lamp. This counts twenty-six sets. Bro. Owler was anxious for us to call again and speak with him on the great question which is the cause of this journey.

Friday, July 3rd. Visit to Loch Lomond. We have not space to describe the Loch and its surroundings; the guide book will repay perusal. But the best thing is to see it.

Saturday, July 4th. This morning we tramped through the pelting rain; sheltering here and there when it came heaviest, to pay a visit to Sister Anderson and her daughters, and after an interview, short, in consequence of business, but very pleasant, we took train to Paisley. We had heard that there was no meeting here, that all was scattered to the winds. This, however, proved to be a false rumour. The meeting continues, though not in a vigorous state at present, owing to removals and deaths. We saw Miss Gilmour first, and learned at once that the friends of truth in this quarter were much displeased at the Christadelphian. The Lamp has been seen, and now all its back numbers were wanted, and the Lecture too. We next called at Sister Hunter's. She gave us a hearty welcome, and would have us stay to dinner. The old story of dissatisfaction with our opponent and satisfaction with us, as far as the reading had extended was here again told. The fact that, this is all voluntary gives it some extra weight. Too much was said to be written, and the end was another order for the Lamp, complete, if possible. Mrs. Hunter's mother is bedridden. She was pleased to see us, and very cheerful considering her affliction. Bro. Ellis prayed with her, and we departed to pay a visit to one of her daughters, also confined to her bed for many months. As from the mother so from the daughter, we received strong sympathy for the position taken up on this question of Christ's redemption. It is always painful for us to visit the suffering. We feel oppressed because we can give no real relief. At our afflicted sister's request, we prayed commending her and all such, to the tender mercies of our Heavenly Father, and refreshing our hope of that state when there will be no more pain.

Having said farewell, probably till the rising of the dead, Bro. Ellis led us up to Sister Gavin's. Here the greeting was warm-hearted enough and the oft-told story of sorrow and shame at the attitude of the self-styled protector of the brethren was repeated in our ears. The Paisley brethren are no part of "the hundreds who do not know of the existence of the Lamp." They all read it and say how much they admire it. When we started from Nottingham, we observed to Bro. Ellis that possibly, he might sell a dozen copies. Pooh, man, said he, fifty! And we now began to think his judgment in the matter was more to be trusted than our own, inasmuch as the last order made 28 complete sets. Our work to-day has not been smiled upon with sunshine. The rain has poured down almost without intermission. On arriving at the hotel, Bro. Ellis found a telegram for him, from Bro. Lind, of Liverpool, informing him that he should be here early on Sunday morning, in order to hear our lectures in the afternoon and evening, as per advertisement.

Sunday, 5th. The lectures were not well advertised, the consequence was a small attendance. We broke bread in the morning, and offered a short exhortation. At two, came together to hear Bro. Ellis, who spoke on the following topic: "Resurrection, not death, the gate of life." At six o'clock it fell to us to address the public, on the subject of "The destiny of the wicked: eternal pain and universal restoration contrary to scripture." The audience, though much larger, was only small; but the attention paid was excellent. Many thanked us, and said the Lamp gave great satisfaction. Some of the people had walked ten miles to the lectures. A conversation Bro. Ellis had with an opponent of our position, strongly reminded us of the one view they all take, so far at least as we have observed, - Jesus was defiled because he was born of Mary; and they appear to shut their eyes to the sayings of the Apostles, that He was undefiled, and in Him was no sin. Then it is said He was raised on account of His perfect obedience. Who objects to this? But it was needful to place Him in such a position as that His perfect obedience would allow him to rise. If, however, he had been born under the penalty of death like other men, he could not have risen by a just law; and we must not forget that God is just, as well as the Justifier. The justice they overlook. A cry is also raised that redemption comes through the forbearance of God. If this had been denied, it would have

some force. Let the grace, or favour, and the forbearance of God be put in their right place; let the favour of God be put first, not last; let it be seen, in giving His only begotten Son to die a ransom for all; then look at the means employed, namely, the moral conflict of Jesus His Son with sin, the laying down of His life, and all is harmony and love. But it is matter of thankfulness to God, that already more than half the brethren admit the truth of our position; and somebody will be answerable for their fruitless endeavours to hinder the truth, and for the spirit in which those endeavours have been made.

Monday, July 6th. Our work in Glasgow being finished for the present, we passed the morning in visiting the Botanical Gardens. The open part has nothing striking, but the Conservatory is a true paradise. The Mossery is lovely in the extreme, and the miniature Loch, on the opposite, is not less beautiful. A sweet calm steals o'er the nerves here, and one utterly forgets the outer world. It is not difficult to see how the Mussulman can spend his days in dreamy meditations in the luxurious gardens of the East. Time flies almost unobserved in such scenes of enchantment.

At 2 p.m. we started, intending to stay at Perth; but changed our minds, and went "the lenth," as the Scotch say, of Dunkeld. No richer and more exquisite view have we ever beheld than that from the bridge across the Tay at Dunkeld. As we steamed along between Glasgow and Perth, the mountain tops were uncovered, and the proud peak of Ben Lomond, 3,175 feet, was standing out with all its ancient majesty. We took up our quarters at the house of Miss Ellis, sister in the faith and in the flesh to our guide.

After tea, the evening being very fine, Bro. Ellis conducted us to several hill-tops, from which we looked down upon scenes we feel quite unable to describe in words. Bro. Ellis being born just hereabout, and having remained until he was about twenty years old, is well acquainted with the district. Behind us lay sleeping seven bright lochs joined together almost in a line, at the sides, and beyond, stood the wooded mountains. Before us was the little town nestling among masses of richest trees, with the river Tay, like molten silver, singing an eternal dirge as it hasted away over its stony bed. Then the mountains rise behind it to the clouds and shut in all in perfect peace.

Tuesday, July 7th. This morning we called on the Misses Anderson, formerly in the meeting here. They carry on a prosperous business in fancy wares made from wood grown in the adjacent forests, photographs, etc. Being very busy packing up orders, they had not much time for conversation, but invited us to call again.

Bro. Ellis then led us up by a tolerably easy road to the top of the mountain, and brought us out at a bluff perpendicular rock, some 1200 feet above the river bed. We might put on paper the objects seen, but that would convey no proper idea of the general effect of the whole. The town looks like a model for smallness, and the windings of the river like large mirrors of polished steel. The firs and pines, of a hundred feet, are dwarfed to the dimensions of shrubs, and a man looks about the length of our pen-holder. After surveying this vast amphitheatre some time in silent admiration, we turned and wandered away to an opposite point, commanding a magnificent view of the Tay for many miles till lost from sight in the mountains, where it finds its source in the Loch, about 16 miles long, of the same name. We passed on down the mountain, often sitting down to rest and to gaze, till at length we reached the cottage of Bro. John Stewart, keeper to the Duke of Athole. He was out, but his wife, Sister Stewart, made us very welcome, and set before us an excellent tea, with game of her husband's killing in the forest. The bright guns hung over the mantel-piece and half a score of king-fisher's wings were strung on a line, waiting to be sold for the making of artificial flies to catch trout and salmon.

About half-past four in came Bro. Stewart; a clean made, wiry muscular man about 5ft. 9in, with a bright keen eye, and a step that hardly seemed to touch the ground. He was dressed in the Highland Style and looked just the man for his work. He expressed himself not a little pleased to see us, and did not find us answer to the hue and cry that has penetrated even the Highland mountains. He had given up the Christadelphian and taken the Lamp instead. We, however, did not know this till now, and he told us that he read it with much pleasure. Here away among the high hills, Bro. Stewart and his wife break bread together every first day alone. There is something touching in the picture of their simple earnest prayers rising like incense from so vast an altar, accompanied by no sound save the sweep of the winds as they make sea-like music in the mountain woods.

We passed several of the more exposed heights, and observed the havoc of the storm among the erect giants of a hundred feet and as many years. Torn up and hurled headlong down the gorge, masses of hard rock sticking in their roots, there they lay, the sport of Him who holds the winds in his fists, and makes the lightnings and thunders his slaves. Bro. Ellis informed us that in a gale in the year 1843, 7000 trees were thrown down in these mountain forests.

Bro. Stewart was very sorry we could not stay a day or two and go with him fishing and hunting. This would be very agreeable, if shortness of time and abundance of work did not stand in the way. We can only hope the day will come when we shall ride at ease upon the high places of the earth. It is a glorious

inheritance, and we think that the man who would burn it up, does not deserve to enjoy even the sight of it now. We returned to Dunkeld and lay down tired enough, but pleased with the day's trip.

Bro. Ellis went in to say good bye to the Misses Anderson, and had a pleasant conversation. They ordered all the back numbers of the Lamp, bringing the sale up to 29 sets. There are several other brethren in this quarter, but they live at such wide distances, that we were unable to reach them.

Wednesday, July 8th. By an early train we started for Perth, and called for a few minutes at Mr. John Norrie's. He keeps a stationer's shop, and informed us he could sell any quantity, short of a ton, of Sankey and Moodey's papers but, literature, setting forth what he holds to be the truth, had to be given away. He had not offered the Lamp for sale.

Leaving Perth we went on to Newburgh, going direct to Bro. David Hepburn's. Here we received a most hospitable welcome. After dinner Bro. Hepburn took us out to see Bro. Forbes. He is an instance of a man who, under the representations of the "Protector," thought he had read all there was on the question when he had read the Christadelphian. It appeared, however he had read nothing and heard nothing, save the 32 questions. At his own request we made a brief statement of the case; he asked a question or two, and our time being expired we were compelled to bid him adieu, and leave him to think over the matter.

Bro. Hepburn contends earnestly for our views. Bro. Ellis took his order for the Lamp, and whatever else we had written. This made up 30 sets. Our faces were now set towards Edinburgh again, to which we returned from the Fife side of the Forth. We took up our quarters for the night at Mrs. Steele's, and started for home next morning. At 9 p.m. we found ourselves safe under our own roof, after a long, dusty, and wearisome ride. The impression formed of our journey is pleasing. From 90 to 100 brethren had declared themselves in sympathy with us, and the sale of matter on the subject has been somewhat enlarged. We have endeavoured to give a fair account of our twenty days' work, and trust it will be followed with more fruit.

JOHN xiii. 8-10.

Ye that are washed, be not afraid,
Doubt not, nor be ye sad,
Ye have Christ's word that "ye are clean" (v. 10),
Oh, thank Him, and be glad.

Always rejoicing, go thy way (Phil. iv. 4 : 2 Cor. vi 10)
"Forgiven!" be thy song, (2 Jno. ii 12),
Praise Him, who died that you might live (1 Jno. iv. 9-10)
The joyful strain prolong.

Clean every whit (v. 10), forget the past (Phil. iii. 13-14),
Press on to perfect day,
If dark or difficult thy path,
Christ is the "Light," the "Way."

And, if perchance thy feet may slip (Mic. vii. 8),
Through weakness, or through wile (Pro xxiv 16)
Confess thy sin, He'll raise thee up (PsL xxxvii 24)
And cheer thee with His smile (2 Jno. i. 9).

In daily travel through the world,
Thy feet may gather dust,
Thy robe, now pure, may sullied be,
Thy energy may rust.

So nightly pray, and pray with faith,
To be forgiven all,
The looking back, the sluggish pace,
The stumble, or the fall.

Then softly rest, thy slumber sweet,
Confiding in the Lord,
For Time and for Eternity,
Cleansed through the all pure Word.

July 23rd, 1874.

JUBILATE DEO.

SOCIAL DUTIES. - MASTERS AND SERVANTS.

There is much danger in all religious communities that, while men strive about doctrine, those elements of Christianity which affect our every-day character will be neglected. Correct doctrine is essential to our future well-being, and not less so, is correct practice to the present as well as to the future. It is in the solid parts of Christian character, rather than in its words and phrases, that real labour and real difficulty meet us; and the principal cause which has poured contempt upon the religion of the Bible is the general practical nonconformity to its injunctions. It is far easier and more agreeable to pry into the import of terms, and to make war on our neighbours for the incorrect use of them, than it is to give practical heed to our own conduct; to apply daily the restraining power of the words of Christ to our passions and appetites; to make a continual effort to repress the evil and stimulate the good.

A blind zeal is also greatly to be feared. It has been well said that "a little knowledge is a dangerous thing;" but burning zeal and incorrect ideas of Christian duty are sure to bring about anarchy and revolution. The saying that, "in flying from Rome we may go past Jerusalem," is full of useful caution. Having been oppressed with despotism, there is no little risk of coming to despise all government. The history of feudalism in France, the sacking and destruction which attended its overthrow, ought to be danger-signals to all new bodies imbued with a keen relish for freedom and universal suffrage. This applies to no class with more force than the class represented by these pages. The inner life of Christadelphianism has, from the very first, been marked by sudden and frequent commotion. The principal, indeed nearly the whole of its eruptions, have been about matters of doctrine; and a community which, with a little judicious management, might now have been of numerical importance in the world, has retarded its own growth, and set anything but a good example to its competitors in the race for eternal life.

Though comprising, for the most part, the poor in this world's goods the standing of the body is sufficiently high to have furnished it with experience of the social relations indicated by the words at the head of this article. What has that experience been? It is to be feared that the exceptions to our answer are sadly too few to blame us for stating it to be unsatisfactory. How it is that Christadelphian Masters do not prefer servants of their brethren to servants chosen from the world? Surely there is nothing in such relationship of itself to create mutual dislike. But, if such relations do give rise to ill feeling and impracticable working, it is not to be expected that in a body comprising so many servants there should be that general good feeling which ought to mark a Christian household. Now, this subject is doctrinal in the first instance; that is to say, the result of our experience in relation to each other, as masters and servants, depends upon the accuracy of our views concerning the commands of Scripture in the case.

The remark of Dr. Thomas to us that "the brethren appear to imagine that the truth destroys all subordination," was based on personal observation. Christian liberty has been interpreted to mean liberty for each to do as he pleases. Sad illustrations of this have occurred both in servitude and family experience. In such cases there was, doubtless, no intention to act improperly; but a wrong view of Christian liberty was the cause. It is manifest that one of the constant duties devolving on those who teach and exhort is to bring this subject into the foreground. But, first of all, they should be sure they understand it themselves; and, secondly, be careful that they set a good example.

A large part of the short-comings at present existing arises, in our opinion, from the unwise preaching of one or two of our leading brethren. So long as subordination, orderly domestic habits, wise economy, frugality, and diligence in worldly affairs, are not enforced, but neglected, and even ridiculed as carnal and soul-destroying, it is vain to hope for any material improvement. Such practices, when given full scope, mean nothing less than communism in its worst form; idleness, incivility, war on all decent institutions and waste of property. We can only excuse some for such wild teaching, on the ground that they are too inexperienced and too short-sighted to discern the abyss to which it leads. But for the handsome liberality

of a few whose habits are regulated by wise rules, these “levellers” would have long since stood naked before the wolf of want; and so far as they are alone concerned the lesson would, perhaps, have produced the salutary effects which example and counsel have utterly failed to establish.

The general tendency of the uneducated servant is to look with ambitious envy on the superior position of his master, just as the too common practice of the uneducated master is, to regard his servant as a piece of machinery, to be worked to the utmost limits of its strength, and then thrown to the “scrap heap” of worn-out humanity. It is also to be lamented that not only does much dissatisfaction arise from the employment of servants of the same faith, but equal dissatisfaction springs from the co-operation of masters, whose different trades are brought into use for the accomplishment of one object; so that such cooperation has been studiously avoided in some instances.

Christadelphians profess to be the reformers of all reform; to have gone right back to apostolic times, and to have reproduced apostolic doctrine in these latter days; and undoubtedly they merit the reputation they have of all who know them for a remarkable diligence in storing their memories with the text of Holy Writ. It would now be well, and it is high time, to consider how far their individual conduct agrees with the examples left by Christ and His Apostles. Let a man preach those things that are palatable and convenient to “the old man,” sharply rebuke sin at a distance, and display much zeal for the spread of the cause he has espoused, and with the “old man” class of professors, with the idle, the selfish, and the ignorant, he will secure an unenviable popularity. On the other hand, he who will be a standing rebuke to all such, both in life and counsel, will make enemies of all such. The Apostle Paul felt the truth of this when he said to such like, “the more I love you, the less I am loved.”

We are not left to the world’s standard in these things. Only let a tithe of the attention which has been given to some subjects, to wit, the nature of the human soul, be paid to Jesus, Paul, Peter, and James on social duties, and a beneficial change will quickly become visible. Some men pretend that an honest man can hardly live by his trade or profession; these are chiefly such as have had no experience in that direction. Minds of this stamp can see nothing in the world but hideous moral deformity. Being very imperfectly acquainted with it they brand the whole with its worst features, and in their honest indignation shrink back so far as to fall into the vices they abhor: narrow mindedness, love of supreme power in their own little worlds, intolerance, and bigotry.

We reserve the best part, namely, the advice of Scripture, to the last. Let us resolve to give it our full practical attention. It is perfectly fair and impartial; no favour is shown to the rich, nor is the poor approved because he is poor. The true and proper obligations of each are set forth in language simple and forcible, and the just consequences of disregard to those obligations are placed in a clear light.

“Servants, be obedient unto them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart as unto Christ.” Eph. vi. 5. “Fear and trembling “ are the words Paul used in the Greek tongue - how are they to be understood? Did Paul inculcate a slavish servile dread of the master by the servant? No. He meant that servants should fear and tremble at wrong doing to their worldly masters, just as they would at sinning against their heavenly Master, Christ. If they profess obedience to Christ’s commandments, let them remember that one of those commandments, is that they serve their makers according to the flesh as they would serve Christ in His very presence, and dread their just anger as they would dread Christ’s personal rebuke. In a word, their labour must be if as unto Christ, “not with eye-service as men pleasers” - industrious and faithful only when the master’s eye is upon them “but, as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart; with good will, doing service, as unto the Lord, and not to men; knowing that whatsoever good thing a man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he is bond or free.”

The frequent occurrence of this advice is a strong argument for its continual need. In Colossians the Apostle enforces the same duties in almost precisely the same words. “Servants, obey, in all things, your masters according to the flesh, not with eye-service as men pleasers but in singleness of heart, fearing God; and whatsoever ye do, do it heartily as to the Lord, and not unto men; knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance, for ye serve the Lord Christ. But he that doeth wrong, shall receive for the wrong which he hath done, and there is no respect of persons.” Chap. iii. 22-25

This counsel, if reduced to practice, is calculated to bring a great amount of daily happiness and comfort. We have the constant assurance that the service is done to Christ, that He approves of it when done diligently and cheerfully, and that, though we may not now receive the just reward for it all in this world’s goods, He will, doubly repay the arrears when those who have selfishly withheld them for their own gratification are dissolved for ever in dust. If we heartily believe that “all things are ours, and we are Christ’s,” the “yoke is easy and the burden light;” but if we do not really and truly so believe, our daily toil is a heavy load from which would fain be free by any means possible. We see how the Apostle weaves the lessons of Christ into the fabric of our daily life. This makes the truth of the gospel a living

thing; it transforms the world, as it were, into Christ's vineyard, and here no labourer can lose his hire. Like sunlight, it gilds and gladdens all the scene, which, without it, is dark and gloomy with toil and woe.

Then, let as many as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honour, that the name of God, and His doctrine, be not blasphemed. Alas, how often has this been the case! The conduct of the servant has frequently been referred by the master to the religion the servant professed, and through his or her negligence scandal has been cast on the gospel of Jesus Christ. Let it be remembered that in Apostolic times many Christians were slaves to Jewish and Roman masters, both bitterly opposed, in many cases, to the faith; the command was, therefore, much more difficult in view of the retaliative feelings to carry out than by servants than it is in our favoured days.

"And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren; but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort." Ah, Paul, thou art a true philosopher; the intricacies of human nature were open to thee! Paul here touches the marrow of our social relations to-day; he sees the liberties that are assumed as soon as the faith comes to be the common property of the employer and the employed; he marks how all proper respect and subordination are thrown aside, and notes the shame and reproach that such professors of the faith bring upon that holy name wherewith they have been called.

Paul knew, also, that men would not scruple even to teach and encourage these things in the ecclesias, and to them he dropped a word of sharp rebuke. "These things," said he to Timothy, "teach and exhort. If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to the wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness, he is proud, knowing nothing (as the margin reads, a fool), but doting (or sick, margin) about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil murmurings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness; from such withdraw thyself."

Peter, knowing the high importance of charging the disciples concerning these matters, said, "Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward." Then he continues, showing that the afflictions arising from service to unkind masters are, by the faithful, to be considered as their bearing afflictions for Christ's sake. This had a force of meaning in those early times which it has not now, except in very rare cases. The disciples might be slaves on whom many indignities were cast on account of their faith. But, whether in those or in these, all that a disciple endures patiently in suffering wrongfully is thankworthy; it all helps to buy up a good foundation against the time to come, when every man shall be made manifest according as his work shall be.

To Titus Paul wrote, "Exhort servants to be obedient unto their own masters; and to please them in all things, not answering again; not purloining, but showing all good fidelity; that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things." Here we see strict, becoming, and faithful service is held to be part of the adorning of the Christian character. Sloth and waste are ill-favoured twins. Solomon says, "He that is slothful is brother to him that is a waster." A lesson of frugality may also be taken from the command of Christ, after working a miracle to feed the multitude – "Gather up the fragments," said He to His disciples, "that nothing may be lost." The object of a servant should be to secure to himself a good name. The Preacher says, "A good name is better than precious ointment;" and Solomon, among his three thousand proverbs wrote, "A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches, and loving favour rather than silver and gold."

We have alluded to the duties of masters, but must say a little more to give each their just and equal admonition. When Paul had given directions to the Ephesian believers concerning servants, he then turned their attention to the duties of masters, and said, "And, ye masters do the same things unto them, forbearing (or moderating, margin), threatening, knowing that your Master also is in heaven; neither is there any respect of persons with Him:" "Masters," said Paul to the Colossians, "give unto your servants that which is just and equal, knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven."

The question with worldly masters is, "for how little can I get this class of work done?" The question for a Christian master should be "What is just and equal for this kind of work?" There is too great a tendency on this side to regard the labour performed by strong unskilful men as the labour of cattle, and to treat the labourers accordingly but it should be remembered that strong men have keen appetites, and though mere bodily strength cannot expect to command the advantages of clever heads, "that which is just and equal" they ought to receive. There are more remedies in the Bible than men think; more safeguards for the happy and successful management of secular affairs; and it is the proper part of those who understand the truth to exhibit the wisdom of the grand old Book.

EDITOR.

NOTES ON SCRIPTURE,

In Answers to Queries by an Enquirer. - Isaiah xxvii. 11-12; Joel ii. 28-29.

Do these passages predict the prophesying and speaking in unknown tongues treated of in 1 Cor. xiv.?

Certainly not, as to Isaiah, which merely conveys the assurance that the Word of the Lord, Spoken by His Spirit in the prophets, would appear to the people as if He were speaking with stammering lips fund another tongue, for the reasons stated in v. 9-10, disregarded by both princes and people, because they were a sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evil doers, children that were corrupters. Isaiah i.

As to Joel ii. 28, 29, Peter points to its inceptive fulfilment on the pentecostal day. Acts ii. And this seems to embrace the clause of the 23rd of Joel - "He hath "given you the former rain moderately."

The full realisation of the prophecy is no doubt foretold in the remaining portion of that verse - "And He will cause to come down for you the rain (of spirit power), the former rain, and the latter rain, in the first month." As the 28 and 29 verses, in context, prove that they have relation to the events of the latter days initiatory of the Great Day of Yahweh - the ultima thule of all prophecy.

THE DELUGE, BY THE LATE JOSEPH H. WOOD.

In the early history of the human race, as recorded in the books of Moses, there is one most strange and startling event, which in the history of all succeeding ages stands unparalleled, both in the mysteries of its production, and the nature and intent of its devastation. In this great catastrophe the vast multitudes of the whole human race were simultaneously submerged beneath the waters of a flood, except eight persons, who with various animals were saved in an ark, which was by divine instruction and forewarning built in order to secure their safety, and that they might re-populate the world.

There is scarcely any subject connected with the sacred writings on which there has been a greater diversity of opinion than the deluge, not only as to the mode by which it was produced, but the miracles with which it is said to have been associated, the traces of the event which still remain, as well as its universal extent or limitation. These subjects have formed the topics of controversy in almost every age in which the Bible has been studied; but, perhaps, in no period previous to the present has there been equal opportunity for arriving at a truthful conclusion on this vast and interesting question. It has in recent times been the object of persevering research, and especially with regard to its extent, has it been variously and ably discussed.

The bigoted opinions of many divines during the last few centuries, whose creed was pronounced to be orthodox by the church, - any departure from it to be heresy, - have raised many unnecessary and unwarrantable difficulties, which the Bible in its plain and simple teaching does not present. It is to be regretted that they have thereby placed before the minds of some a barrier against belief in the truths of the divine word, and have by their misjudged and erroneous interpretation given just grounds upon which the sceptic may assail and ridicule its truths.

The statement in its simplicity, as recorded in the Bible, will be received and admitted by all who regard that Book as a divinely inspired record. There are persons, however, who still attempt to refute this almost universally admitted truth. The infidel has ever made this event one of the chief objects of his obstinate attack. If the deluge had been based on mere historic testimony, apart from any pretensions to inspiration, it would have been frankly admitted as a fact of history, but as it is recorded in a book generally admitted to be divine, the historic narrative is at once denied, and a feeble attempt is made to refute altogether the possibility of so unnatural and singular an occurrence. Thus, by questioning this miracle they endeavour to undermine the confidence, which is reposed in the other contents of the Scriptures. I have not, however, in the present instance, to combat with unbelievers. The deluge is a fact which all present will admit has once occurred.

If needed, however, there is evidence apart from the Bible of this once extensive inundation, and by which also the arguments of the sceptic may be met.

Tradition speaks loudly and universally on this great question. There is scarcely a nation in the Eastern hemisphere that has not some trace in its traditions of a mighty deluge. The oriental nations preserve, perhaps, more remarkably, the great outlines of this calamitous disaster. Although the tradition lives in the dominions of the East, though it is sculptured on their temples and stamped upon their coin, yet it is not confined to the lettered nations of the Old World. The unwritten thought of the tribes in both North and South America bear their strong and ample testimony to the fact of the flood of Noah.

These traditions furnish incontrovertible evidence of the truthfulness of the sacred volume, especially of this great and miraculous event, - testimony so strong that the arguments of the sceptic will find a difficulty in refuting.

No person could have forged the account of the destruction which came upon the whole human race; as recorded in the Scriptures, so as to be corroborated by universal tradition, unless he had been acquainted with the literature and tradition of every nation in the world, - an amount of information which, until very recent times, it would be impossible for any individual to possess; and it will surely not be argued that some fable manufacturer, who composed our divine books, was so very fortunate as to record an untruth, which should by mere accident be the tradition of the world. Here, then, are two sources from which we obtain a knowledge of this sad event. The Bible teaches the truthfulness of tradition, and tradition again confirms the statements of the Bible.

The Bible is the only source, however from which we can obtain clear and decisive information of its cause. It is there plainly revealed that the sin of the people was the reason for their destruction. The Scriptures most emphatically describe the depravity and degradation to which man had fallen in such strong and repeated terms, that it appears as though the sacred penman found it difficult to depict the true character and extent of their evil propensities and rebellion. "There were giants in those days," not in stature, for there is no reason to suppose that men were in any way different in size, during the antediluvian era, than at the present day. They were giants in sin. The word entirely refers to their excesses, the extravagant wickedness, and oppressive acts of these antediluvian sinners. Man had apostatized and fallen from his intimacy with God, had lost all love for the true, and all aspirations after the divine, he had become completely enslaved to his animal propensities, running greedily after the lusts of his own evil and depraved heart. He became overwhelmed in the most revolting iniquities, the very worst sins were committed, the vilest passions aroused, and the whole earth became filled with violence. Not one solitary redeeming thought or action had found its way into this universal folly, when it is recorded that every motive and action were evil. "Every imagination of the thought of the heart was only evil continually." How sad a picture. In this impenetrable night of mental perversion no ray of light fell upon the dismal scene, the night of sin had enwrapped its victims too deeply within its black and dismal folds. So gloomy a picture language or canvas would alike fail in faithfully portraying.

God is the moral governor of the universe, and the laws of morality are as inflexible as the laws which regulate matter. Retribution and reward are invariably dependent on purity of intention or on action. We may notice the operation of these laws at every step we take in the world. Sin has an invariable tendency to debilitate and destroy the vitality of a people, and in accordance with the extent to which it is indulged, so surely will its votaries suffer. The nearer mankind live in obedience to the divine laws, the more perfect will man become, bodily and mentally. In its lower forms we may perceive how honesty industry, and virtue produce happiness and health, with all their blessed train of attendant good, and this is all resolvable into the purity and perfectness of God.

The breach in these laws of health and morals, must have induced disease, corruption, and decay in these antediluvian sinners. The point at which the contagion had reached appears to have been hopeless. Inference would lead us to conclude that repentance and reformation were as far removed from their thoughts as the east is from the west. At the merciful warning of Noah they manifested the most intense carelessness, if they did not ridicule and sport with this messenger of God. As persuasion was hopeless, and preaching vain, and there being no prospect of repentance, they were left for the retributive justice which God would Himself inflict.

In this great calamity God had not to consider the convenience and welfare of the individual sinners, but its grand and ultimate bearing on the whole future of the human family. It seems to me one of the most merciful and generous acts to the future races of mankind, and not the less so to the individuals themselves, to sweep away from the face of nature, all trace of so unworthy a people, that from one good and virtuous family the earth might be again populated and posterity have the privilege and power of retaining the favour and smile of Heaven.

On the nature of the events connected with the deluge, divines of all ages have tried their guesses. Many learned, and no doubt good men have spent much labour and study in attempting to account for the manner in which this marvellous event was produced. Many opinions have been advanced, and means

suggested, for obtaining the vast amount of water required to submerge the whole planet, and when produced, a second, and even greater difficulty, was in again disposing of it. It may be instructive briefly to glance at a few opinions which have been advanced, each of which, in its time, met with numerous supporters.

One divine, Dr. Burnet, supposes that the primitive earth was only a thin crust or shell of dry land, without any sea whatever upon its surface, and that the whole interior contents of the earth was “a vast central abyss of waters.” At the time of the deluge, for some reason or other, this shell cracked, and out came the water, falling upwards, as of course water does from fountains, or, as the Doctor expresses it, “spouting upwards in vast cataracts and overwhelming the surface,” a very original explanation of the words, “The fountains of the great deep were broken up.” This egg-shell, as we may call it, broke up into numerous pieces which, with the people and animals that each contained sank into the waters and perished.

(To be continued.)

ANSWERS TO J. GRANT'S QUESTIONS.

1. The sentence passed upon Adam embraced himself, and all lineally descended from him, and consigns them to dust, which is neither living nor organized.

2. (a) The impartation of breath was the giving of life to Adam, and the operation of the Spirit was the impartation of life to the substance of Mary, which had no life in itself, neither germinative power.

3. (a) No.

4. Your answer shows that you understand your own question. (b) It is possible, (c) Certainly it can. (d) No, Adam had no consciousness of any kind before he was made alive; and no moral consciousness until placed under law. A child lives prior its having either moral or physical consciousness. Suspended animation implies the existence of an organism in a perfect state, and does not form a parallel to one beheaded, who has no power of consciousness. Neither is suspension possible before it has existed. (e) The sentence being death, resulting in a return to dust, can be carried out in various ways, such as by burning, or corruption, etc.

5 (a) No life in the arm exists already, and simply requires the sustaining power to be continued. The seed germ in a woman has existence as a grain of wheat, but it has no germinative power. It is presumed that many women die childless who could have borne but never has one instance occurred of one giving birth of herself. The life imparting power, therefore, is due to the male, and not to the female. If men only be considered, neither male nor female can give life independently; but what is impossible with men is possible with God. For He gave Adam existence without any female germ and He also gave Eve germs of seed of man independent of any male. He caused also the seed germ in Mary (which was simply a continuation of the power he gave to Adam and Eve when he created them at first) to germinate, or become alive. This seed of the woman begotten or caused to live by Holy Spirit power, was the son of God, as really as Cain was the son of Adam.

5.(b) Because the holy thing: or one conceived in her was of the Holy Spirit, and not of the will of the flesh, which was sold under sin.

5. (c) I have said, “without independent existence and moral consciousness there is no responsibility.” This is self-evident, and differs widely from inheriting the consequences of a father's crimes as you very properly remark. Every son of Adam inherits the consequence of his disobedience, but before it can be proved that Jesus was a son of Adam you must destroy the testimony that He was the son of God.

6 (a) Answered above. **(b)** All infants inherit flesh legally dead; at the same time a very large number die from the carelessness and ignorance of mothers, nurses, doctor etc. The presumption is they would not, but there is no testimony in the matter.

7. Exclusion from the Tree of Life, is the only explanation given.

8. To inherit an effect is to inherit a certain relationship to the cause. This I presume is what the Apostle means, when he says, “By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all in whom all sinned. Rom. v. 12.

9. Eve was taken out of Adam before she was formed, and certainly was not in him and out of him at the same time. Had Eve only sinned, she would have died in her own sin, and could have been replaced by another, and in like manner Adam's sin could only be rectified by another Adam, not involved in the first

Adam's sin. The woman's sin did not involve the race, but the man's did, and hence we do not read by one woman sin entered into the world, but by one man. The woman's action could not involve the man, but the man's action involved her, and her posterity, by him; but not her posterity by another husband. Jesus being the offspring by the second husband, the only kinsman having power to redeem, inherited a right to life from his father, and not death from his mother, who could neither confer death upon him, nor life, by any act of her own, independent of her husband. Hence it is, that the sin of her first husband entailed death on her children, and the offspring of the Almighty; the second was born legally free.

10. It is not testified that all cattle were cursed, but that the serpent was cursed above or more than all cattle. That all cattle suffer more or less from the degradation of their lord, for his transgression, is manifest, but that they suffer any other curse it is not so written. The animals slain in type of Christ were all legally holy and clean, and were not themselves cursed, neither could they typify a cursed one, as you foolishly imply.

11. "Sin that dwelleth in me" is a phrase for lust or desire that often leads to sin, but is not sin unless the transgressor of law either in fact or purpose takes place. Rom. viii. 3, states that God for or on account of sin condemned sin in the flesh. This was done in two ways: 1st. By subjecting his own son to a state of trial and difficulty, which He passed through with success, and therefore He condemned the action of the first Adam as unnecessary and wicked. 2nd. By visiting upon the innocent the stripes due to the guilty, when the innocent voluntarily gave Himself up that the guilty might go free.

12. (a) Mary was born with the seed germ within her. This germ as part of herself, she inherited from the creative power of the Almighty, constitutionally conferred upon her. Like herself, and because it formed part of herself, it inherited the sentence of resolution into dust, whether it remained a constituent of herself or was germinated by human begettal into a living man. This germ, which derived its existence and qualities from God the Creator, was germinated by Him into a living child. Thus was life imparted to that which had existence but no life, and which if germinated by a human father would have inherited the sentence of a resolution into dust, or existence without life. It is beyond dispute, therefore, that the life of this germ was condemned if germinated by a human father, and free from condemnation if germinated by a divine father. (b) Adam was created with mental qualities, in the image and likeness of God. The transgressor of the divine law did not take any one of these away, nor impart to him any which he had not by creation.

12. (b) It is impossible to accept the doctrine that either mental or physical property created by the Almighty is in itself sin, without accepting also the dreadful conclusion that He created sin. There is no testimony that Jesus the Christ had either any more or fewer mental or physical properties in His nature than the first Adam. Faith comes by hearing; transgression came also by the same medium; but hearing is not a sinful quality, but one very highly commended in the scriptures; we might add, one very much needed in connection with this question.

WM. ELLIS.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

To the Editor of the "Christadelphian Lamp."

Stow, Midlothian, 26th July, 1874.

Dear Bro. Turney, - I have just received the "Lamp," and am really astonished at what has appeared in it concerning me when at Galashiels on the 25th June. You know perfectly well that I did not say "that I did not believe in the doctrine of sinful flesh." "What I mean, (and what you know I mean,) is flesh (or man if you like, under sentence of death on account of sin). I have believed this for eleven years, and still believe it.

You also know that I did not say to you that "I wished the "Lamp" to be sent to me, that I might read it. You must remember, that just when we went out of Bro. Bell's, to go to the railway station, you asked me did I get it, I said not. You then asked me would I read it? I said yes, that I would read anything, but that I would not become a subscriber for it. You then said, that you could not print for nothing. I said I knew that. Then you told me you would send it to me, and leave the payment to myself, afterward.

Again, you know just as well that I did not say, that I admitted there was great force in some of your arguments; what I said (and what you cannot fail to mind) was, that the only argument you had advanced, that appeared to have any weight on me was the one you gave of the nobleman disinheriting his wife and

children by his bad conduct, and the free nobleman redeeming them. But before I left Bro. Bell and Bro. Melrose, I saw the un-scripturalness of it, and pointed it out to them. In conclusion I would just say that if your report concerning me is a sample of all the rest, it is nearly a fabrication from beginning to end. For your information, I may say that all the brethren and sisters in Galashiels are of the same mind concerning the doctrine of Christ as they were before your visit. When I say all, I don't include Messrs Pearson and Melrose, the former not having been in fellowship with us for eight or nine years, and the latter for the same number of months, both (I believe) leaving (although they had not the honesty to say so) because the doctrine of the resurrection and judgment made the meeting too warm for them. Hoping you will find space for this in the "Lamp,"

I am, yours truly, JAMES ALEXANDER.

“BY THY WORDS THOU SHALT BE JUDGED.”

Up to this moment we have received only two letters, if our memory is correct, in reference to our recent tour through Scotland. The first, from Bro. John O'Neil, says the Lamp is invaluable to him, and all who wish to know the truth. The second is the foregoing, intimating the probability that our account of the tour "is nearly all a fabrication from beginning to end."

Bro. Alexander denies having said in our hearing, and that of Bro. Ellis, that he did not believe in the doctrine of sinful flesh. We reply that we are sure he said so, and that his statement was not solicited, but voluntary. He goes on to say: "What I mean, and what you know I mean, is flesh, or man if you like, under sentence of death on account of sin." Pray what has this to do with the statement in question? The two things are totally different. We ourselves have believed the latter, and like Bro. Alexander, "believe it still." Bro. Alexander does not appear to understand himself; until he does, we shall not be surprised at his misunderstanding us.

Bro. Alexander is very wrath with us for saying "he wished to have the Lamp." In the house, we clearly understood him to say he should like to see it. He now admits that he said he would read it. This is sufficient. Let him look again, and he will not find we have stated he would become a subscriber. When we saw he would like to read the Lamp, surely it was not cruel for us to leave the payment to him.

Again. He is offended because we have reported him to have admitted there was force in some of our arguments; while he now allows the same thing in regard to our arguments about the nobleman, which, however, he saw, after our departure, was unscriptural, and pointed it out to his brethren. If he will point out the same to us, we shall feel grateful to him for the correction.

It will be understood that our report in the Lamp refers to parties seen at Galashiels, and we believe it to be true, in the sense of a faithful account, of what we saw and heard. We are very sorry to see Bro. Alexander, who is so incorrect himself, accusing some of his brethren of dishonesty. His namesake, the Apostle, says: "Whoso bridleth not his tongue, that man's religion is vain."

We suspect that the real cause of Bro. Alexander's soreness lies in the fact that a literally correct report of what he did say has placed him in an awkward position, in view of what he once wrote to the Christadelphian, but such communications as the foregoing letter will not tend to palliate his conduct by being published in the Lamp, which, perhaps, he imagined we should refuse. The only regret, however, we feel is, that his own defence should be so complete a refutation of himself, and hope soon to find him in a more amiable mood.

EDITOR.

Elizabeth, New Jersey, July 14th, 1874.

Bro. Edward Turney, - I have been reading your tracts with interest and profit. I now enclose two dollars, - one dollar for the Lamp, and fifty cents for tracts. - Bro. Ennis has loaned the Lamp to me, and I have concluded to have the numbers from the commencement, if you have not disposed of them. I have been a subscriber to the "Ambassador," and also under its changed name, from the first, and still continue to take it; for I always like to read both sides of an argument; truth courts investigation - here is where Bro. Roberts is in the wrong; he will not let others speak for themselves in his own paper for fear the truth will suffer. Now it is evident that others love the truth as well as himself, and who honestly may differ from him on many minor points of doctrine. He ought to allow other brethren the right of private judgment; they love the truth equally with himself - although he may call them "Renunciationists." Well, it is a

small thing to be judged of man's judgment. As far as the brethren here and in Newark have read your views concerning the nature and sacrifice of Christ we consider them fully proved by scripture and in perfect harmony with His manifestation in flesh; and that death had no legitimate claim upon Him; hence we see the virtue of His laying down His own life for us – His dying for our sins, although, as Isaiah says, "He was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief," "yet they were our sorrows He carried, they were our griefs He bore," not His own. This is a subject that ought to unite the brethren instead of causing division. "We ought to walk together in love, because Christ hath loved us and gave Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour."

Yours in the love of the gospel, JOHN O. WOODRUFF.

COURAGE AND CANDOUR.

To the Editor of the "Christadelphian Lamp."

Glasgow, 24th July, 1874. Dear Bro. Farmer, - After a long and impartial consideration of the controversy relating to the nature of Jesus Christ, I am now fully persuaded in my own mind that I see the whole matter in a more clear and scriptural aspect. This arises partly from a few words I had with Bros. Turney and Ellis, when on their visit here, but the principal cause is the reading of Bro. Turney's lecture on "The Sacrifice of Christ," and the reading also of the Christadelphian Lamp, which Bro. Turney kindly told Bro. Ellis to send me, and if I thought them worth paying for, I could do so, or not, as I pleased. I received them in a few days after from you, for which I now, after having gone through them all once, and some of them two or three times, am in a better position to tell you what I think of them, and to thank you kindly for sending them, because they have removed a coat of scales from my mental eyes. It is needless for me to here enumerate all the things which so clearly contrast with my previous conceptions concerning the Christ, and so beautifully agree with the words of Jesus Himself and His own followers, not to speak of the Law and the Prophets, before John the Immerser, concerning Him; suffice it to say, Bro. Farmer, that I not only think the Christadelphian Lamp worth paying for, but am convinced that it is invaluable to me and all who wish to learn the truth concerning this matter. I regret very much now the part I have taken in conjunction with others, in passing judgment against all who believe Jesus free from the Adamic curse; but like other and better men than myself, it was done with a zeal for what I thought to be the truth, without knowledge. I fear many of my co-workers in the same cause have acted on precisely the same footing; indeed, from what I experimentally know of them I am convinced they did, and still do, which is all owing to trusting to the opinions of those who have set themselves up as their teachers, and who, from transpiring evidence, show that they themselves need to be taught. I have not attended the breaking of bread in 280, George Street, here, for two weeks before I received the Lamp and lecture; indeed, after seeing that Jesus was a Lamb without spot or blemish, morally and physically, I could not, without defiling my conscience, partake of emblems which represent a Lamb sinful and blemished by the curse of God being upon Him, the same as with all sinners. My reason revolted against identifying myself with such an ecclesia of men and women; and no matter how pained I felt at the idea of a separation from those whom I had known as kind and affectionate brethren and sisters, I knew that to prefer their company in this capacity would be making myself amenable to the judgment with my eyes open, and without excuse. I very acutely feel at present the grief which such a separation is causing me; but still I am convinced, if I don't confess Jesus the Christ before men as I believe Him to be He will not confess me before His Father and His holy angels when the Judgment is set. By the time you receive this, I will have placed in the hands of Bro. Nisbet, Secretary of the George Street Ecclesia, my withdrawal from them; also my reasons for doing so, some of which I have given in this note. In conclusion, Bro. Farmer, I must say, had I had the Christadelphian Lamp from its commencement, I think I should have been able to discern between the genuine ring and the ring of the counterfeit; for the proclamation of the Gospel as a whole; and I may mention to you that my long conceived opinions regarding the disposition of Bro. Roberts are fully verified in the "Explanation" which prefaces Bro. Turney's lecture on "The Sacrifice of Christ." I may also state that I would not yield to anyone in sorrow and grief for Bro. Ellis when he joined Bro. Turney's so-called new theory; but it was well it was so, for it showed me how I loved him, and now I can see it was to be only for a season, that in the end I might be able to rejoice with him. That this may be the blessed consummation of all our endeavours to obey the Truth here, that when the Master comes we shall be of those whom He will console for their sorrow and patience with the blessed words from his sinless and pure lips - "Inherit the Kingdom prepared for you," etc.

I remain, yours in this blessed hope, JOHN O'NEIL.

[The careful readers of the Lamp will recognise the writer of this letter as the brother mentioned in our tour. We permit him to speak for himself, having no doubt that his manly confession will be of much benefit to others. It is now his Christian duty to enlighten his friends. Surely the rapid strides the truth is making, and the reception of it by the most earnest and thoughtful of our community, will ere long enlighten the obtuse and soften the hardest hearts. We are reluctantly constrained to acquiesce in brother O'Neil's view, that envy and self-conceit on the one part, and unreasoning assent on the other, are the true obstacles that lie in the path. Nevertheless, in less than one year, we are able to rejoice that an increasing majority of our body already see the light. Perseverance will, perhaps, enlighten the whole. God give us patience and perseverance. Amen. - EDITOR.]

Kaukaee, May 17, 1874.

Dear Bro. Turney. - I ask your candid criticism as to whether I speak in accord with the "law and the testimony."

The blood of the first covenant purged the flesh (Heb. ix. 13-22.). When Israel was brought under the covenant from Sinai they had no conscience of sin to be purged from, hence Adamic sin was conditionally purged by the blood of the covenant. I say conditionally, because, if they failed to fulfil their part of the covenant, their circumcision was counted uncircumcision. (Rom. i. 25.)

Adam, by disobedience, lost his and our right to Life. That is, natural life. God set by the first covenant, before Israel, Life and Good, Death and Evil (Deut. xxx. 15.) Was this eternal life? Was eternal life promised under this covenant? No! it was natural life. To claim otherwise is to involve God in injustice in requiring Jesus to suffer the evil and curse (Deut. xi. 26-29), when He had a right to eternal life, after keeping the law in all points, if the law gave that right. Besides, if the life promised under the law was eternal life, with the increase of the land, then the Blessing set before Israel was exactly what was promised under the new covenant.

This involves Paul in contradiction, who says, "Jesus was the Mediator of a better covenant, established upon better promises" (Heb. viii. 6). Yet as in Adam's case, it may be reasonably assumed that eternal life would have followed obedience. The answer of Jesus to the sticklers of the law (Luke x. 28) and Paul to the Romans, shews that this would have been the case. Natural life only having been promised we find that Jesus, having kept the law in all points, had a right to His natural life with the good promised (Deut. xxx. 15.). Yet the Father required Him to give it up and accept the evil. Jesus was not obliged to do this to attain to what was promised under the first covenant, but He had to do it in order to attain to the right to the life promised under the new covenant. He was obedient to accept the evil "for the joy set before Him" hence His obedience to death gave Him the right to exaltation and eternal life. Thus Jesus laid down a life that obedience to the law gave Him the right, in doing which he opened a way to eternal life.

You appear to admit that eternal life was not promised under the law (yet life was), you then take a most singular position, in placing a free life under a covenant which only promised the right to a free life (natural life), and then, because it kept the covenant, you make the covenant give the right to eternal life; you might, with as much reason, put the angel Gabriel under the covenant from Sinai as to place Jesus under it, if he had a free life to start with. Hence, I conclude that the whole controversy depends upon which was promised under the Mosaic covenant, natural life, or eternal life.

Yours in the hope, FRANK CHESTER.

[The blood of the Mosaic covenant "purged the flesh," not in a physical, but in a legal sense. No change took place in the flesh itself after the sacrifice, but the person was legally right in the eye of the law and entitled to mix in Jewish society.

Those who understood the sacrifice of atonement to be typical of the great sacrifice, would have no conscience of sins, by reason of faith in the latter. Those who thought "perfection" was by the law, were deceived by the typical offering.

Adam lost his right - which came by birth - to natural life. Properly speaking, however, he did not lose the right to eternal life, for he never had it. That right would have come by obedience, perfected. He came short of it. Hence all in him "have sinned and come short of the glory of God."

We affirm that eternal life was not promised by the law. Our position will not appear "most singular" if it is perceived that the second Adam stood in the position of the first, as well as being made under

Moses law. As a second Adam, his trial relates to all Gentiles, as Messiah - King of the Jews - it relates to those under the law. What we always mean by free life is the life of a free man, not a slave. As to the thing called life, there is no difference in either case, but the grand difference is, that the free man is not condemned like the other. Question. Was Adam free before he transgressed? Certainly. Why so? Because his Father was free, and himself had not broken law. Was the second Adam free? Certainly. Why so? Because he had the same Father and He Himself obeyed every command. This is the whole matter. Freedom and Slavery, not flesh and blood, and the physical nature of life which the Birmingham "Protector" tries to make believe. The question is not "subtle" but simple. - EDITOR.]

GOLIATH WITH HIS HEAD CUT OFF.

18, Lamartine Terrace, St. Ann's Well Road, Nottingham, August 4th, 1874.

Dear Bro. ROBERTS, - Presuming that you now believe Bro. Turney will not accept your challenge to discuss with you the whole question at issue between you, I herewith challenge you to discuss, for two nights, the whole scheme of Redemption as revealed in the Bible. The place of discussion to be the Temperance Hall, Birmingham. That a verbatim report be taken by neutral parties, who will correct their own notes, for publication. The expenses to be equally borne by both sides. The time and manner of discussion I leave to your own choice.

I am, yours truly, WILLIAM ELLIS.

Athenum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham, 5th August, 1874.

ROBERT ROBERTS TO WILLIAM ELLIS. - I am in receipt of yours of yesterday, and beg to say in reply - That on receipt of your original proposal, I decided in my own mind to agree with it for the sake of the opportunity it would give me of contributing to the enlightenment of those in Nottingham who, with yourself, have been misled. In your next communication, however - by the very next post, in fact - you withdrew the permission to have the discussion at Nottingham. You thereby destroy the only inducement I could have to meet an incompetent man.

18, Lamartine Terrace, St. Ann's Well Road, Nottingham, 6th August, 1874.

DEAR BRO. ROBERTS, - I received yours this morning declining discussion with me on the ground of incompetence. I humbly beg your pardon for the presumption I have shewn. Until now I gave you credit for willingness to enlighten any of the brethren, but now, on the most paltry pretext you wrap yourself within your Editorial conceit that such and only such may dare to discuss with you. You have forgotten that God has chosen the weak things to confound the mighty. Wishing you a speedy deliverance from your present state of vanity and confusion,

I am, yours truly, WILLIAM ELLIS.

18, Lamartine Terrace, St. Ann's Well Road, Nottingham, August 6th, 1874.

DEAR BRO. TURNEY, - I send you the enclosed for insertion in the Lamp. It affords the best illustration of the insincerity of Bro. Roberts when he challenged you to a discussion with him. First, he hampered his proposal with conditions which he knew would be the cause of a refusal on your part; and again, when offered a very fair opportunity of attacking the truth contended for by you, for one night, and you to reply on another, he again plays the trick of opposing his absurd restrictions about the Socratic method. He now refuses me as incompetent, with the kind remark that he would have accepted my challenge if I had not restricted it to Birmingham. In this he shews great anxiety for those misled here, but no charity for any at home or anywhere else. This disinterestedness reaches the sublime. The Editor, who, in his own estimation, is the only living embodiment of the truth in its integrity, would condescend to discuss with a weak opponent. It seems not to have entered his thoughts that there are hundreds elsewhere who require enlightenment, and who would gladly listen to any light he has to offer, although he has spoken and written a vast amount for these seven years, containing more contradictory matter than on any question he has spoken or written upon. As Bro. Roberts cannot get a competent foeman worthy of his steel, I would suggest the propriety of his discussing with himself, as he is as much at variance with himself as he is with us. This is the infallible leader of the brethren, who was always right, and at the

same time has been everything by turns but never twice the same, and whose present whereabouts on this question I have failed to discover.

I am, yours in Christ, WILLIAM ELLIS.

We publish this correspondence as an exhibition of cowardice and impudence, "Robert Roberts" declines to discuss with "an incompetent man" unless he can meet the said "incompetent man" at Nottingham, so that he may have an only chance of enlightening the incompetent man's friends. Does "Robert Roberts" not remember that he was once at Nottingham in the flesh, being questioned for a whole night by the brethren? Does he not know that his conduct only served to convince them of his incapacity to make his case good? Has the said "Robert Roberts" forgotten that Bro. Glover asked him for a proof text that Jesus was under condemnation - knowing well that Adam's condemnation was meant, how he evaded the question by quoting the words - "when he (Judas) saw that he was condemned." "Robert" will not meet "William Ellis" only at Nottingham; he offered, however, to do "the Socratic" with the Editor "either at Birmingham or Nottingham." "Robert" pretends he cannot enlighten the Nottingham brethren except at Nottingham, but we could have promised a very large attendance of them at Birmingham. The real truth is that "Robert" is afraid of Bro. Ellis in the midst of his own folk, very much more than he is anxious to enlighten our Nottingham people. His objection to meet Bro. Ellis in Birmingham agrees with his repeated advice not to read the Lamp. He dreads too much light. If he would meet someone else at Birmingham, why not "William Ellis?" The more "incompetent" the better for him. It requires, however, a great inducement for "Robert Roberts" to meet "an incompetent man," and a greater still to meet one who is competent. But may we humbly ask wherein "William" is incompetent as compared with "Robert?" Is "Robert" more learned? If we mistake not "William" could give "Robert" a lesson in either Hebrew, Greek, or Latin, while we are sure "Robert" could do no such thing. "Robert" boasts of reading nothing but his Bible, and looks on libraries as shelves full of poison. "William" has read his Bible too, and something else to help him to understand it. "Robert" erects himself, strokes his chest, and downward, blusters, barks, screams, and sometimes drops. "William" is calm, enquiring, patient. Douglas Jerrold used to say - "Dogmatism was only puppyism grown old." "Robert," we are sorry to see, is still determined to display this kind of "ism." "Robert," as self-constituted "Protector of the Brethren" is pretty wary at protecting himself, even against incompetent men. Many of the brethren have asked how it was he refused to attack us one night, and allow us to reply another night, seeing that we attacked him and he replied to us. They wonder "Robert" did not avail himself of this fine opportunity. Let them recollect he was after "the Socratic method." Well, but has not "William" accepted the Socratic form? True, but that form is not effective with an "incompetent man," except in a certain town, viz., Nottingham. Yes, yes, but did not "Robert" wish to use this form in Birmingham against somebody else? Ah! we see now it is all humbug on the part of "Robert." It is not the truth he cares about so much as getting an advantage in argument, even over an "incompetent man." He laments our "havoc among the brethren," which we take to mean havoc with his position, and the smarting of his wounded spiritual pride, but much more is in store for him unless he amends his ways. - EDITOR

“OUR WARFARE; OR “THE TRUTH DEFENDED AGAINST ALL COMERS.”

A good while ago the Christadelphian set forth this heading, and for some time fought under it. But it has suddenly disappeared, and a change of policy has occurred. The last number of that periodical shews that its editor is in desperate straits. Many are pressing him with his own contradictions and inconsistencies. He exhibits much wrath at the reasonable demands upon him all round for "fair play," and to "hear both sides." And his answer is, "I am the captain of the ship; I know the course to be sailed over; I shall stand by the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth." Herein is much unsavoury talk; much that is altogether unwholesome and bombastic; seasoned to an intense degree with hot temper. Keep yourself cool, good editor, and answer the questions besetting you every day; shew your friends how a slave can free a slave; and leave off story telling.

Our recent work in Scotland has filled the "Protector" with great heat; he is ready to "scorch men with fire." Perhaps he fears he "has but a short time" to impose on the friends of truth. Why should he speak that which is not true? Why should he be sickening in his illustrations? Why should he publish "the proposal of a marriage with Doweites" which was never proposed? Why construe common courtesy into a religious alliance? Good behaviour is for those from whom we differ as well as for those with whom we agree. "Carnal ways" consist much in hasty words and untrue sayings repeated. We have not, to our knowledge, "fellowshipped Doweites," and should not wonder if some of the so-called should deny the Protector's statement.

Every issue of the Lamp shews, and truly shews, how this non-slavery doctrine of CHRIST is spreading. It shews, too, how the Christadelphian is regarded. Look at the American Intelligence, to say nothing of England; compare it with back numbers. Nearly the whole of the Brotherhood there, we are credibly informed, have long been weary of the "Protector" and his ways, but have had no vehicle of utterance.* Anything sent to him not flattering was burked. But now all is to come to the light of day. The "Protector" has nobody but himself to thank for the terrible exposure to which he is being subjected, and no amount of shouting and vehement vituperation can ward off the lash.

While the Protector, through a foul glass, is "beholding Edward Turney and William Ellis with their muzzles in the old puddle, lapping it up with gusto!" other people are attending to their sayings and their writing's, and becoming convinced every day of the untruths put into their "muzzles," more decently termed "mouths," by the angry "Protector," and of the truth of their teaching.

Though we cannot sincerely tender our thanks to the editor of the Christadelphian for the good service he is doing to our cause, because "his heart is not with us," still, we really do rejoice at the violence of his exertions, inasmuch as they operate to the destruction of error respecting CHRIST, and a corresponding spread of the truth. As Napoleon once said of his enemy, we can also say of our self-styled "well wisher," "that man is playing my game."

EDITOR.

* When it suited the "Protector" to flatter certain brethren at Adeline, he said they had attained a high degree of knowledge in "God-Manifestation;" but, as soon as he could not agree with them, he called this "high degree of knowledge" "an exaggerated form of truth"! We should like to know whether this is not error, and if so, why not be candid and say it is? -

EDITOR.

INTELLIGENCE.

COATBRIDGE.- We understand the brethren here are sufficiently numerous now to form an ecclesia, and they are about to do so. We sincerely trust that wisdom and prudence will be constantly in their midst while they increase in the knowledge of the truth.

GLASGOW, 28TH JULY. - The Enemy Foiled. - I had a visit from Bros. Nisbet and D. Smith on Sunday evening last; they caught me investigating the Lamps and Christadelphians, and weighing both in the balance. They did not seem inclined to speak about the note of withdrawal I sent to the "ecclesia" till I broke the matter by asking what they thought of Bro. Turney, etc., and if he, Bro. Nisbet, had got my note. He said he had, and had read it, not to the meeting, but to the Committee of Management. This is the first act of courtesy and brotherly conduct I have received from the ruling spirits at present in George Street. But they, no doubt, had a motive in not letting the ecclesia hear my reasons for absenting myself so long, and also my reasons for not fellowshipping them any longer. The conversation was short about Bro. Turney's views and my change. They seem to care only how to misrepresent Bro. Turney's words. I intend to make a house-to-house visit of those whom I love for the truth, so that Bro. Nisbet's motive may be frustrated to some extent at least. As for any opposition, I fear none from them as I know their forts, and they cannot stand the artillery of the truth. Please sent half-a-dozen of the Birmingham Lectures. - Yours in a sinless Christ, J. N. Q'NEIL.

Bro. Fleming speaks of the pleasure of the brethren at the enlightenment of Bro. O'Neil. From the latter also we have interesting news to appear next month.

LEICESTER. - The interest continues to be sustained in our efforts to set forth "the Truth," the attendance being as good, if not somewhat better, than it was a few months ago. It is usual, and perhaps natural, to measure success by the number who accept by obedience the good message, but, though we

have none to report this month who have arrived at that point, I am pleased to say there are many who seem anxious to be set right on the momentous question propounded by the Philippian jailer.

Bro. J. Martin, of Birmingham, has lectured twice here since my communication of last month. On the first occasion (July 19) his subject was, "Eternal life only to be obtained through Jesus Christ;" and for the second lecture he took advantage of a recent lecture delivered by a Mr. Bishop, who had lately renounced Secularism for orthodox Christianity, and who drew together a large audience to hear him give his "Reasons for embracing the one and renouncing the other," on which occasion he laid himself open to some severe handling. One remark of his in reply to a secularist opponent, to the effect that there was no reason for expecting, and no prophecy to show, that Jerusalem would ever be rebuilt. Oh! Astounding ignorance of the Book he was standing up to defend! Bro. Martin took the opportunity of calling his attention, and that of his audience, to one contained in Luke xxi.: "Jerusalem shall be trodden down, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." More of the like sort was forthcoming, but this was too much for lecturer, chairman, and audience; he was cried down as a Christadelphian, and no more would be heard; the champion of the night had received a fatal stab, but few could be made to see it; accordingly, on the next Sunday evening, we advertised Bro. Martin for a lecture - "Secularism v. Christianity" - and took the Lecture Room. A good audience was brought together, and it was made apparent, I think, to those who would allow prejudice to stand aside, that the Christianity Mr. Bishop had espoused, was no better than the Secularism he had just rejected. Bro. W. Richmond lectured Aug. 2nd, and Bro. J. Glover (both of Nottingham) on the 9th; on both occasions, good and attentive audiences. CHAS. WEALE.

LIVERPOOL. - Since our expulsion from the original "Christadelphian ecclesia" in this town, we have continued to hold our meetings in a room of Bro. Lind's, who kindly placed it at our service until we should succeed in obtaining a suitable place. We have, at last, managed to get a room in a large house which is let off for club meetings, etc., it is nicely arranged and very comfortable. We shall be glad of a call from any brother passing this way. The address of the meeting room is 97, Soho Street, Islington. Our members at first were nine; this was lessened by the removal of Bro. and Sister Ellis, but it has since been made up by the arrival of Bro. and Sister Terry, from Nottingham, to reside in this town, so that there are nine at present rejoicing in the knowledge of the fact Jesus was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners, and able to lay down His life as a ransom. We hope we shall keep the light burning here and that we may soon have more to share our joy and rejoice in the light. - W. L. ATKINSON.

LONDON. - Died, at 6 a.m. on the 20th of July, after a painful and lingering illness of consumption, David Inglis, of Edinburgh, I believe, but resident in London. He passed peacefully away at the last, in the sure faith and hope of the resurrection unto life eternal. - DAVID BROWN.

MALDON. - Bro. David Handley has transferred his business to his sons, and is now waiting a convenient opportunity to take up his residence in Nottingham, which will place him more centrally in relation to the ecclesias he so frequently visits.

MUMBLES. - The progress the truth is making in Mumbles is encouraging. Our congregations are increasing. We have three or four interested enquirers. Bro. D. Handley is to be here labouring for a month. I have no doubt there will be an increased stir about "The Way which they call Heresy." Our earnest prayer to God is, that the seed sown may fall into good and honest hearts. We are much delighted with the increased spread and lustre of the Lamp. Hoping our people everywhere will endeavour to recommend it more, as a lamp to shine in every dark place. W. CLEMENT.

NEATH. - I have much pleasure in informing you that we have another addition to our ecclesia, Mary Ann Taylor, aged 24, formerly Wesleyan. She has been a zealous member of that sect for eleven years. On the day of her birth her father enrolled her as a member, he being a local preacher for many years at Bath. She was visited by the Wesleyan minister of this place, who had been informed of her being here by a letter from Bath, from the minister there. She spoke to him of the kingdom of God, and the things she expects to receive. His answer was that "he hoped their heads would not ache until the kingdom was restored, which he did not believe in. He felt sure he had an immortal soul," but failed to give proof. They offered him an opportunity to put them right. He promised to call again, but has not been yet. Bro. D. Handley is at Neath. - S. HEARD.

NEWBURGH-ON-TAY. - I have received the Lamps, etc., as ordered per Bro. Ellis. I wish three or four more "Lectures," "Discussion," and "The Sacrifice of Christ." I have enclosed postages to the amount of 7/6, which clears pamphlets and one year's supply of the Lamp. I appreciated the visit of Bros. Turney and Ellis very much. I am sorry I omitted to say so in their hearing. Yours in the Lord, DAVID HEPBURN.

NEWCASTLE. - We are much interested in the Editor's tour in Scotland, and feel confident that if the brethren will lay aside prejudice and search their Bibles they will very soon find that Bro. Turney is right. I am happy to state that we all agree in Newcastle in an uncondemned Christ. - WILLIAM ORD.

NOTTINGHAM. - The collection for the Jews ought to have been mentioned last month. The amount was £5 11s. Dr. Hayes is returned from a tour of two months. He spoke on the 16th to a good meeting. The brethren have been much pleased by a few days' visit of Bro. Bingley from America. Bro. E. Turney being ill, Bro. Bingley addressed the public in his place. Subject, "The Marriage of the Lamb," Aug. 2. On the Tuesday following, 70 or 80 of the brethren came together to have tea with Bro. Bingley, who spoke to them at great length on American affairs, telling them how highly the "Lamp" was approved there, and what a large spread it was making. The brethren were much gratified. Bro. Bingley left for America on the Thursday. Aug. 9 : Bro. F. N. Turney filled Bro. E. Turney's room, he being still unable. Subject: "The World's Political Future." A good audience. Bro. E. Turney lectured on July 19 and 26, to good and very attentive audiences. Subjects: "The Nature of Sin and Death;" "Redemption unto Eternal Life." The brethren are of one heart and one mind, and the public are kept alive.

STOURBRIDGE. - I have the pleasure to report that since last writing we have had a further addition to our number, viz., Mr. John Davis, and his wife, Mrs. Mary Davis. During the month Bro. Ellis has been here, and lectured on, the 2nd upon the subject of "Who is the Light of the World? When kindled? And for what purpose?" We have also been visited by Bro. W. Clement, who delivered two lectures this week: - Sunday, the 9th, "The Kingdom of God;" and Thursday, the 13th - subject, "The Second Coming of Christ, its object, its possible nearness: what should men do in view of it?" The lectures continue to be fairly attended. The ecclesia having considerably increased, the brethren are now thinking of taking a more suitable room, the present one being too small when they hope the truth will gain a better hearing in town. - F. N. TURNEY.

TRANENT. - Brother Thos. Cornwall, writing on the 5th inst., says: "We hope Bros. Turney and Ellis will have been refreshed by their tour in Scotland, and though they may not have found everything to their taste, they could hardly expect otherwise in these times of transition." He adds: "Bro. Strathearn will be in California by this time; read a letter to-day sent on his arrival at New York, stating that they were all well. We feel our loss very much; at the same time it will have the tendency to stir us up to renewed energy, and thereby fit us for the appearing of the Lord." Notice of an immersion was promised, but it has not reached us.

EXTRACTS FROM FOREIGN LETTERS.

OVENS, - In a long and interesting letter from Bro. Willis, he states that he does not see how Mr. Roberts can prove that Christ was condemned in Adam, for many reasons. He is gratified with the Lamp.

GREEN ISLAND, OTAGO. - Bro. Campbell, in some correspondence sent to us by Bro. Willis, shews the fallacy of the Adamite doctrine, and proposes something upon baptism which we will try to find time to look into.

JEFFERSONVILLE. - In an interesting epistle left us by Bro. Bingley, Sister S. J. Bottorf says: - "Of the loved co-worker E. Turney, his articles for years had been eagerly sought and read in the Birmingham paper, and I must say I hailed with delight the birth of the "Lamp." With reference to going to America, she writes: "As for myself, I should take much pleasure in entertaining so earnest a candidate for immortal honours as I take E. T. to be."

HELP - The appeal for help through Bro. Daniel Brown's letter, has been handsomely answered: but he for whom it was intended died before any of it could reach him. The several contributions have, therefore been returned to their respective donors, and we now desire to thank all who have remitted, for their kindness and brotherly love.

Editor.

