

The Christadelphian Lamp

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

Vol. 2.

NOVEMBER 1874

No. 1.

CONTENTS

Page 1.	A Treatise on The Two Sons of God	Brother Edward Turney
Page 6.	Political Signs	Dr Hayes
Page 7.	Bible Redemption	Brother W. Ellis
Page 11.	Our Opinion of Creeds	Brother Edward Turney
Page 11.	Exhortation "At The Breaking of Bread"	Brother Glover
Page 12.	Public Debate on The Immortality of the Soul	Mr Hitchcock & Bro Edward Turney
Page 16.	The Seventh Chapter of Romans	Brother S. G. Hayes
Page 21.	Scripture Similes and Emblems	Sister Sarah Rodgers
Page 23.	Pilgrimages	Extract Gibbon
Page 23.	Religious Pride	Brother Edward Turney
Page 25.	Sin	W. F. Channing
Page 25.	The Peace of Europe	Brother Jennings
Page 27.	Extracts	Eclectic
Page 28.	Letter to The Editor	Brother Christopher Rogers
Page 28.	The Body of Sin	Brother Edward Turney
Page 28.	Editor of The Christadelphian Magazine contradicts	Dr Thomas
Page 29.	Criticism on Isaiah LXIV.6	Eclectic
Page 29.	On The Conduct as an Index to The Heart	Eclectic
Page 30.	Intelligence	
Page 38.	Impure Versions of The Bible	Bible Echo

"The struggle betwixt Jesus' own will or natural inclinations, and the will of His Father, is sufficient to prove the possibility of failing, or even disobedience. "Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me; nevertheless, not my will but thine be done." The natural inclination led Him to turn away from the horrors of that cup; but the Father's will was that He should drain its bitterness to the dregs. To say "not my will," if there were no will, no power to refuse, is a mockery too solemn to find credit, at least where reason is not absent. "I came down from heaven not to do mine own will" which implies He might have done it if He had sought; but He said, "I seek not mine own will." "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me, and to finish the work..." "If any man will do His will," leaves it to the option of the man who knows what that will is. The doctrine propounded in certain quarters of late, that Christ was to God something like what an axe is to a wood-cutter, finds no countenance in the Scriptures doctrine of election. The above testimony goes to show that Jesus was an instrument only in the sense of being a willing agent. But if the other were the sense, it would follow that the love the Father had for Him was the same nature as that which the wood cutter has for a good axe; that is to say, of no higher character, thereby excluding all love on the part of the instrument towards its owner. This is the certain outcome of the doctrine; it makes foolish and dead all that is recorded in the Psalms, the Prophets, and the New Testament of the trial, love, pity, and joy of this obedient Son."

"For Christ also hath suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God." - 1 Peter 3:18

A TREATISE ON THE TWO SONS OF GOD.

(Continued from October, page 8)

CHAP. IX. CONCERNING ELECTION.

THIS is a subject upon which very little has been said among us. It almost seems to have been left over to "orthodoxy," as not worthy of being examined, at any rate, it has been neglected. The dissension and trouble it has caused in "the Christian world," may to some be an admonition that it is best let alone.

There is no reason, however, why it should not be temperately entered upon; and the prominence given to it by the Apostle, seems a good and sufficient ground for making it a matter of careful study. Notwithstanding the obscurities which heated controversy has heaped upon the subject, we cannot, upon calm reflection, maintain that the Apostle's language is necessarily dark, or that he did not intend those to whom it was addressed to understand it.

Surely it is but reasonable to infer that he designed it to be comprehended, and that it was comprehended. First, then, as to the word Elect. Eligere is the Latin word from which it springs, consisting of e, out, and legere, to gather, to choose. Hence, to pick out, to select from among a number, to make choice of; to fix upon by preference, to choose; to prefer. Some use words as though they had contrary meanings; one sense in secular usage, and another in theology; but we are not ready to allow this to be correct.

We believe the Scripture to employ the word elect according to its definition as above given, which is undoubtedly the true one. We, therefore, shall not frame or adopt a theory of election, and then make the Bible a text-book to support that theory; but shall proceed in quite the opposite direction; namely, take the proper meaning of the word, apply it to the passage where the word is found, and abide by the conclusion to which we are brought by this method.

"Behold my servant, whom I uphold" - or upon whom I lean, in reference to the eastern custom of kings leaning on the arm of their trusty servants - "mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth." Isaiah xlii. 1. By the general consent of Jews and Christians this passage speaks of the Christ. He is presented beforehand as Jehovah's chosen one; His elect upon whom He poured out His spirit for the preaching of the good news of the kingdom, and the performance of many mighty works. Luke iv. 18, 19. But it ought not to be concluded that, because the Father made choice of His own Son for the work assigned to Him according to the prophet, and repeated by Luke, that His elect had no power to do otherwise. The struggle betwixt Jesus' "own will" or natural inclinations, and the will of His Father, is sufficient to prove the possibility of failing, or even disobedience. "Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me; nevertheless, not my will but thine be done." Luke xx. 42. The natural inclination led Him to turn away from the horrors of that cup; but the Father's will was that He should drain its bitterness to the dregs. To say "not my will," if there were no will, no power to refuse, is a mockery too solemn to find credit, at least where reason is not absent. "I came down from heaven not to do mine own will" (John vi. 38), which implies He might have done it if He had sought; but He said, "I seek not mine own will." "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me, and to finish the work." If any man will do His will," which leaves it to the option of the man who knows what that will is.

"Our voluntary service He requires,
Not our necessitated; such with Him
Finds no acceptance, not can find; for how
Can hearts be free, be tried whether they serve
Willingly or no, who will but what they must
By destiny, and can no other choose?"

Milton.

The doctrine propounded in certain quarters of late, that Christ was to God something like what an axe is to a wood-cutter, finds no countenance in the Scriptures doctrine of election. The above testimony goes to show that Jesus was an instrument only in the sense of being a willing agent. But if the other were the sense., it would follow that the love the Father had for Him was the same nature as that which the wood cutter has for a good axe; that is to say, of no higher character, thereby excluding all love on the part of the instrument towards its owner. This is the certain outcome of the doctrine; it makes foolish and dead

all that is recorded in the Psalms, the Prophets, and the New Testament of the trial, love, pity, and joy of this obedient Son.

But we must regard this Elect One with a discriminating eye. He differed from all the other elect in this respect, that besides being God's chosen One, He was also His Son; so that sonship, in His case, is one thing, and election another. Begetting first, then choice. God begat a Son that He might choose Him to fulfil His purpose; but the Son was absolutely compelled to fulfil those purposes because He was begotten. On the other hand, unless He had been a begotten Son to the Father, He would have no power to do His will in this matter; for it is a self-evident proposition that none but one who is free-born can give freedom to those who desire it.

"Mine elect shall inherit it, and my servants shall dwell there." Isaiah lxxv. 9. This sets forth the purpose of God to place His chosen servants upon the land of Israel. The testimony points to a still future inheritance, but our present argument is not affected at all by that; it would stand precisely the same if the prophet had been speaking of the first possession of Canaan; for while it is true that the inheritance is the result of their election, it is equally true that their election is not devoid of all conditions; so that the possession of the land arises out of their compliance with the conditions on which they were elected by God.

Concerning the future settlement, the Apostle shews that, although it is determined by God, it is not an absolute decree having no relation to circumstances, but that it is a decree based upon conditions which God foresees will arise. But the Jews are surely not compelled to acquiesce in these conditions just because God foresees they will do so; or else His foreknowledge would deprive all intelligent beings of will, and therefore of responsibility. "They also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in; for God is able to graft them in again."

Belief is the condition; and without belief God cannot, consistently with His decree, graft them in again. "When thou art in tribulation, and all these things come upon thee, even in the latter days, if thou turn to the Lord thy God, and shall be obedient unto His voice (for the Lord thy God is a merciful God), He will not forsake thee, neither destroy thee, nor forget the covenant of thy fathers which He swore unto them." Deut. iv. 30, 31.

Here the conditions of choice are plainly stated, and irrespective of these there can be no inheritance in the latter days. Again in chap. vii. 9, 10: "Know therefore that the Lord thy God, He is God, the faithful God; which keepeth covenant and mercy with them that know Him, and keep His commandments, to a thousand generations, and repayeth them that hate Him to their face." "As the nations which the Lord destroyeth before your face, so shall ye perish; because ye would not be obedient unto the voice of the Lord your God;" viii. 20. "If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land; but if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." Isaiah i. 19, 20.

To private individuals and their descendants the Almighty has applied the same principle upon which we have seen in the foregoing passages He deals with the whole nation. "And he said unto me, Solomon thy son, he shall build my house, and my courts, for I have chosen him to be my son, and I will be his father." But hear the terms on which all this rested: "If he be constant to do my commandments and my judgments, as at this day." 1 Ch. xxviii. 6, 7. Passages of the same tenor are very numerous, and it is not needful to cite more at present: these shew unmistakably that God's election is not an arbitrary act of supreme power only, but that it is a decree based upon the fulfilment of clearly defined conditions, the parties themselves being free to comply or refuse.

The choice God made of the nation of Israel is always represented as exalting them to a great height above all other nations; but He whom God styles "my first born," Israel, Jesus, the Prince of God and Saviour of men rode high above all His chosen nation. The honours to which they were elected He received by birth-right. They were chosen to a conditional inheritance; He was born to that inheritance, and could only lose it by disobedience. He, as the rightful Heir to the estate (whose right it is'), having established His right through every necessary form of trial, stands as the great Elector, offering the said estate upon His own terms. He being also the born Heir to eternal life, and having by obedience passed from the heirship into the possession, couples this unspeakable gift therewith. The great work of election, or taking out a people for His name, required that God, "in all things," should give the Elector the pre-eminence. Jehovah's first-born, Jesus, is "the beginning of His strength," "higher than the kings of the earth." Herein lies the primary elective power, the secondary, or conditional, belongs to the elected.

... "in thee
As from a second root shall be restor'd
As many as are restor'd, without thee
none." - Milton.

The principles of the gospel are in strict harmony with the doctrine of election thus far considered. The future wealth and glory of God are bound by certain stipulations, all of which imply the power of man to act up to them; and whoever teaches to the contrary, affirming man's inability so to act, does in effect construe divine election into fatalism. "To them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honour and immortality God will render (verse 6) eternal life; but unto them that are contentious and do not obey the truth but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first and also of the Gentile, but glory honour, and peace, to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile, for there is no respect of persons with God." Rom. ii. 7-11. What indeed were the use of all this if we could not obey the truth? To obey the truth does not mean to obey part and part not obey, for that were "to obey unrighteousness." The promise and threat proceed on the clear understanding that the elect can perform every condition under which they are chosen, "according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith." Rom. xvi. 26. "And having in readiness to revenge all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled." 2 Cor. x. 6. "Bringing every thought into the obedience of Christ." Verse 5. "Whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness." Rom. vi. 16. "As ye have yielded your members servants to uncleanness, even so now yield your members servants to righteousness." Verse 19. "For your obedience is come abroad unto all men." Chap. xvi. 19. "His inward affection is more abundant towards you whilst He remembereth the obedience of you all." 2 Cor. vii. 15. Paul shews that Christ "wrought by him, to make the Gentiles obedient by word and deed." Rom. xv. 18. He also wrote to the Corinthians, "that He might know the proof of them, whether they were obedient in all things." 2 Cor. ii. 9.

Now, what is the teaching of these scriptures? Is it that we cannot, or that we can, fulfil all obedience? The latter, unquestionably. To assert that we do not is no excuse, nor any proof at all that we cannot; but rather to declare our own condemnation in the face of God's righteous commandments; and, as we before said, it establishes the doctrine of fate, than which nothing is more absurd, or more relaxing to morals. But none would protest against the sceptical doctrine of fate more than those who say we cannot render full obedience; although it is quite easy to shew that such is the issue of their own position, nay, worse, for the result is to bring in God, in whom they believe, as the author of their own faults. For as regards fate, it is but an empty sound, and when referred back to the laws of nature implies in the clearest manner a legislator or maker of those laws; if therefore, man by reason of the law of his nature cannot obey righteousness, upon whom does the blame fall, but upon God, the maker of that law?

". . . to persevere
He left it in thy power; ordain'd thy will
By nature free, not over-rul'd by fate
Inextricable, or strict necessity." - Milton.

Indeed, though at first sight it may not be observed, the ground held by some, professing to be teachers of others, is level with that of heathenism, as derided by the old Greek poet:

"Perverse mankind! Whose will, created free.
Charge all their woes on absolute decree:
All to the dooming gods their guilt translate,
And follies are miscalled the crimes of fate."

But in considering the Scripture doctrine of election there are two points to be noticed; one, is the obedience for which we are chosen; the other, the obedience unto which we are elected. Though we have spoken of the first, it is the last which properly; stands first in the divine arrangement. Before we can possibly begin to work out our obedience, it is imperative that we be planted in the obedience of Jesus. Peter will help us to explain this matter: "Elect . . . unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." Two things are mentioned, "obedience" and the sprinkling of the blood;" and unto these, in the order given by the Apostle, were those to whom he wrote "elect." This election brings us on to new standing ground; it causes us to change sides, or to use the English version of Colossians, i. 13, to be "translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son." We stand, as it were, on "holy ground." It is here we approach "the blood of sprinkling," and beyond these limits not one drop can reach us. Being "elect" unto these things we are "made righteous." There is no power in us, as of ourselves, to make us righteous; this is accomplished "by the righteousness of One," even Jesus. Helplessly we were all "made sinners;" and equally so, in a certain sense, are we all "made righteous;" for, had not Christ already established

“obedience and the blood of sprinkling,” there could neither be any election unto these, nor could any movement or desire on our part effect any help whatever. “By the righteousness of One the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.” This favour being bestowed, we are now commanded to act righteously. “He that doeth righteousness is righteous.”

When these two points are clearly seen, we are constrained to join the Apostle, and exclude all boasting as touching our righteousness, as though it, of itself, were effectual in justifying us before God; and with the Apocalyptic throng we exclaim: “UNTO HIM that loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own, blood; and hath made us kings and priests unto God and His Father; TO HIM be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.” But, suppose with Mr. Roberts, in his Thirty-two Questions, we reckon Jesus Himself as a part of this Body so loved and washed, making such cleansing needful for Him as a member of the Body, then unto whom is this joyous ascription of praise? To Himself undoubtedly; so that it makes Him sing how He loved Himself and washed Himself from His own sin in His own blood! Surely the wise are taken in their own craftiness neither is there any power of deliverance in “the Socratic method.”

How then does the matter stand? We are parts of Christ’s mystical Body; that is to say, when we have been made such; not by birth. But in this process we are “made righteous,” so that we do not need, as members of His Body, to be made clean, much less was it requisite for Him to be a, member Himself of an unclean Body. But Mr. Roberts’ argument is, that Christ’s Body in all its members was full of sin. He being one of them; therefore for Himself, as well as for them, a cleansing was needful. This conclusion is false, because the proposition is false. Christ’s Body does not consist of unclean members, but of clean. No one can become a member thereof who has not experienced “the washing of water by the word.” To become part of His Body, therefore, it is incumbent upon us to be cleansed and adopted by Him who came to cleanse us; but nowhere is it said to cleanse Himself. It is possible for a washed and justified person to become defiled, and so to defile the Body, thereby incurring a fearful vengeance, but this is no answer to the foregoing argument, which shews that at first it was needful to be made clean in order to induction into the Body. Subsequent defilement, therefore, rather establishes than breaks down the position. But to continue. That election is not arbitrary, but conditional, appears from Paul’s saying, that “without faith it is impossible to please God.” “O faithless generation, how long shall I suffer you?” This rebuke proves faith to have been within their own control; by vigilance it came, by negligence it departed. No faith, no election, is a proposition easily supportable. “God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the spirit and belief of the truth.” There is no choice, or election, without belief of the truth; hence it follows that the elect are the believers. “Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for, but the election hath obtained it.” Who are these, but the believers?

These are mentioned again in the same chapter: “Thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded but fear.” The revelator saw a multitude of sealed ones; these he describes as having the Father’s name written in their foreheads; but the sealing did not precede the writing; it was the proper sequence to hearing and belief. “In whom also ye trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation, in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy spirit of promise.” “Then one said unto Him, Lord, are there few that be saved? And he said unto them, Strive to enter in at the straight gate; for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in, and shall not be able.” They are not able because they do not believe, for it is written, “If thou believest, thou shalt be saved.” The elect then, are the few who believe. “Many are called, but few are chosen;” which is only another way of saying, few there are that believe.

“For there shall arise false Christs and false Prophets, and shall shew great signs and wonders, insomuch that if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect.” This, however, is not intended to convey that believers cannot be deceived, for it was to believers that Christ said, “take heed that no man deceive you;” and the apostle Paul, who was surely one of the elect, feared that, after having preached to others, he himself might be cast away. “The very elect” appears to mean here the actually saved; that is, those ultimately accepted, for the passage shows that to deceive them would be impossible. It is an expression used to describe the strong persuasiveness of the coming impostors, but not intended to teach that the elect cannot fall away.

There are several other texts on the subject of election which we have not; touched upon, but which rigid Calvinism would never leave out of the discussion. The history of Moses and the reference of Paul to the hardening of Pharaoh’s heart by God is a favourite refuge of those who will have it that the Almighty makes wicked men as well as good men for Himself. Theodoret, the author of ecclesiastical history, has a happy observation in his commentary on this text. “What am I to understand,” he asks, “by God having hardened Pharaoh’s heart?” And after some other remarks he gives the following illustration:” The sun is said to melt wax and to harden mud, although it possesses only the property of

giving heat; so the patience and goodness of God produce two contrary effects in different individuals, being useful to the one, and rendering the other more guilty; hence it is said that some are thus converted and others hardened.”

Another difficult passage is that of Rom. viii. 28-30. “We know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose, for whom He did foreknow he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, . . . moreover, whom He did predestinate, them He also called, and whom He called, them He also justified, and whom He justified, them He also glorified.” On this text John Milton writes as follows, which seems to us a very good handling of it: “In the first place it must be remarked, that it appears from verse 28 that those who love God, are the same as those ‘who are the called according to His purpose,’ and consequently as those ‘whom He did foreknow,’ and ‘whom He predestinate,’ for them He also called, as is said in verse 30. Hence it is apparent that the apostle is here propounding the scheme and order of predestination in general, not of the predestination of certain individuals in preference to others. As if he had said, - We know that all things work together for good to those who love God, that is, to those who believe, for those who love God believe in Him. The order of this scheme is also explained. First: God foreknew those who should believe, that is, He decreed or announced it as His pleasure, that it should be those alone who should find grace in His sight through Christ, that is, all men if they would believe. These

He predestinated to salvation, and to this end, He, in various ways, called all mankind to believe, or, in other words to acknowledge God in truth, those who actually thus believed He justified; and those who continued in the faith unto the end He finally glorified. But that it may be more clear who those are whom God has foreknown, it must be observed that there are three ways in which any person or thing is said to be known of God. First, by his universal knowledge, as Acts xv. 18, known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world.’ Secondly, by His approving or gracious knowledge, which is a Hebraism, and therefore requires more explanation. Exod. xxxiii. 12. ‘I know thee by name and thou hast also found grace in my sight.’ Psalm i. 6. ‘Jehovah knoweth the way of the righteous.’ Matt. vii. 23. ‘I never knew you.’ Thirdly, by a knowledge attended with displeasure. Deut. xxxi. 21. ‘I know their imagination which they go about etc. 2 Kings xix. 27. ‘I know . . . thy coming in, and thy rage against me.’ Rev. iii. 1. ‘I know thy works, that thou hast a name that thou livest and art dead.’ In the passage under discussion it is evident that the approving knowledge of God can be alone intended; but He foreknew, or approved no one except in Christ, and no one in Christ except a believer.” Hence, the sum of the matter is this, God has elected all who believe, and has glorified those who hold fast their belief to the end.

Next: we cite Rom. ix. 11, 12, 13, “For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God, according to election might stand, not of works, but of Him that calleth. It was said unto her, the elder shall serve the younger, as it is written, Jacob have I loved but Esau have I hated.” The view of this passage from which we differ, asserts that, all conditions out of account, God determined to love and save Jacob, while he also resolved to hate and curse Esau. But no power of assertion can make this view of the matter avoid giving great offence to a mind at all tinctured with just ideas. To picture divine love acting thus is to degrade it to what we have seen in Nero and Henry the Eighth. Let us look carefully at the wording of the verse. God had said, the elder should serve the younger. Before they were born God said this, and He said it that the “purpose of election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth.” But what is here referred to by election? Is it the eternal and preordained salvation of Jacob and the eternal and pre-ordained destruction of Esau? By no means. It is clearly an election to the privileges of a firstborn. “The elder shall serve the younger.” God foresaw that this would be so, and spoke of it; but it will not do to say, on that account, that God forced Esau to sell his birthright, or that He forced Jacob to lie and deceive his father Isaac. Neither, if we take the statement to refer to the nation, can we maintain that the perdition of Esau was thus decreed. Paul shews here that God determined to exclude all men from attributing their election to their own works. Election comes first, then works. The foreknowledge of God was written concerning Jacob and Esau before they were born; His determination that the younger should become the first born was also written; but He did not hate Esau and love Jacob before they had done anything. Paul does not say this; he merely points out the right God had of primogeniture; but the history of Jacob and Esau shews that God’s choice was conditional.

When Paul says, “As it is written” etc., he quotes from Malachi. Now, Malachi spoke of these two brothers, not before they were born; but long after they were dead. Neither does he speak of election; but simply calls the attention of his nation to the fact that, though Esau was Jacob’s brother, yet God hated Esau. He then tells us how God’s hatred was manifested. “I laid his mountains and his heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness.” And when the Apostle mentions this hatred of God to Esau, he does not inform us that it existed while he and his brother were unborn; but adds it as a proof that what he had said before about the election of the one and the refusal of the other, was true. But this does not prove that

arbitrary love and hatred were in God's mind before the birth of Esau and Jacob; nor that it was thus after their birth. The gist of the matter is this: God foresaw what would be. He resolved thus and so according as he foresaw. His resolve was not arbitrary but conditional. The life of Esau and Jacob voluntarily produce these conditions, and the blessing and cursing followed in agreement thereto.

Paul anticipates the very objection which arises out of the supposed arbitrary power of God. "Why then doth He yet find fault? for who then hath resisted His will?" This question assumes that it was God's will to make Pharaoh wicked. But this is false. This wickedness was Pharaoh's; the mercy, endurance, and long suffering, were God's. Upon such a man as Pharaoh this produced just what God foresaw it would. "I know," said God, "Pharaoh will not let you go." On a lower scale, we have many instances of this in the ordinary incidents of life. A son often construes the kindness and forbearance of his father into weakness, and so continues reckless. An army interprets a retreat to mean fear, and pursues to its own destruction. Then why not have adopted other measures? This was the case. We behold "both the goodness and severity of God." Under the latter, Pharaoh relented. Justice then demanded the plague should be stayed; but no sooner was the plague stayed than this kindness hardened Pharaoh's heart: to repeat Theodoret's saying, "as the sun hardens mud, while by the same power it melts wax." A calm consideration clears God from all cruelty or despotism, and shews both His justice and mercy all the more vividly by contrast with Pharaoh's tyranny and rebellion.

To be continued.

POLITICAL SIGNS.

BY DR. HAYES.

THERE is perhaps no surer indication that we are approaching the close of the "Times of the Gentiles" than the existing agitation among the Jews, whose minds have been aroused to the project of agricultural pursuits in the Holy Land by a recent letter from Colonel Gawler to Sir Moses Montefiore. The scheme proposed for the more general cultivation of the land in Palestine being highly approved by Sir Moses, the letter of Colonel Gawler was laid before the members of the Board of Deputies, who after passing a vote of thanks to the Colonel and greatly applauding his scheme, directed that it should be printed and circulated among the members of the Board.

The writer of the letter in question, it may be mentioned, is the son of Colonel Gawler, formerly Governor of South Australia, and the author of a very interesting pamphlet on Palestine, in which the future prospects of that country are discussed from a prophetic point of view. The same gentleman was also a friend of Sir Moses; he accompanied him on some of his travels and has evinced great interest in the Jews.

In this letter Colonel Gawler states that the subject is now occupying the attention of many thousands of Jews and Gentiles, and then, after alluding to the recent distress, which as usual has been most severely felt at Jerusalem, he goes on to say, "the remedies for the sad condition of affairs in the Holy Land, were agriculture and employment of labour. How to bring it about constituted the main difficulty. But my task is comparatively easy. I have not now to prove that the Holy Land is fertile, nor that land may be obtained on most favourable terms by grant from Government - witness M. Netter and various religious institutions; or from tribes or communities by lease or purchase - witness sundry German settlers of late. It may be well, however, to give the law on the subject of land tenure. In 1845, at page 15 of his pamphlet my father stated - 'While on the one hand, it is contrary to the letter of the Ottoman Law that foreigners should hold land in freehold; it is, on the other, conformable to long established practice that they should occupy such property on tenures nominally temporary, but amounting, in fact, to freehold possession.' And this has been further improved of late years. By a convention, dated July 1868, Englishmen, as well as the subjects of other States who sign the convention, may now acquire real property in Turkey, and there now, I think, seems fair reason to assume that what fell through in by-gone years, need not do so now. The old plan requires modification to meet altered conditions, many of the old difficulties no longer exist, and altogether circumstances are more favourable.

"The question of protection from the Arabs was formerly the great stumbling-block; but the increased activity of the Turkish Government has entirely removed this obstacle, as is abundantly testified by the numbers of travellers for pleasure and pilgrimage, who flock through the Holy Land, and whose numbers increase yearly. The energetic M. Netter, the German brotherhood, and the various Missionary establishments, are not molested on their property, nor has any violence been offered to the Palestine

Exploration, whose scattered survey parties of two or three Europeans would be a tempting bait, and their proceedings and use of instruments strange and suspicious enough to rouse the jealousy or fanaticism of the Arabs, if they were ill-disposed or were under inefficient control.

“In the Consular Reports on Manufactures and Commerce, No. 1, 1873, Vice-Consul Green, writing from Damascus, reports that even in the remote Hauran, beyond the Jordan, “the Bedouin tribes of the Syrian and Arabian deserts have lately voluntarily submitted to the authority of the Governor General, and placed many of their strongholds in the hands of the Turkish soldiers. A new department has been formed out of the desert districts; and an energetic sub-governor named to rule over it. Such of the Bedouins as may wish to abandon a roving life, or to have lands allotted to them, and to be supplied with oxen, agricultural implements, and seed; a considerable number of them have also been embodied in the Zabtieh force, or provincial constabulary, and have consented to abandon their native dress, and assume the imperial uniform. The present moment is therefore very propitious for the prosecution of public works in the Bedouin territories, and the Governor General has been ordered by the Porte to connect at once, by the construction of a telegraph-line, Damascus with the holy cities of Medina and Mecca.

“The pith of the present plan is the holding out of inducements to the employers of labour to enter into an enterprise, more or less with their own resources, in one of the most productive countries in the world, almost desolate though it be, which however is amply counter-balanced by the following facts. 1. It is now in telegraphic communication with all parts of the world. 2. It has an extensive sea board, with several ports in use, and others (though small) which only require repair to make them again available. 3. It is within a few days’ journey, by regular steam communication, with the chief cities of Europe. I would here notice a prospectus, now in private circulation, for the construction of a railway from Jaffa to Jerusalem, passing to Ramleh, Lydda, and Yalo. The scheme includes the construction of a breakwater and pier to improve the harbour of Jaffa. In 1872, by the official returns, the number of steamers that visited Jaffa amounted to 171; sailing vessels and small craft, to 1,073; the trade about 35,000 tons, and the number of pilgrims and tourists proceeding through Jaffa, 36,374.”

The Consular Report for 1873 on the Siwa, or minor province of Jerusalem, states that the production of that district to be - olive oil, wheat, barley, sesame, and maize. The cotton grown in Nablous amounted in that year to between 600,000 and 700,000 “okes” (an oke is $2\frac{3}{4}$ lbs). It is raised from native seed of inferior quality, and sent chiefly to Marseilles. There has been no good Government effort to promote its cultivation. With good seeds and proper instruction and implements, cotton might be successfully and extensively grown.

“In the statement, January, 1874, of the Palestine Exploration Fund, Lieut. Conder, reporting, page 11, on the country bordering on the coast between Jaffa and Carmel, mentions, among other evidences, “the great wine vats hewn in rock on flat places, which attest the ancient fruitfulness of this deserted land.”

“Bitumen and sulphur are mentioned frequently in the Consular Reports, and by many travellers, as abounding, but almost untouched. And within the last few days I have been informed by the officer in charge of the Palestine Exploration, and who has just come to England for a brief respite from his labours during the summer, that red copper (oxide) has been found in the neighbourhood of Sidon, and a seam of coal in its proximity; the discovery has been taken up by a company, principally English, formed in Beyrout and Egypt. Who will deny that the Holy Land was once, and may be again, ‘a land of vineyards and olive trees’? But they at present import wines from France. Good ‘Kasher’ wine from the Holy Land would find a large market especially for Passover use, and very probably, for extensive use among Christians; citron and palm branches likewise during the Feast of Tabernacles. M. Netter finds a good market for oranges, etc., already springing out of the Suez Canal traffic; cotton of suitable quality would be absorbed as fast as it could be produced; and wheat, barley, maize, etc., would never lack a market anywhere.

“Here, then, is a field for the agriculturist from the British Isles, Germany, or Russia, the cotton growers from America; the fruit, olive and wine growers from France, Italy, and other parts of Europe. If, therefore, it seems that there is sufficient protection, and that the present condition of affairs, as regards acquirement; of land, the laws and taxes are such that Europeans might devote themselves to agriculture in the Holy Land, with prospects of considerable profits to themselves and advantage to the Government, let a society be formed for the encouragement of such; not for the capitalist who will buy a tract of country and live away from it, but, for the man who will live on his own property or leasehold, who understands his business, and will employ labour. The object of the Society might be, the promotion of agriculture in the Holy Land, and the industrial occupation of its indigent Jewish population.”

The above account of the present position and prospects of the Holy Land as a field for colonization, and the profitable pursuit of agriculture and other industries is cheering, and will call up before the mind

of the student of prophecy the numerous predictions concerning the future prosperity and blessedness of Jehovah's Land.

Not only the Jewish, but the English press has called attention to this matter as a sample of which we refer to a leading article lately polished in the Daily Telegraph, in which a powerful appeal was made to the British public on behalf of the Holy Land.

Another indication of the coming overthrow of the existing order of things in Church and State, is to be found in the unsettled condition of the religious world generally. There is a terrible shaking among the dry bones of orthodoxy. A spirit of enquiry is abroad, which is fatal to the pretensions of the spiritual leaders of the people, many of whom are either becoming indifferent to their ministrations or altogether sceptical. Christendom (so-called) is in a state of ferment. The dogma of an "immortal soul" is rejected by increasing numbers. A few years ago to preach the doctrine of the absolute mortality of man was to encounter an amount of clamour and opposition, which but few had the moral courage to provoke; now the same doctrine is calmly debated in public, and influential men among dissenters are openly declaring before their flocks their conviction of its truth. A striking instance of this lately occurred at the large meeting held in Chelsea, and presided over by Mr. S. Minton. Witness also the number of publications daily issuing from the press, contending for "Life in Christ, only." Scientific men are also contributing their quota to the general enlightenment. The admirable lectures of Professors Huxley, Tyndall, and others set forth truths, the result of careful observation and deduction, which, while dead against the long-cherished dogmas of the clergy, are, when rightly understood, in harmony with the inspired record concerning creation. Truly, it may be said in this day, many are running to and fro and knowledge is being increased.

Lastly, there are numerous causes in operation both in the East and in the West which prognosticate a storm. There is the Carlist insurrection in Spain, political complications in France, disputed succession in Turkey, Russian advances in Central Asia, and increase of armaments nearly everywhere. With the single exception of Denmark, every European State has considerably increased its military force during the last few years, so that Europe at the present time exhibits the spectacle of considerably more than six millions of men under arms, with every probability of still further augmentation. Russia is reported to have traversed the entire length of the river Oxus by steamer, thus bringing her close to the borders of Afghanistan. On this point the Daily Telegraph, of Sept. 1st, makes some pertinent observations which are worth quoting: - "Russia has opened the Oxus. Such is the latest news from Central Asia which has reached this country by way of North Germany. According to the telegrams certain dams have been removed by the intervention of an expedition sent to the great river in the interests of scientific research. The result gained is of immense importance, since thereby the force posted near Khiva city will have obtained secure communication with the Jaxartes. The statement is that the steamer Peroffski has actually floated over that portion of the river which has hitherto barred the way upwards, and that henceforth Russian craft can steam up as far as they please and show their flag on the frontier of Afghanistan. This very day a year ago Mr. Macgahan embarked from the Khivan shore with a party of officers and wounded, on his way to the Jaxartes. The whole body went in twenty large boats; they were bound for the Arab flotilla which lay in the lower waters of the Ulkan Darga, or Ulkun Oxus branch, and descended, partly aided by the current and partly by the use of oars. At night they landed, cooked their suppers, and slept ashore; by day they speeded along the lonely river. Throughout the voyage they met with no obstructions, and only opposite Kiptchack found a slight torrent, not sufficient to impede navigation.' There were 'no falls or rocks,' no hills except on the right bank a little below Kiptchack;' in fact, the river is perfectly navigable as high as Khiva.

"If that statement is correct, then the last shadow of Khivan independence vanished when the Peroffski steamed up the Ulkan Darga. The presence of a garrison in the newly annexed territory carried with it the security of submission on the Khan's part, and ever since the treaty was signed his sovereignty has been only a name. But the presence on the Oxus of war ships destroys all hope of future resistance, and such ideas are never absent from Asiatic minds, while it will bring additional pressure to bear on Bokhara, already sufficiently weighed down by the occupation of Sarmacand. Russia stipulated for the exclusive right of navigation on the Oxus, and she will not be slow to assert a power having a relation so important to her ulterior aims. It is hardly too much to say that the opening of the Oxus to steam navigation is an event which doubles the moral and physical force of Russia in Central Asia. The news, if true, will flit from lip to lip throughout the bazaars of India and Persia; it will be the talk of native Courts, and form a subject for deep reflection in State Cabinets. The smoke of the Peroffski above the reedy Oxus delta is the signal of coming trouble, since the long, black, waving flag foreshadows nothing save further progress in the stupendous career which Russia is so steadfastly bent on pursuing. The acquisition of the Khanates is only a stage in a great march towards other climes realms which will not be a burden but a

gain to the Exchequer, regions affording a better position whereon to establish that counter-check upon England so long foreseen to be the aim of Russian policy.

“The movement southwards, so rapid and successful, has been adopted of deliberate set purpose, with the manifest design of preparing difficulties for England, which will assume an active shape should the integrity of Turkey again become a question, or should an European quarrel arise between the two great Powers. The sweeping advances towards the Hindoo Koosh and the Persian frontier which have made the last twenty-five years so remarkable may have subsidiary aims, but the main object sought is the acquisition of a solid foothold as near the Indus as possible, with the distinct intention of hampering British action and curbing British power in, perhaps, a near future. The key to the Central Asian question lies on the Bosphorus. Its political interest is trivial apart from the fate of Persia and Turkey, and the bearing of that upon European independence, as well as British dominion in the Orient. Russia’s absorption of Central Asia or a large portion thereof, is assuredly pregnant with serious embarrassments to the British Empire, remote perhaps, but inevitable. It is positively absurd to suppose that one Power can approximate steadily towards the other, without affecting its status in the East, diminishing its security, and prospectively augmenting its burdens. The voyage of the Peroffski means dread in Persia, apprehension in Cabul, more or less solicitude in India, and no agreeable sensations in Stamboul. It is Russia’s sign-manual of Central Asiatic supremacy.”

BIBLE REDEMPTION.

BIBLE redemption is presented to us under three heads or essential points, which must be clearly understood and distinguished before the scheme as a whole can be discerned. These points are - 1st, those to be redeemed; 2nd, the redeemer, and 3rd, the ransom or price.

1st. - Those to be redeemed. Those embraced in the Divine scheme are the descendants of Adam, one and all, himself included; because all, without exception or distinction, were involved in the sin and consequences of one transgression. The consequences of one transgression are defined by the sentence, “Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.”

In the absence of any scheme of redemption, it is manifest that Adam and all his posterity would have returned to, and eternally remained in dust. There was no eye that could pity or power that could save from the just sentence of Almighty power.

The only one that could meet the case of the guilty pair was the Almighty Father Himself. His goodness, power, and wisdom were equal to their circumstances. He therefore devised and resolved upon a plan whereby He could be just, and the Justifier of everyone who accepted of His favour. The evidence of the Father’s determination to redeem is found in the statement He made before passing sentence, “The seed of the woman shall bruise the head of the serpent.” While in making coats of skin to cover them, He illustrated to their senses how He would effect their redemption. The promise given, and the illustration of its fulfilment in covering them with the skins of animals, which He either slew himself or caused to be slain, clearly shews that redemption was not simply a promise, but a promise typically fulfilled. It seems fair, therefore, to conclude that in these transactions the Almighty typically redeemed the human family, so that they henceforth stood before Him as covered from their transgression. He did not any more look upon their nakedness, but upon their coverings, which had been worn by innocent victims, whose blood had been shed for them. The Redeemer, therefore, was none other than He who caused the animals to be slain, and made their skin into coverings for the transgressors of His law.

This brings us to the consideration of the ransom. The typical ransom was the life of a lamb or lambs without blemish or spot. The real or antitypical ransom was the Lamb of God, or, as expressed by Peter, in writing to his brethren, “Ye were redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you.” The ransom must be the property of the ransomer or redeemer, otherwise the purchase could not be effected. It believed Jesus, therefore, to be the exclusive property of His Father in the matter of disposing of Him in any way He pleased. That such was the case is demonstrated by the pre-ordaining promise of a son given at first, and by the repeated after amplifications of it, detailing the time, manner, cause, and place of his birth, not one of which could have been either arranged or accomplished by any other being but the Almighty Himself. Jesus was not His own father. He did not preserve Himself from the jealousy of Herod; He did not educate Himself; He did not please Himself nor keep His own interests before His Father’s. The ransom being neither a dumb animal, which

knew nothing of the reason for which it was put to death, nor silver and gold, but a living, intelligent man, who had during his whole life pleased His Father, He could not be put to death by His Father as an act of justice. No clause in the Mosaic Law, or any other, commanded a son to die simply because his father wished him. Jesus Himself said, I have power to lay down my life. He did not lay down His life reluctantly as a matter of duty, but, as a freewill offering. He delighted to do His Father's will, because He knew that nothing short of His voluntarily giving up of His life could put away sin, or atone for the guilt of the first man. While Jesus had absolute power to allow or prevent men from taking His life from Him, He had no power to raise Himself from the dead. This was an act of favour on the part of the Redeemer similar to the act of His begetting in the womb of Mary. Hence, the Father said to Him on the morning when He raised Him,

“Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten Thee.” These three steps form the three-fold cord by which the Almighty kinsman has perfected His scheme of redemption, viz., His promise of a seed or Son to the woman. His word, or promise, made flesh when a child was born, and His begetting from the dead of this Son, who is consecrated for evermore the only name through whom any son or daughter of Adam can obtain redemption from sin and all its consequences, and become heirs of the eternal life promised before the foundation of the world.

Redemption is a gift. We cannot suppose of a compulsory gift. The Father was not compelled to give a son; neither, after having one, was He compelled to give Him up to death nor, after being dead, was He compelled to raise Him up again. These separate acts of favour have one source – the favour of God. Jesus Christ was not compelled to give Himself up to death for us. He freely gave Himself. Compulsion implies the power to enforce a demand. If the Father had compelled Jesus to give Himself up, or even backed His expressed will with a threat in case of non-compliance, the value of His self-sacrifice would have been destroyed. The act of Jesus, therefore, was a free-will offering. Jesus could neither demand nor compel His Father to raise Him from the dead. To demand is to assert a right. This Jesus could not do, inasmuch as He voluntarily gave up His life for those who deserved to die. While lying in the grave, He lay there in vindication of His Father's honour, and for this voluntary act of submission, God has exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name, that every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess that He is the Lord (possessor of the earth, with all its peoples and nations) to the glory of God the Father. From what has been written, it is manifest how God can be just, and also the Justifier of everyone who believes in Jesus as His ransom for the salvation of His sons who have rebelled against Him. He will not compel men to be saved any more than He compelled Jesus to die the just for the unjust, but He wishes the salvation of all, and has given ample evidence of power to do all His good pleasure.

Concerning this matter, the Apostle says “All things are of God, who hath reconciled us to Himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit – that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them.” The last phrase in this quotation illustrates the perfect character of God's scheme of redemption. God is reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them.” The world is in trespasses, but God does not impute them. This shows that they have been sacrificially removed, and that all that is accessory on the part of the world is, to know what He has done, and accept of His reconciliation. For He hath made Him sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him. The elliptical phrase “Made Him sin,” has given rise to the idea that Jesus Christ was made sin by being born of a woman. A more unreasonable construction of the Apostle's words could scarce be conceived. Human nature is not sin; neither is it a sinful thing to be born; and, besides, it was after Jesus had passed with success through trial that he was made sin. This clearly shows that He was made an offering for sin, or a sin-offering, but to have made Him sin in the manner supposed, would have defeated the purpose for which He was born.

W. ELLIS.

OUR OPINION OF CREEDS.

HAVING received of late several printed forms of creeds, we take occasion to express our opinion upon such documents in general, proceed from where they may. No form of faith was ever printed that was not found fault with, either as containing too much, or not enough, to say nothing about the endless disputes upon the wording of this or that proposition. And nothing is more objectionable than repairing and revising a form of faith. Whatever needs this is imperfect or incomplete. Creeds have been, and are still, among the curses of ecclesiastical experience. History abundantly shews that a form of faith is a

bone of contention, and generally fares like a political treaty - is torn up and burnt after much disturbance. All printed forms of faith are like water, coloured more or less with the channels through which they pass; some are tinged and impregnated with one element and borne with another, the clearness and parity being thereby affected. If men are not content with the Scriptures, nothing else will please them long, and if they are, nothing else is needful. As disputes will arise, let them be upon the original itself, not upon some secondary and man-framed basis. To make a separate form of faith insensibly lowers our esteem for the Bible, while it cannot give that reverence to it which we all feel for that great Book. Popish Breviaries, Imitations, Protestant Prayer Books, and Catechisms, are all the out-growth of the creed-concocting propensity, and the prime end of all these is the enforcing of their own diverse notions rather than a search of, and an abiding in, the Inspired Word alone. Business rules are more or less necessary; but give us no form of faith but the Bible. This is sufficient "for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

Editor.

EXHORTATION BY BRO. GLOVER, AT THE BREAKING OF BREAD.

WHEN Christ instituted this ordinance, He said, "Do this in remembrance of Me." From this we learn that the specific object of its institution was, to bring Christ to our remembrance. Not, however, that it may be inferred from this, that we may forget Him at other times. Indeed, we ought never to forget Him. It is true, that we cannot always be thinking of Him, inasmuch as other objects have a just claim upon our thoughts. But there is a sense in which perpetuity of remembrance does not depend upon continuance of thought in reference to the thing remembered. For instance, a father labouring away from home possibly may not think of his children during the whole of the day, and yet not, for one moment forget them, inasmuch as he does not forget to labour for the provision of their wants. Practically, he never forgets them: though mentally, he often does, and necessarily so.

It should be thus with us. In a practical sense, there ought not to be one moment of our forgetfulness of Him. We do not forget Him whilst we are at our post of duty, though that duty may not always be strictly of a religious character, providing that in the performance of the same we are seeking His glory rather than our own personal comfort and convenience.

We do not forget Him if our love towards Him form the mainspring of our spiritual life, by which our daily walk and conduct are regulated. We shall not fail to remember Him if we habitually cherish and manifest that meek, patient, kind, gentle, loving, forbearing spirit which characterised Him in His sojourn on earth.

But whilst there should be this constant practical remembrance of Him, it is needful also that there should be special seasons of remembrance, - regularly recurring seasons, when our mental faculties should be called into the liveliest exercise in remembering Him - when they should be called away from other objects towards which they may at other times be legitimately directed, and be concentrated on Him alone as the sole object of our heart's attraction. Such special seasons are every first day of the week when we meet around His table.

It must be borne in mind that it is not only our duty to remember Christ, but also to do so in His own appointed way. It is true, that a saunter in the fields and lanes with the Bible in our hand would furnish a very favourable opportunity of remembering Him, being so harmonious with the laws of health; and yet what is favourable and legitimate in itself would become a sin if indulged in to the neglect of this divine institution. If we have health and opportunity it is our solemn duty and should be felt our highest privilege to go where He has bidden us, and remember Him in the manner which He Himself has prescribed, for He said, do this in remembrance of Me.

We, therefore, meet at His table to eat and drink the emblems of His broken body and shed blood!

This bread, on account of its life-sustaining properties, very fitly represents Christ to us, of whom the Apostle says that "He is our life." Nothing can be found as an equivalent for bread for the sustentation of physical life, and hence it has been designated (and rightly too) the staff of life. And likewise, it is only by our union with Christ that we can live spiritually. Spiritual life has its origin in a saving acquaintance with Him; and eternal life will be bestowed by Him. The wine represents to us the means by which this life is secured to us, namely, by the sacrifice of His own. Eternal life could not be imparted unless sin was

remitted, and His blood was the price paid to meet the requirements of the Law, that “Without the shedding of blood there is no remission.”

The price was valueless in itself, but precious indeed, and efficacious to the cleansing of sin through being the blood of a sinless victim, and the Father’s only begotten.

How infinite His love, how glorious the prize He died to procure us; not a temporary life, but an eternal one – an immortal life through a painless, luminous, and incorruptible body in the Kingdom of God.

Surely a contemplation of these glorious truths is calculated to nerve us for the work set before us.

PUBLIC DEBATE ON THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL

Between Mr. Hitchcock of Nottingham, a leading Spiritualist, and Brother E. Turney; in the Peoples’ Hall. Brother J. L. in the chair. December 16th, (about) 1866.

THIS debate came about in the following manner: Mr. Hitchcock came to the Sunday morning previous to the 16th, and while the worship was in progress, rose and asked permission to read a chapter. Bro. E. Turney who was presiding, informed him that would not be in order to do so at that time, whereupon he resumed his seat. But at the close of the meeting, Brother Hopcroft, invited Mr Hitchcock to say what he had desired to say or read. Mr Hitchcock then proceeded to remark that he did not believe in the second coming of Christ, though he had believed it in time past. Neither did he believe that a Saviour was necessary to man. On the contrary, man was naturally immortal, and so certain was he of this that if the meeting would go with him through some arguments, he had no doubt of being able to demonstrate the truth of his assertions as plainly and conclusively as that “two and two make four.

At this point Bro. Turney observed that the present was not a proper opportunity to remain while Mr. Hitchcock argued the question, but that the brethren would be glad to give him a chance of doing so at their Wednesday-night meeting. Mr. Hitchcock at once accepted the offer, and challenged us to discussion. He was quite prepared at any time we might choose to fix. Bro. Turney replied that he would be glad to meet him himself at 8 o’clock on that night, and it was instantly agreed that the two hours should be divided into quarters. Mr. Hitchcock might have his choice of the question, and he chose the soul’s immortality first.

There was a large attendance on the Sunday night to hear the lecture by Bro. Turney, which was “the blood of Christ cleanseth us from all sin.” “Repentance and Baptism.” The president, Bro. Isaac Turney announced the discussion at the close of the lecture. This, with Bro. E. Turney’s own invitation to Mr. Hitchcock to bring all the friends he could raise, was the cause of quite a crush to hear the discussion. The room was full almost to suffocation, and some say there were more outside than in. The interest appeared to be very great.

Bro. J. Lovett having been elected to the chair, rose and made the following observations, Ladies and Gentlemen, I had much rather you had placed a more competent person in this important post. But as you are unanimously agreed that I should occupy it, I will promise to do the best I can, and if I should be deficient in any respect, I must crave your indulgence. The question to be discussed by Mr. Hitchcock and Mr. E. Turney is the natural immortality of man. I need not say that this is a very important and solemn question. We ought to be desirous of arriving at the truth upon it, and one good way of doing so is to hear it freely discussed. I must beg you to hear both parties attentively and patiently, and feel sure that in some way or other you will be enlightened, and I trust, ultimately benefited. I now beg to call upon Mr. Hitchcock to open the subject.

Mr. Hitchcock: - Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, When I attended the Christadelphian meeting on Sunday morning, I asked to be allowed to read a portion of scripture, but the chairman, Mr. Turney, replied that it would be inconvenient then. So I sat down. But at the close, being invited to make some observations, I stated that I did not believe in the second coming of Christ, or in the immortality of the soul. I did not think that what transpired then would have led to this discussion; but it was agreed that Mr. Turney and myself should debate one of these questions to-night, and the question chosen was “the immortality of the soul.” Now, if I had my choice, I would rather discuss this question from a scientific point of view. Still I do not object to go into it upon a scripture basis. Perhaps Mr. Turney may have the best of the argument in that way, but I think by far the greater number of passages would be found on my

side. But there are texts on both sides, and that is why I would have wished to take the matter in hand scientifically. I will now read you something from a book I have here, and you can look at the quotations.

Mr. Hitchcock now read rapidly, and for the remainder of the time from a volume on spiritualism, giving chapter and verse without the texts, so that it was impossible, except in a few cases, to refer to anything cited.

Mr. Turney: - Ladies and Gentlemen. When Mr. Hitchcock challenged me to discuss the question of the soul's natural immortality, I was led to expect that in his opening remarks he would have stated his proposition plainly, and then as plainly have brought forward his proofs. I am not accustomed to public debate, this being the first in which I have been engaged, so that my notion may be somewhat incorrect. At any rate, I thought that the course I have pointed out must, in effect, be the course to be followed in the investigation of our subject. I need hardly tell you and my opponent - for both you and he must have already observed it - that the mode referred to has not been adopted, at all events in Mr. Hitchcock's opening speech. Perhaps he will be kind enough to bear this in mind while I have the honour of addressing you, and be prepared with something more relevant next time. I must not, however, omit to observe what course Mr. Hitchcock did take. In a certain sense it was a spiritual course, if not a scriptural one. He has treated us to a written description, of modern spiritualism, and I regret that my memory is not good enough to retain, even for this short space, all the statements made. But I was not expecting to be called upon to combat a book on spiritualism rapidly read and then shut up. It is not, I dare say, a mode of warfare, which Mr. H. anticipated I myself should employ. Several references have been made in the lengthy reading to scripture, and as far as I can recollect them I will give them my attention. Of course, though very vaguely dealt with, it is understood that they are authorities for Mr. Hitchcock's view of the soul. He holds that they do teach the soul's natural immortality. But before we believe this, we ought to look carefully at them for ourselves and only believe it when we have proved it to be the truth. "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good," or true says the Apostle Peter, alluding to spiritual things. If we affirm the soul of man to be mortal, we must prove it to be so - that is to say - we must show plainly from the word of God who made the soul that He made it mortal. Now, this is what I am prepared to do without the aid of science, though science, properly understood, must agree with the divine word and revelation. No inconsiderable part of an argument sometimes consists in silence. But silence must not always be understood to mean consent. If, however, we find complete silence in regard to one side of a subject, and, at the same time, numerous plain and positive statements on the other, then I say, silence is to be construed into an argument in favor of the teaching of the positive texts. And to apply that remark forthwith, I would observe, that the scripture from Genesis to Revelation, contains not a single passage in which are to be found the words "immortal soul - immortality of the soul - never dying soul - departed spirit - spirit-home - spirit-land" - and such like expressions constantly falling from the lips of modern Christians, and especially of spiritualists. Now, if this doctrine is of vital and paramount importance as represented on all hands, and by persons professing to believe the scriptures, is it not remarkable that none of the words nor their equivalents are to be found between the lids of the only original authority upon the subject? It seems to me, and I think will upon reflection, to some of you, a silence of a most extraordinary kind. But, however powerful that silence may appear to be, we ought not to be content with it alone. But when we look at what is said, I think the entire absence of such statements as those I have recited will strike you as being harmonious and of great power. Let us now turn to the Book, and take first the 27th verse of the 1st chapter of Genesis, one of the verses quoted by Mr. Hitchcock in support of the soul's immortality, - "So God created man in His own image; in the image of God created He him, male and female created He them." I suppose Mr. Hitchcock means to say that, because God is immortal and man is in God's image man is immortal also. That is a singular mode of reasoning, truly. Are there no senses in which man can be in the image of his Maker without being like his Maker in nature? Man is like or in the image of God in those things which relate to his moral responsibility, which I need not enumerate, not to mention that man is like the Deity in his physical form, for we read of the head, foot, hand, eye, mouth, and so forth of the Deity, terms which mean just what they say. Jesus, the second Adam was "the express image of His Person." But to let Mr. Hitchcock have his way of reading the text, I would ask him how we are to understand the words, male and female created He them?" Man was a part of the creation, and it will be instructive to look at somewhat of the account of the formation of other animals besides man. We shall find that of whatever kind or shape they may be, they are all possessed of one thing and that is a living soul. Read the 20th verse of the 1st of Genesis, "and God said, let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life (margin, living soul) and fowl that may fly," etc. Now, the 30th verse, "And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to everything that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life" (margin, living soul). I may say that the reason of living soul being found in the margin when, birds, beasts, and fishes are spoken of, as well as man, is that in the language Moses wrote

the same word is employed in each and every instance. Hence all animals have living souls, the same as man. The testimony of God declares it, and we cannot set it on one side. This is a very important piece of information, inasmuch as it prohibits our coming to the conclusion that man's soul is imperishable. In the mere matter of life, or soul, man hath no pre-eminence above a beast, as the wise man tells us in Ecclesiastes, iii. 19. Further: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul" ii., 7. This says nothing of the soul's natural immortality; but it says that the man of dust became a living soul. Now I would add, that to the man - that is, to the living soul - God said, "thou shalt surely die." This leaves no manner of doubt as to the soul's entire mortality, for had it been immortal, it could not have died. Jesus says they which are immortal cannot die any more. The living souls spoken of could not therefore have been never-dying souls. "Dust they are, and to dust they must return." [Time called.]

Mr. Hitchcock: - Ladies and Gentlemen, - Mr. Turney has said that I thought he might have the best of the argument in appealing to the Bible for proof. But what I said was, that though I should prefer the scientific to the Bible plan, I believed that most of the texts would be found on my side. The passage in Genesis has not been correctly read. Mr. Turney reads it dust of the ground, but there is no "of" in the original. If he tells me that God made man of dust, I want to know how He made him. Let Mr. Turney tell me how the dust stuck together? As the child remarked, I should think the dust must have been wet. Now I profess to be as simple as a child, and I want to be enlightened. There are numerous passages showing the existence of spirits, and that the soul lives after death. Take, for instance, the account of Saul and Samuel, the interview between Jesus and His disciples when they thought they saw a spirit. If Jesus were not a spirit, how is it that none but His disciples could discern Him. Doubtless they only could see Him because He was a spirit, and they were in a proper state, and could spiritually behold Him. Then again there is the appearance of Moses and Elias on the Mount; also the fact of many spirits being seen after the crucifixion. There are many cases on record besides what we find in the scriptures, where persons have appeared from the spirit-world. And surely their statements are as reliable as those of other men. When a respectable man tells us that he has seen a friend and conversed with him whom he knew in the flesh, how can we disbelieve his statement? There are thousands of such cases attested by persons whose word is as worthy of reliance as any man's who ever lived. What does Mr. Turney make of these things? Is there not as much evidence to attest the truth of spiritualism as there was to support Christianity in the first ages of our era? And why need this generation be so astonished at the wonderful revelations of spiritualism now? Did not Christianity astonish thousands in its origin? But instead of handling these things, Mr. Turney has taken up his time by introducing a theory of his own. As he has thought proper to do so, I will now introduce mine. Mr. H. then proceeded to read for the remainder of his time from the same work, which gave instances of spiritual communications, and dealt very copiously in interrogatories similar to those in his last reply. [Time called.]

Mr. Turney: - Ladies and gentlemen, - The first point I would notice in my present answer is a statement made by Mr. Hitchcock that in the Bible there were passages both for and against the soul's immortality. It would have been more satisfactory if Mr. Hitchcock had selected one or two specimens for our consideration. If he really believes that to be a fact I wonder why he should refer us to such a book. A book that deals in contradictions cannot be regarded as an authority. I take the liberty to say that if Mr. Hitchcock better understood the scriptures he would not have made an assertion involving such grave consequences. What is the value of such a statement coming from a man who has professed his belief in the Bible as the word of God? What can be Mr. Hitchcock's notion of the Deity? How can he trust Him either in word or anything else? Let him ponder this a little"! I have been found fault with for putting into the text in Genesis a word too much. But the charge is quite a mistake. Those of you who have Bibles will please to notice that the word objected to is in italic letters, by which it is understood not to be in the original. But who put it there? There are many passages containing such words, which are understood to convey the sense more fully than the bare original would do if put down into our own tongue by itself. But in numbers of instances the taking out of those words does not at all impair the sense of the text. If Mr. Hitchcock would like the passage better without the word "of" he can have it so. But he will not find that the verse then affirms the immortality of the soul. It would almost appear more striking in the opposite direction. "The Lord God formed man out of the dust of the ground." What can be plainer as to the constitution of man? Man's foundation was in the dust, and his termination will be in the dust also. I am almost ashamed to make even a passing allusion to Mr. H.'s remarks about the dust sticking together. I am much surprised that he could have descended so low. Does he believe in the power of God to execute His own will? If so, there is no difficulty. Truly I cannot inform him how, or by what process, the Deity formed flesh from dust, neither can anyone else, so I am not behind in that matter. But because we cannot understand the process by which a thing is made, are we to deny that it has been made? I am

sure Mr. H. would not like to take up that position himself. If Mr. Hitchcock wants to be enlightened, as he tells us, concerning man, let him read the scriptures; they are able to make him wise unto salvation. Let me now show you that Mr. Hitchcock does not know a spirit when he sees one. He is quite mistaken as to the nature of a spirit, although he professes to know that they are very fond of disturbing furniture. They seem to have a special fancy for chairs and tables. Banging ones traps about does not strike me as very celestial or honourable employment for residents of spirit-land. But let us look at the text referred to. You will find it in the 37th and 39th of the 24th chapter in Luke. I will read it: "But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit." Now, Mr. H. wants to know whether Jesus was not a spirit? Hear what Jesus says to the terrified disciples: "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I, myself; handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as you see me have." Jesus was unquestionably a spirit. His body was spiritual, or immortal. It was not however, composed of gas through which you might pass your hand without feeling anything, but He was real flesh and bone without blood, for that had been shed some days before. It needed no extraordinary condition to see Jesus, and if Mr. H. wants to know why none but the disciples saw Him, I should say it was because they were not present. As to the case of Moses and Elias, they were both men like ourselves. We read that Moses died and was buried, but that Elias was taken up into heaven. For Moses to be seen anywhere he must of necessity have been raised. I do not care whether you say it was soul or body that was Moses. Whichever it was that constituted Moses, it died and was buried. We know where the death took place, but are not told where the grave was. Now, even a spiritualist would not assert that it was the spirit that was buried, and if not, then the spirit was not Moses, for it was Moses himself whom God buried. In regard to the prophet Elias, it would be necessary for him to present himself to view again. Mr. H. wants to know what I make of the accounts he has told us regarding spiritual manifestations. Well, I have no trouble with them, for they flatly contradict the word of God, and therefore, I cannot believe them, the excellent authority upon which they are based notwithstanding. I shall conclude this reply by inviting your attention to some more of what Mr. H. has erroneously styled "my theory." Seeing that the scripture declares that man returns to dust, it follows that after death he is non-existent, and in case of no resurrection he is extinct, or annihilated. I beg you not to take fright at this, for, as I will plainly shew, it is taught positively, as well as inferentially in many portions of the word of God. Job says, (ch. 4, 17) shall MORTAL man be more just than God? And of certain characters he testified in the 20th verse, "they perish for ever." Now, it is held by immortal soulists that the veritable 'me,' the 'I,' and so forth is the imperishable soul. Did Job so understand it? Let us ask him. Addressing his Maker, Job says, remember, I beseech Thee, that Thou hast made ME as the CLAY; and wilt Thou bring ME into dust again? Chap. x. 9. Some people wonder what death is; they are downright puzzled with giving up the ghost. Job makes the matter very plain. He says in chap. xi. 20: "But the eyes of the wicked shall fail, and they shall not escape, and their hope shall be as the giving up of the ghost." (Margin, "a puff of breath"). Now, that is the ghost, and it is nothing more. Again, Job says, "Wherefore hast Thou brought me forth out of the womb? Oh, that I had given up the ghost, and no eye had seen me!" Well, we may ask what would have been the after state of Job? Hear his answer. "I should have been as though I had NOT BEEN." x. 18, 19. – [Time called.]

Mr. Hitchcock: - Ladies and Gentlemen, Mr. Turney has not taken up the texts which I particularly wished he would do. I mean the appearance of Samuel, and the appearance of those spirits at the crucifixion. I hope he will do so next time. I should not like to believe Mr. Turney's doctrine. It is so gloomy. According to him, when we are dead we are done with. I feel a longing for immortality, and therefore I know I shall have it. I am as sure of it as if I had already got it. My view of the soul fills us with hope, and if I knew it were not true, I would rather have it than Mr. Turney's, for the comfort it gives in this life. What is the advantage of trying to do good and to live in a Christian way, if there is no hereafter - if we are never to live anymore? If that is truth, I cannot think God is just, for those who strive to do right are no better off than those who lead a carnal life. Mr. Turney does not believe in the manifestations of the spirit. Had not the Christians in the Apostles' days spiritual gifts, and why can we not have them now? Was it all to be confined to that generation? We know that they could heal the sick and do many wonderful things, and why cannot God's people do so now? God is a spirit, and that spirit is intelligence. That spirit permeates all things. It is found in animals and plants. It is even in wood, as this table. Then we can learn from the spirit in the table if we choose, and when a number of persons unite in one mind they can hold spiritual conversation through this table. I did not once believe these things, but I am obliged to do so now, for I have proved them to be true. By this means we can hold converse with the spirits of our friends who have died years ago. Man knows that he possesses this spirit. He feels that he has it. I am sure of it, and therefore I do not want any proof. Man is not like other animals. He has conscientiousness. This tells him what is right and what is wrong. He does not require the Bible to do this. If he will consult the spirit it will guide him right. Man is wonderfully formed. He has two beings,

that is, both sides are alike. In fact man is double. He has two hearts, two livers, two lungs. He is double in all things. There is the inward man, and the outward man. These are separate and can live apart. The inward is independent of the outward. Man is the same as the flowers; they bloom, die, or seem to die, and come to life again. It is merely a change from one sphere to another.

[We publish this without alteration or addition as written from memory at the time. It is unfinished; for we remember ours was the last speech. Although it deals with what to many of our readers is a well understood subject, there are many others on the lookout for something on this topic to whom it may not be dry reading. The year is not set down, but we believe it was about 1866.]

THE SEVENTH CHAPTER OF ROMANS.

“THIS seventh chapter of Romans is almost a touchstone by which a man’s whereabouts in spiritual understanding may be ascertained.” So asserts the editor of the Christadelphian, in an article which appeared in the September number of his periodical. Now suppose we endeavour to ascertain the writer’s “whereabouts” on the principle laid down by himself in reference to this chapter. While with many of his comments we can quite agree; on the other hand there are some from which we altogether dissent; and with the latter it is that we have mainly to deal. The editor starts well by observing that “this chapter forms part of a chain of reasoning, but may, nevertheless, be considered apart without disadvantage, if its relation to the chain is recognised.” He thinks it presents an illustration of Peter’s remark about the Epistles of Paul, in his second letter, third chapter, and sixteenth verse, which is not improbable. However that may be, certain it is the chapter under consideration has been found somewhat difficult of interpretation, for there has been much contention about it, even among those believed to possess spiritual discernment. There are some indeed who have gone the length of quoting the Apostle’s words in justification of their own evil practices, and such persons would thereby seem to belong to the class denounced by Peter as the “unlearned and unstable (who) wrest (this), as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction.” No doubt it requires spiritual-mindedness to understand Paul’s statements and to see their truth, as the Editor observes, but at the same time we must be careful to distinguish between the statements of an Apostle and those which are made by uninspired men, however high their reputation for “spiritual-mindedness.” To elucidate his idea that “a carnal man does not know what a carnal nature is,” the editor brings forward a lion, which beast, he says, “does not know itself a lion, though it be such,” The illustration, however, is not apt. The parallel would be, a man does not know himself a man, though he be such. But this is not true, so we will dismiss the illustration and enquire what “a carnal man” really is. Paul defines him as one who minds the things of the flesh, who fulfils the desires of the flesh or who does the works of the flesh; and of these works he gives a long catalogue in the fifth chapter of his Epistle to the Galatians. Now, when a man lives in the practice of the vices enumerated, does he not know that he is guilty in these particulars, and that he is gratifying the appetites of his carnal nature? Does not an adulterer know that he is an adulterer, a murderer that he is a murderer, a drunkard that he is a drunkard? Undoubtedly he does, and not only so, but he will often take the greatest pains to conceal his iniquities from the eyes of others. In the same way a man who takes no heed to religion is fully aware of the fact. How common it is to hear such a man say openly: - I am a man of the world, I am not a religious man. We maintain then, that a carnal man is not ignorant that he is carnal, but that his ignorance consist in his being unacquainted with divine things, and this is in perfect harmony with the Apostle’s teaching that “The natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God; for they are foolishness to him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.”

In writing to the saints at Rome the Apostle was addressing himself to a mixed assembly, composed partly of Jews and partly of Gentiles, a circumstance which gave rise to many disputes between them, and caused the Apostle to pen much that he has written not only in this Epistle to the Romans but also in others of his letters. While the Jews would in all probability be conversant with the law of Moses, such would not be the case with the Gentiles, and we believe it is for this reason that, in addressing them collectively in the parenthetic words of the first verse, Paul does not say, “I speak to them that know the law,” but “I speak to them that know law,” there being no article in the original: thus alluding to law, as we conceive, in a more general and extended sense, and not specially to the law of Moses. The illustration of marriage, as used by the Apostle, would be readily understood by both classes, and would prepare their minds for the argument that was to be based upon it. In subsequent verses, beginning at the fourth, it is

evident the Apostle referred particularly to his Jewish brethren, for to only had Jehovah sustained the character of a husband. Thus, in speaking to the nation by His Prophet Isaiah, God declared, "Thy Maker is thy husband." (Isaiah liv. 5). The Jews then stood in the relation of a "married wife" to the Almighty, and such being the nature of the union between Him and them, the law had dominion over them as long as they lived. In Paul's illustration, therefore, it follows that the woman is representative of the Jewish nation, and the husband is Jehovah; who may be said to have died representatively in the person of Christ. At this crisis the law was abrogated and the Jews became free to be married to another, "even to Him who is raised from the dead." The Jews died legally and the Christ died really, "blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to His Cross." (Col. ii. 14.) In this manner, then, the bond of union, or old covenant between God and His people was dissolved and the new covenant, or law of the Spirit of Life, in Christ Jesus, brought into force. In the prescribed way, that is, by Baptism into Christ, the Jews individually could be united to another, although nationally in the condition of a widow, and thus desolate they must remain until the time indicated by the Prophet Ezekiel when the Lord will bring the whole house of Israel into the bond of the covenant. Ez. xx. 51.

With respect to the death of Christ the editor says, "When He rose again, He was 'another man' in relation to what He had been before, a free man by marriage with whom we may obtain freedom also." Which, of course, implies that he was previously a bond man. But to be under law is not necessarily to be in bondage. The first Adam was placed under law: but will anyone venture to say that he was in bondage before he transgressed? Paul rejoiced in a certain law which had introduced him to a state of freedom. By implication, we are accused of teaching "it would have been sufficient to be married to the first Christ - Christ before crucifixion," which is about the most monstrous charge that has yet been brought against us. Such a charge involves the absurdity that Baptism into Christ before He suffered would have been efficacious as a means of salvation; and thus, in effect, entirely overturns the plan of redemption; for a belief so "vain" would render the death of Christ unnecessary, leave the promises unconfirmed, and falsify the divine word, which proclaims from Genesis to Revelation, that without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins! The imputation, however, is one "carrying weight only with the simple." We do, indeed, teach that Christ was "free," the free-born Son of God, and that He never lost that freedom by any act of transgression; maintaining, with the Editor, that Christ was not "a sinner by birth, or any other means." See *Christadelphian* for June, p. 281. Even here the writer is not consistent with himself, for in the very next sentence, he affirms, "I believe He (Christ) inherited in His flesh the result of Adam's sin as we do." Other contradictions occur in the same paragraph of this June number; but the above sample of the Editor's "spiritual discernment" may suffice for the present. The next statement we have to combat is that Christ was "subject to death like his brethren." The words which we have italicised are added by the writer to those of Paul in Gal. iv. 4, where, speaking of the Son of God, the Apostle says, He was "made under the law." Heb. ii. 9, 14, 16, are also quoted in the same connection; but these passages fail to establish the likeness contended for. What they certainly prove is that He was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death; that He was a partaker of flesh and blood, and of the seed of Abraham; which was requisite in order that the purpose of God in Him might be fulfilled. But, unlike his brethren, His death was sacrificial; a sin offering for the sins of others, and a voluntary act of obedience to the will of His Heavenly Father. His own words prove this: "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself; I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father." John x. 17, 18. Could Jesus have uttered such words as these if he had been "like his brethren" - already dead in Adam? Impossible: there is no parallel between the two cases. Apart from His mission, there was no reason why Jesus should die; for death is the wages of sin, and He was without sin. On these grounds, then, we hold that Christ was not "subject to death like His brethren."

Passing over matters concerning which there is no dispute among us, "we must pause a moment," as the Editor says, to consider the "I" of this (the seventh) and the succeeding eighteen verses. We concur with him in so far that in some of those verses "Paul speaks of himself at different stages of his life." The question, however, arises - Does the Apostle refer to himself exclusively or, does he not also speak of others in a similar position to himself; making the "I" of these passages representative of a class? Further, was not Paul an "unregenerate man" at one period of his existence? Was he not in this condition when he describes himself as "a blasphemer, a persecutor, and injurious"? We question whether the Editor's "very rapid glance" has not been rather too "rapid," and whether the charge of using "the language of Ashdod" does not recoil upon his own head? Did Paul himself "with the mind serve the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin" (verse 25) at any stage of his life? Hear what the Apostle says about the matter. "There is, therefore, no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but

after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." Rom. viii. 1, 2. "I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection." 1 Cor. ix. 27. "Ye are witnesses, and God also, how holily, and justly and unblameably we behaved ourselves among you that believe." 1 Thess. ii. 10. "This say I, then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh." Gal. v. 16. "Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ." 1 Cor. xi. 1. "I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your BODIES a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service." Rom. xii. 1. These quotations show conclusively that Paul, having been made free from the law of sin and death, not only served God with the mind, but also with the body, and that his members were the members of Christ. He did not exhort others to do what he did not perform himself, but was an example to them in all things. The fact is, the Editor has been misled, partly by his preconceived notions about "sinful flesh" and the Law of Moses, and partly by the English rendering of the Apostle's words. The verse under consideration is interrogative, and should read thus: Do I, myself then, serve with the mind the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin? And the answer is, By no means. This at once removes all ambiguity, and shows the Apostle to be in harmony with himself. To use the Editor's own phrase, "nothing but the requirements of a wrong theory could have suggested such an application of the words of Paul as would make him declare himself to be still serving with his flesh that very law of sin and death from which he had been made free." Macknight has an excellent note on this verse, which we here transcribe: "Do I, myself, then, as a slave, serve with the mind the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin? Ἀρα οὖν αὐτός ἐγώ, etc. Here ἀρα is a particle of interrogation. This question is an inference from what the Apostle had said concerning his being delivered from the body of death, through Jesus Christ. Being delivered, 'Do I myself then, as a slave, serve with,' etc. Translated in this manner, interrogatively, the passage contains a strong denial that the person spoken of, after being delivered from the body of this death, any longer serves as formerly, with the mind only, the law of God; and with the flesh the law of sin in his members. Whereas, translated as in our English Bible, 'So then, with the mind I myself serve the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin,' it represents the delivered person as still continuing in that very slavery to sin, from which he says he was delivered by God through Christ, and utterly overturns the inference drawn; chap. viii. 1), from what is said in this passage: There is, therefore, no condemnation to those in Christ Jesus, who walk not according to the flesh, but according to the Spirit. 2), For the law of the Spirit, &c. But, if those to whom there is no condemnation walk not according to the flesh, but according to the Spirit, it surely cannot be said of such, in any sense, that with the flesh they serve the law of sin; so that the common translation of verse 25 is utterly wrong, and even dangerous." - (Apostolical Epistles, vol. 1, p. 291, note 2.)

Far be it from us to make "sport" of a law of God, or "dare" a "presumptuous question." To make sport of a divine law, and to make sport of those who by their false interpretations pervert a divine law, are two totally different things, and they must not be confounded. There is nothing either "presumptuous" or "son of Belial like" in exercising our reasoning powers on what God has caused to be written. On the contrary, we are expressly invited to do so. For instance, God says His prophet Isaiah, "Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord. Is. i. 18. And again, by His prophet Ezekiel, ch. xviii 29 addressing the house of Israel, "Are not my ways equal, are not your ways unequal? What are such passages as these but invitations to His creatures, on the part of the Almighty, to examine and search into the justice and equity of His proceedings in relation to them? We believe, as the Apostle affirms, that the law is holy, just, and good," and on this account we cannot accept the conclusions arrived at by the editor in our judgment they would prove that the law was the very reverse in all these particulars, and would in effect make the Almighty the author of sin. Not in this fashion can the "apparent paradox" in Paul's writings be reconciled. The conflict between the propensities of human nature and the new man of the spirit is felt and admitted by all who are under the influence of the latter; but it is a mistake to suppose that it is impossible to obtain the victory over the flesh. Such an idea is contrary to both precept and example, not only as set forth in the writings of Paul, but throughout the New Testament. In addition to what has been already quoted we add the following - "Whosoever abideth in Him sinneth not." "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for His seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." "We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not; but he that is begotten of God keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not." 1 John iii. 6, and v. 18.

The difficulty of understanding verses 14 to 24, we are informed, "arises from a superficial view of the case." This may be granted without, however, committing ourselves to the editor's view of the case, which does not appear to us to be a following of Paul "in the depth of his argument." The writer says of the Apostle that "he carried about with him the spiritual burden of the old man, whom, though held in subjection, he found to be an ever-present obstacle to the full flights marked out by the new mental; man created in him in Jesus Christ." According to the Editor's reasoning, the case of the Apostle was that of a

man who had not put off the old man with his deeds his deeds, as he counselled others to do, but who still carried the burden about with him! If the "spiritual burden of the old man" was held in subjection, how, we ask, could it at the same time be an ever-present obstacle? Are obstacles held in subjection obstacles still? We confess we have not yet soared high enough to comprehend such logic as this. Speaking of Paul having become spiritually minded, the writer remarks, "but this was an engraftment from without." "It was super-imposed on the natural Paul by the education of the truth." "It was a new man united with the old or natural man." "There was thus a duality created." This is the editor's idea of the Apostle when he had become "spiritually minded;" he was a "duality" composed of a new man united with the old or natural man. A sort of co-partnership had thus been established between sin and righteousness! The Apostle consequently was at one and the same time both carnal and spiritual, in the flesh and in the Spirit, sold under sin and redeemed by Christ, under condemnation and not under condemnation, under the law of sin and death and yet free from that law! If Paul's "duality" is to be admitted, it cannot certainly be allowed in this sense. The engraftment from without transformed the natural Paul into the spiritual Paul. It did not unite the one to the other as the editor teaches. Thus transformed, the Apostle was no longer in the flesh, but in the Spirit, having passed from under a sentence of death into a state of justification to life eternal. The editor has mistaken the struggle between the natural impulses of our nature and the new man thus created in Christ Jesus, for a struggle between the old man of the flesh and the new man of the Spirit, as if the two could co-exist in the same person and constitute him a duality!

"It is necessary," the writer continues, "to have this duality in view in order to appreciate Paul's remarks in question." And these are summed up in what the Apostle said to the Galatians, "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." In brief, the Editor's position with respect to the "spiritually-minded" Paul is, that so long as he was physically in the flesh he was unable to accomplish what he would, and necessarily submitted to things he would not. And keeping this in view we see the Editor's "whereabouts" in relation to the Apostle and the seventh chapter of Romans - a position which we entirely repudiate as not only false but most pernicious in its tendencies, for it would not only countenance but excuse all sorts of shortcomings in those professing to be spiritually-minded. The application made of the passage just quoted from Galatians does not savour much of "spiritual discernment." The words used by the Apostle do not teach, and could not possibly be meant to teach, that a man could not in the absolute sense do the things that he would. Such an interpretation would not be in harmony with the previous verse which reads, "This I say then, walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh." Campbell translates the last clause of the 17th verse thus: "So that ye do not do the things that ye would." And in the Diaglott it is rendered, "ye do not perform;" etc. Such a rendering does away with the notion of impossibility and harmonises the Apostle with himself as well as with the Apostle John. We will (shall?) not be held accountable for the non-performance of the impossible," says the editor in the last paragraph but one of his articles. "Shall we presumptuously dare to impugn Almighty justice, and charge Him with commanding us to the performance of the impossible? God forbid." The natural impulses or desires are not sinful in them-selves: they were originally implanted in man by his Creator, and only became sinful when allowed to pass over the boundary line which the law of God lays down. Within this limit all is well: to go beyond it is transgression of law, which is sin. Paul, doubtless, was fully conscious of this warfare within him, but in the conflict he overcame and crucified the flesh, with its affections and lusts. "In sanctified state Paul, though of course still in the flesh in a physical sense, did not do things which he hated and allowed not. To cite the observation of Archbishop Whateley on this point, the Apostle did not live "a life of wretched contradiction to his own judgment."

In his Epistle to the Romans Paul says - "our old man is crucified with him that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." Rom. vi. 6. But according to the Editor's reasoning the "old man" in Paul, instead of being crucified, had formed an alliance with the new, and the Apostle still served sin. He calls upon the Ephesians, chapter iv. 22, to "put off concerning the former conversation the old man which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts." Taking the Editor's view, the Apostle, while thus exhorting the Church at Ephesus, had himself failed to comply with the injunction, and so far from putting off the old man had united him to the new! Again, in writing to the Colossians, the same Apostle says: "Ye have put off the old man with his deeds." Col. iii. 9. But the editor would persuade us that Paul had neither put off the old man nor his deeds; no wonder then he could not do the things that he would! In the same paragraph we are gravely informed by the writer that: "The implantation of the mind of the Spirit by the word, does not extirpate the natural man with his affections and lusts; it imposes but a check, a control, a power to restrain and crucify and bring into subjection." From which it results that although this implantation of the mind of the Spirit has the power to do all this, yet it is not done or only in an imperfect manner! There is power to bring into subjection, but the person

under its influence is not subjected, and can still say: "I am carnal, sold under sin." If this was Paul's position, we should just like to ask the Editor how the Apostle could be a follower of Christ? "Be ye followers of me as I also am of Christ." 1 Cor. - ii. 1

Paul could triumphantly say at the close of his career: "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith." 2 Tim. iv. 7. The editor will of course repudiate the results arrived at from this examination of his article, but they are nevertheless logical deductions from the premises he has laid down, and convict him, we will not by any means say of teaching intentionally what is not only contrary to sound doctrine but most dangerous in its tendency, giving room for those so disposed to excuse themselves on the plea that they are no worse than the Apostle, for he did things that he hated, and the good that he would he did not, but the evil that he would not that he did; and further induce such to comfort themselves with the notion that it was not they who did it; but sin that dwelt in them! It is much to be regretted that a man like the Editor, who has reasoned so well about the Kingdom, the mortality of man, etc., should be so far astray on other points; but so long as he continues to adhere to the dogma of "sinful-flesh," he will not only be out of harmony with the Scriptures but inconsistent with himself. We are sorry for him, and also for those whom he misleads, but we still venture to indulge a hope that he may live to see the error and have the moral courage to renounce it.

S.G.Hayes

P.S: - Among other strange sayings the editor tells that Paul was "spiritually in the flesh!" We should like to know what this means.

SCRIPTURE SIMILES, OR EMBLEMS, BY SARAH ROGERS.

No I. - "Keep me as the apple of the eye." - Psl. XVII. 8.

THE pupil, or apple of the eye is kept, or protected by: -

1st. The strong bony socket which surrounds the eye and wards off any blow.

2nd. The very sensitive lashes which look out for danger.

3rd. The eyelids which close as soon as the lashes are touched, and when we sleep.

4th. The soft cushion of fat on which the ball rests.

NATURAL PICTURE.

Amazing skill! to place so great a power
Within so small a spot,
And wisdom vast! to fix the tender nerve
Where harm easily comes not.
If more diffused, or more exposed, 'twould be
Our constant work to tend
A boon so rare, that, in our daily life,
Such countless joys attend.

Mark, how protected is the priceless gem,
In bony socket hard,
That breaks the blow, repels each deadly foe,
And so the eye doth guard.
Lashes, like faithful sentinels that stand
For ever on the watch,
Ready to give the alarm of danger near,
Upon the slightest touch.

The telegraphic hairs the message take,
At once down drops the lid,
So exquisitely contriv'd that safely now,

From harm the eye is hid.
Pillowed on fleshy softness lies the ball,
A nursling safe and warm,
Ungentle touch its slumber cannot break,
Nor sudden shock, alarm.

SPIRITUAL PICTURE.

And may I pray to be kept as the eye
Am I so great a gem?
Yes, for the Saviour died that I might shine
In His bright diadem.

Keep then, with Thy vast strength, my feeble will,
Give Thou the Shield of Faith
That shall resist the tempter's fiery darts,
And conquer even death.

Be Thou my Watch-tower too, and tell me when
The enemy is nigh,
That I may run to Thee, and be secure,
As in Thine arms I lie.
Shut safe within those "everlasting arms,"
Sin cannot touch me there;
Nor treacherous, wary foe shall fiercely smite,
Or tempt me unaware.

Be Thou my strength, my Watch-tower, Hiding-place,
My Guard, - and welcome Rest,
When safe at last within Immanuel's land
I stand among the blest.

No. II. - "The righteous shall flourish like a palm tree." Psl. xcii. 12.

The palm tree is famous for its luxuriant growth, for the abundance of its fruit, and for the great usefulness of all its parts. It is an evergreen, the wealth of the eastern is reckoned by the number of palm trees he possesses. Its leaves afford shelter from the burning rays of the sun. The juice forms a wholesome and nourishing food; honey is usually found at its summit. The bark is made into cordage; with the wood the Easterns build their huts, and with the leaves they thatch them and make their beds.

The tree grows very slowly, but lives long and is very easily reared.

NATURAL PICTURE.

Oh, noble upright palm,
In thy stately grandeur calm,
Untouch'd by summer's sun, or winter's snow,
Thy crown of leaves so green,
Circling thy brow is seen,
All bright with conquest's everlasting glow.

Thy growth is very slow,
Firmness and strength doth show
For use, no tree with thee can e'er compare;
Thou art thy owner's wealth,
In food, drink, shade, and health,
Thy fanning branches cool the desert air.

SPIRITUAL PICTURE.

And so the righteous life,
Through sunshine or thro' strife,
Still trusts, looks up, and grows in heavenly grace;
No sapless mind is here,
No laggard love all sere,
But faith with works, and works with faith keep pace.

God's sons are ever found,
Dispensing blessings round,
And growing richer by each gift they give, (Prov. xi. 24 & 25)
From strength to strength they go, (Prov. iv. 18)
There is no rest they know,
While in a world of sin and want they live.

Trials may come apace,
But patience wins the race,
Not making haste (Is. Xxviii 16) but never standing still;
So firmly plodding on,
The victory shall be won,
And palms adorn the brow on Zion's hill.

PILGRIMAGES

THE clergy of Jerusalem exhibited the instruments which had been used in the passion of Christ, the nails, and the lance that had pierced His hands His feet and His side; the crown of thorns that was planted on His head; the pillar at which He was scourged; and, above all, they showed the cross on which He suffered, and which was dug out of the earth in the reign of those princes who inserted the symbol of Christianity in the banners of the Roman legions. Such miracles as seemed necessary to account for its extraordinary preservation and seasonable discovery, were gradually propagated without opposition. The custody of the true cross which on Easter Sunday was solemnly exposed to the people was entrusted to the bishop of Jerusalem, and he alone might gratify the curious devotion of the pilgrims by the gift of small pieces which they had encased in gold or gems and carried away in triumph to their respective countries. But as this gainful branch of commerce must soon have been annihilated, it was found convenient to suppose that the marvellous wood possessed a secret power of vegetation and that its substance though continually diminished still remained entire and unimpaired. It might perhaps have been expected that the influence of the place and the belief of a perpetual miracle should have produced some salutary effects on the morals as well as on the faith of the people. Yet the most respectable of the ecclesiastical writers have been obliged to confess not only that the streets of Jerusalem were filled with the incessant tumult of business and pleasure, but that every species of vice, adultery, theft; idolatry, poisoning, murder, was familiar to the inhabitants of the holy city. – Gibbon.

RIDICULE, which chiefly arises from pride, a selfish passion, is but at best a gross pleasure, too rough an entertainment for those who are highly polished and refined. - Lord Kaimes.

RELIGIOUS PRIDE.

PRIDE is as various as taste; but it may come under two main heads - Worldly and Religious. Our present intention is to make a few remarks - chiefly upon the latter, in whatever sphere of life there are few things more offensive to our sight than manifestations of pride in our fellows. It is not a thing that we get angry at, but it arouses in us feelings of scorn and contempt. While humility hides, or palliates gross offences, pride seems to spoil good deeds. What is more hateful than proud charity or proud religion? Inordinate self-esteem is the foundation of pride, and it is often seen to be greedy and selfish while practising no small degree of benevolence. But it may easily be detected. Self always comes to the front; no ruling principle can be long concealed. Pride has no respect for the honest convictions of opponents: it is a world to itself, and all outside is either trivial, or barbarous. It is the deity of its own shrine: all who approach with reverence, or admiration are graciously smiled upon and blessed; but black clouds, forked lightning, and crashing thunder is the lot of those who presume to pry into the sanctum on suspicion that the deity there enthroned may be as mortal and peccable as his worshipers. Whether worldly or religious, pride always deceives its victim, hardens his heart and, if not checked, often brings him to destruction.

The first notable example of it after the flood was exhibited in the scheme of the builders of Babel. Their intention was to make a name; to concentrate the world, as it were, in and around themselves; and to dispense or withhold the blessings of their government as their wisdom might dictate. But the design had a canker in its vitals. God had not authorised the work; and the object He had in view of regularly re-peopleing the earth was accomplished in their ruin. The tower went on very well no doubt for some time; its top was every day rising higher and higher towards the sky, and probably the architect and chief constructors walked round the massy base and watched its steady growth with pride of heart. When it rose high in air they would ascend its summit, and exult at the vast extent of view, gazing in prospective fancy at the subject peoples circling at its foot. As the edifice progressed the builders, however, were not without fear. It was fear in fact that helped pride to start the project. They were nervous lest the increasing population should be scattered abroad and begin new colonies. There was no harm in merely rearing a tower; but they were doing it in a wrong spirit; and their aim was to establish a state of things which, if permitted, would defeat the purpose of God. It is very likely they had argued themselves into the piety and philanthropy of the scheme; and become persuaded that the plan was more than human; that they were the chosen instruments of Heaven; but still there was a lurking dread that if they did not erect the tower they should lose their power and popularity. At length the blow was struck in the midst of their prosperity; their speech became confused and confounded; the contradiction was immense, and reconciliation impossible; the unfinished tower, meant to perpetuate their glory, became a mocking monument of shame.

Pride in worship is the most abominable of all pride; and yet, where is there a community not guilty of it? Is the house of God the place to indulge in comparisons to the disadvantage of our fellow worshippers? Is it not hideous and Pharisaic to think ourselves more deserving the attention and favour of Heaven than the rest of our brethren? The grace of God makes us all equal: all are sinners born, and sinners by our own wills: none can boast: all are the children of death: all alike, rich and poor, learned and ignorant, are at the sovereign mercy of God, and utterly helpless to become the procuring cause of our own deliverance from the grave. If the Almighty were to make as much distinction in the bestowal of temporal blessings on the just and the unjust, as we sometimes make among our brethren, the earth would soon need to begin afresh. We see some faults and failings in others, and they see some in us; but are we sure that on the whole our behaviour and our motives come nearer to the perfect pattern of Christ than theirs? Let us remember His words, "Judge not, that ye be not judged." It is quite possible that the standard we form to ourselves may not be Christ's standard. It is certain that, if in our midst, He would have to caution and reprove us for many indiscretions and imprudences, which we are very slow to admit at the hands of our brethren. He who imagines himself to be walking by an infallible rule and finds himself by turns at variance with all his brethren, thereby judges all, condemns all, and justifies himself. He exalts himself at the expense of the character of all his fellow saints - the Master's servants. But Christ saith, "Every one that exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted."

Pride is generally pictured to us in the scriptures under the figure of lifting up. "The heart of Uzziah was lifted up to his destruction, for he transgressed against the Lord his God." Also of Hezekiah it is written that his "heart was lifted up;" and afterwards that "he humbled himself for the pride of his heart." Daniel's charge against Nebuchadnezzar is couched in the same style. "His heart was lifted up, and his mind hardened in pride." Solomon says, "When pride cometh, then cometh shame; but with the lowly is

wisdom.” This seems to teach that pride deprives a man of wisdom and prudence, and drives him to do things which clothe him with dishonour. This, no doubt, is one of the results. While such a man is priding himself upon his own superior powers, address, policy, and so forth, he is exposing himself to the just scorn of some, and the mingled pity of others; but above all to the hatred of Heaven: for it is written that “God hateth the proud.”

It appears to be the peculiar province of the gospel of Christ to subdue pride; both with regard to doctrine and practice. We see in the several sects among the Jews, in the apostle Paul’s day, striking examples of pride of doctrine. The proud Pharisee of Christ’s parable, will live side by side with the humble publican while language lasts. The heathen philosophers were also marked for their pride of doctrine. When this kind of arrogance takes possession of a man, he becomes jealous and angry at the development of thought from any source other than his own brain; and he frequently betrays the vanity of disliking to be supposed not to have known whatever new thing may be introduced to his notice by another, even though he may approve it; and will, in fact, sometimes reject for a season, from sheer pride, that which his judgment tells him is right. Paul testifies that the end of his warfare in the gospel was “the casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ.” There is no finality in knowledge, and part of true wisdom is progress.

Pride is further known by strife for the mastery. Lawfully or unlawfully, it claims preeminence, and in matters of religion, its plea is that such and such is the will of the Lord. It is indeed an easy thing for a proud man to confound his will with the will of God, and to propound if not a reason, at least an excuse, for whatever he desires to do. But the sure foundation of all society hinges to some extent on compromise. Pride ever forces its way, like the pebble dropped in the cleft of an oak, until the edifice is rent in twain. It is the mortal enemy of all forbearance. In no man does it appear so odious and detestable as in the self-styled “servant of the Lord;” in those who, in their own esteem, do all things as in the sight of God. But the true servant of the Lord is known by his gentleness, and patience, his aptness to teach, and in meekness to instruct those who oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth; and that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will. This was the manner of Christ and of Paul. Honest and candid opponents were treated with the greatest forbearance and kindness; severe rebukes were reserved for the notorious sinners and hypocrites. Christ’s forbearance with Peter, and Paul’s address from the stairs of the castle, are memorable examples. – Edward Turney

SIN

“The word sin, I apprehend, is to many obscure, or not sufficiently plain. It is a word seldom used in common life. It belongs to theology and the pulpit. By not a few people sin is supposed to be a property of our nature, born with us, and we sometimes hear of the child as being sinful before it can have performed any action. From these and other causes the word gives us many confused notions. Sin in its true sense is the violation of duty, and cannot consequently exist before conscience has begun to act, and before power to obey it is unfolded. To sin is to resist our sense of right, to oppose known obligation, to cherish feelings or commit deeds which we know to be wrong. It is to withhold from God the reverence, gratitude, and obedience which our own consciences pronounce to be due to that great and good Being. It is to transgress those laws of equity, justice, candour, humanity, and disinterestedness which we all feel to belong and to answer to our various social relations. It is to yield ourselves to those appetites which we know to be the inferior principles of our nature, to give the body a mastery over the mind, to sacrifice the intellect and the heart to the senses, to surrender ourselves to ease and indulgence, To prefer outward accumulation and power to strength and peace of conscience, to progress towards perfection. Such is the aim. It is a voluntary wrong-doing. Any gratification injurious to ourselves is sin. Indifference to our Creator is sin. The transgression of any command which this excellent Being and rightful Sovereign has given us, whether by conscience or revelation, is sin. So broad is the term. It is as extensive as duty. It is not some mysterious thing wrought into our souls at birth. It is not a theological subtlety. It is choosing and acting in opposition to our sense of right, to known obligation.”

– W.E.Channing, D.D Discourse on The Evil of Sin”

THE PEACE OF EUROPE

Just four years have elapsed since the surrender of the French armies at Sedan marked the opening of a new era in European politics . . . Sedan was, it is apparent, the opening of a period of transition, and the new years may be expected to bring changes of a yet vaster historical importance as the inevitable sequel of the struggle that culminated before the wall of Paris.

As one result of the last war, we find Europe is now merely an armed camp. The most sanguine optimists no longer indulge in anticipations of the age of perpetual peace that at one time innumerable amiable enthusiasts confidently looked forward to. And the schemes of general disarmament that used to be broached at constantly recurring intervals have passed away into oblivion. The example of victorious Germany has been followed by its allies, its rivals, and its enemies amongst the nations; and Austria, Russia and France, beside the lesser powers, have embraced the system of compulsory service, and armies in which all the manhood of such people is enrolled.

Never before have the military budgets attained such vast and ruinous proportions. France, besides the enormous tribute she has had to pay, Italy in defiance of imminent bankruptcy, Austria, notwithstanding a financial weakness that is chronic, Turkey, although she has long been compelled to eke out her annual income by loans raised at a usurious interest, Russia, although she has to seek for capital on all the exchanges of the world, have alike engaged in the most lavish expenditure on armies and fleets that they may not be wholly overshadowed by the formidable growth of Germany and be quite helpless in the presence of her arrogant and conscious strength. The evidences are abundant enough already that Germany is quite prepared to use her newly acquired authority in Europe. The decided attitude that Prince Bismarck has assumed in regard to Spanish affairs is a sufficient indication of the spirit in which the new Germany may be expected to act; and action of this kind is, of course, full of menace to European peace. The attitude that Germany has assumed in regard to Spain is, in fact, one that cannot but be regarded with disquietude. Instead of taking active measures itself on behalf of the Republican Government that it has seen fit to befriend, it has proposed to take advantage of the powerlessness of France to insist that the French Government shall advance the German policy. In the present position of France no alternative was left to the Ministers of Marshal MacMahon but to yield to the pressure applied. Similar concessions will doubtless be demanded in future; but France will not always submit to the tutelage that the national calamities have for a while imposed upon her, and the danger to European peace from this cause alone is a sufficiently serious one. That the struggle between Germany and France is at an end, no one affects to believe. That France will at the first favourable opportunity retrieve her lost fortunes is certain. And that an opportunity offering some chances of success will not have long to be waited for is obvious. No one has recognised this more clearly than Prince Bismarck, and the drift of his policy must be derived from the knowledge that he believes that the contest between the two nations will be renewed at no distant date. French parties may continue to struggle amongst themselves for pre-eminence, but the prediction may safely be ventured upon that the future form of government in France will not be decided wholly without the intervention of the Chancellor of the German Empire. Whilst Germany has always to count upon the hostility of France, she cannot be wholly indifferent to the ill-concealed jealousy with which Russia regards her sudden development. Although the imperial families of Berlin and St. Petersburg may be on thoroughly amicable terms, it is notorious that the most influential sections of Russian political society are far from sharing in these friendly feelings. The refusal of Russia to recognise the existing Government at Madrid is but one indication of the divergence that may be expected in the future in the policies of the two Powers; and Russian and German interests come into contact and collision at so many points, on the shores of the Baltic as well as on the banks of the Danube, that any signs of a difference of views is ominous.

It is certain that France will eagerly watch to detect any straining in the relations between the two nations that must necessarily exercise the most important effect upon her own destinies. Not the least striking evidence of the disquiet that is characteristic of the present condition of Europe, is to be found in the proceedings of the Congress on the laws of war that has just concluded its sittings at Brussels. Called together at the instance of Russia, the first thought that it suggested was what aims the astute statesman of St. Petersburg had in view in endeavouring to obtain unanimity of opinion as to the way in which the wars of the future should be waged. Few political observers expected that any definite results would be obtained from an assembly which represented views necessarily conflicting. Lord Derby, while consenting that England should be represented, very wisely declined to allow the country to be bound by the deliberations that might take place, or the decisions that might be come to. Although no official

information is yet forthcoming, it is known that the Congress quite failed to arrive at any conclusions. England naturally would not admit of any undertakings that might neutralize the advantages derived from her predominance at sea. On the important question, how far irregular levies in cases of invasions could be awarded the privileges of regular troops, the utmost divergence of opinion of course prevailed between those assembled at the Congress. The plausible anxiety of Russia to soften the rigour of future wars has clearly failed to obtain the support and sympathy that were counted upon. And the congress separated without arriving at any results of practical importance. So that in the new European struggle, that the keenest observers of contemporary politics regard as inevitable, and not very distant, the belligerents will have to adapt the old usages of warfare to the new conditions as well as they can. How long the unstable equilibrium that marks the present condition of Europe may endure is uncertain; but it is impossible to study the aspect of affairs in France and Spain, or to observe the ambitions of Russia and the pretensions of Germany, without being driven to the conclusion that no long period of peace can prudently be looked forward to.

(Examiner.)

EVIDENTLY no great confidence exists in the East with regard to the maintenance of peace on the part of Russia. In the Danubian Principalities a decree has just been published ordaining military instruction for boys from the age of thirteen. A similar institution prevails in a number of Swiss cantons, and in the German State of Wurtemberg. The decree issued at Bucharest makes military instruction - without arms between the ages of 13 and 15, and with arms from the age of 15 - obligatory for all public schools. A number of boys of the different schools are to be formed into a battalion, each of which will receive a banner with the inscription "Vütorul," i.e., "The Future." Every year a military examination will take place. In Switzerland the system of a "Youths' Militia" acts very well. In a monarchical state, in which the ideas of civic independence are but slightly developed, there is more or less danger of such an institution being calculated to simply strengthen the bureaucratic machinery. The ordinance alluded to shows, at all events, that the Danubian Principalities, where Russia began the war in 1853, are not without apprehension for their future.

Thanks to Bro. Jennings for the above. - EDITOR

EXTRACTS BY ECLECTIC.

OF writers of sermons, as well as of preachers, it may be said that their principal business is rather to enforce old truths than to discover new ones. The articles of the Christian faith, and the particulars of Christian duty, are delineated so fully in the sacred oracles of inspiration, that no room is left for human addition; however much may be found for elucidation, comment, and application. To hold up truths long-since revealed and acknowledged in new lights, to illustrate them by new comparisons, and to attract attention to them by new considerations, are objects worthy of the pursuit of the skilful and diligent theologian, and when attained honourable to his ability.

There is an indissoluble connection between the privileges which the Gospel bestows, and the character which the Gospel requires.

"Hearers do not take the word of God along with them to guide them in their ordinary walk, to arm them against temptation, to furnish them with the cautions of prudence, to stimulate them to universal conscientiousness. Their tempers are unsubdued, un-softened, unsanctified; their conversation produces none of the fruit of the spirit, which is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance.' But the word of God is practical; every truth is announced to accomplish some purpose. If it reveals a refuge, it is that you may enter it and be safe; if it proclaims a remedy, it is that you may use it; it is not your hearing of it, but your applying it, that will save you from death."

"As Christians are to think of living for a while in the world, it is not un-seasonable for them to be affected with its occurrences and changes. Some plead for a kind of abstracted and sublimated devotion, which the circumstances in which they are placed by their Creator render equally impracticable and absurd. They are never to notice the affairs of government, or the measures of administration; war or peace, liberty or slavery, plenty or scarcity, taxes or money to pay their debts, all is to be equally indifferent to them; they are to leave these carnal and worldly things to others. But have they not bodies? Have they not families? Is religion founded on the ruins of humanity? When a man becomes a Christian, does he cease to be a member of civil society? Allowing that he is not the owner of the ship, but only a

passenger in it, has he nothing to awaken his concern in the voyage? If he be only a traveller towards a better country, is he to be told that, because he is at an inn which he is soon to leave, it should not excite any emotions in him, whether it be invaded by robbers, or consumed by flames before the morning.

“Instead of that chasteness of style, and that unaffected and artless simplicity, which are particularly requisite either in discussing or enforcing the great truths of Christianity, we often meet in modern discourses with inflated language, needless amplification, meretricious and cumbrous ornaments, false or confused metaphors, and attempts to surprise by antithesis and point. That these are not requisite to give force and effect to the exposition of Christian doctrine, or the earnestness of Christian exhortation, has been abundantly proved. A method of treating texts, which was frequently employed by the old divines, consists in taking a text (as it were) to pieces, and drawing from the several propositions and terms contained in it the matter and arrangement of the sermon. How this differs from the mode sometimes adopted, of using a text simply as a motto, it is unnecessary to point out. We will quote a striking example, which occurs in a sermon published in the year 1630, the author of which, after citing as his text the words, ‘he hath given Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour’ 1 (Ephes. v. 2), says, the texts presents to our view seven considerable circumstances:

1. Who? Christ.
2. What? Gave.
3. Whom? Himself.
4. To whom? To God.
5. For whom? For us.
6. After what manner? An offering and sacrifice.
7. Of what effect? Of a sweet savour.”

From “Review of Sermons by William Jay, with Extracts. - The, Christian Observer. Oct. 1802, pp. 649-652.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

47, Morleston Street, Derby.

DEAR BRO. TURNEY, - In sending you the remittance for the Lamp, I also wish to congratulate you on its success, as a light, greatly needed in these days, of I might almost say, heathen darkness, when all denominations seem at war one with another, and more especially in the Church from which, I am happy to say, I have been delivered, by the reading of the Bible, without the shackles of an effete Theology, but by the aid of reason and common sense.

It is now my earnest endeavour, as far as my humble ability enables me, to try to spread the truth of the Gospel of the kingdom to all I come in contact with, but so few will listen sufficiently long to enable me to break down their preconceived ideas of what is the truth, and more especially those who have got thoroughly within the meshes of the net which, dragging them down the stream of respectability, they dare not for a moment think of stemming the torrent of rebuke which would be poured upon them, for daring to question such a thing as man being by nature immortal. Oh! No. It must be true, for have not ministers of every denomination for centuries preached this doctrine, and they cannot all be wrong.

This is the answer I frequently get to my argument that man is instructed to seek for immortality. Yet I feel hopeful of one or two who I know are hovering just now, not exactly knowing what to do. If I can only get one or two to help me I shall feel better able to fight against the Monster\Doctrine, which seems to be the only stumbling-block that shuts out the light of truth (the immortality of the soul).

My earnest prayer is for more light. May your Lamp burn brightly and give to others as well as myself some rays of light to dispel the almost heathen darkness of the age in which we live.

Wishing you every success in the enlarged edition, I remain, dear brother, yours faithfully in hope of redemption,

CHRISTOPHER J. RODGERS.

“THE BODY OF SIN.”

This is a phrase of Paul's, and it deserves to be studied.

The connection of it is as follows: “Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed - or rendered powerless - that henceforth we should not serve sin.” Rom. iv. 6. What is this body of sin; is it our natural body of flesh and blood?

We answer in the negative. The literal living body is just as powerful for sin after baptism as it was before; all its inclinations exist still, every impulse which leads to transgression is present as long as the body lasts in health and vigour.

But “the body of sin” is rendered powerless; crucified; put off as “the old man with (all) his deeds.” What is this? We understand the apostle to mean by “the body of sin” or “the old man,” the former character and standing in Adam. This is put away by the Christ's ransom as soon as applied to the head and heart. A living body is capable of producing ‘the old man’ or ‘the new’ according to circumstances, but the living body itself is neither the one nor the other.

To talk of putting the new man upon the old, as if the two could be conjoined, is unmitigated nonsense. “The old man” must first be “put off” from the literal person, and then “the new man” must be put on. A character bad in the sight of God is cast away, and a character good in the divine estimation is assumed. These constitute the old man and the new man. It is preposterous to contend that a man's real body is “the body of sin” Paul speaks of, if it were, how in this present time could it be said to be “rendered powerless?” The apostle's expression is evidently figurative; his language in this instance will not admit of a literal construction. EDITOR.

EDITOR OF CHRISTADELPHIAN CONTRADICTS DR. THOMAS.

In the animal man there dwelleth no good thing. The Apostle affirms this of himself, considered as an unenlightened son of the flesh. “In me, that is, in my flesh” says he, “dwelleth no good thing.” - Elpis Israel, page 82.

“Nothing but the requirements of a wrong theory could have suggested the violence of taking away these words from Paul and putting them into the mouth of a so-called “unregenerate man.”
- Christadelphian - September, 1874, page 416.

CRITICISM ON ISAIAH LXIV. 6.

It is evident, on examination, that the words we render “filthy rags,” bear a very different signification wherever else they occur in the Hebrew scriptures. Restoring them in this place to their proper import will be far from lessening the humiliating truth contained in the passage, and may reach some minds which have found means to elude their force when urged under their present form.

‘Adi’, plural ‘adim’ is rendered (Exod, xxxi. 5, Is. xlix. 18@ Jer. xxxi. 4, Ezel. xvi. 2), ‘ornament,’ ‘ornaments,’ and ‘adargh,’ ‘to deck’ or ‘adorn.’ Job. xl. 10, Is. lxi. 10, Jer. iv. 30, etc. In the text under consideration, ‘kebeged addim’ may be translated, “All our righteousnesses are as a garment of ornament, or gaudy robe, thrown over an unclean person,” or, to avoid altering the present structure of the verse, “But we are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as a gaudy robe or cloak of covering.”

The charge made by the prophet is, that their works were done to be seen of men, destitute of right principle; and it is apparently the same with that brought by our Lord Himself (Matt. xxiii. 27) - “Ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness.”

I conclude with an observation which appears to me very important. The scriptures uniformly speak of true piety even in its weakest state and its lowest degrees, with honour; it is, therefore, to be lamented

that this text, which evidently refers to ostentatious and hypocritical works, should be applied, as it often is, to genuine though imperfect holiness, - "The Christian Observer," Dec. 1803, p. 715. = C. L.

Boothroyd renders the passage thus - "And all our righteousness as a rejected garment," which is nearly the same with Bishop Lowth.

ECLECTIC.

ON THE CONDUCT AS AN INDEX TO THE HEART.

"When we exhort men to examine themselves by their conduct, it is only as that is an index to the state of the heart. The state and disposition of the heart determines the character, and being visible to God, is that by which His judgment of us is formed. We can judge of others only by external appearances; but of ourselves our judgment should be, as much as possible, guided by that of God. External actions are not always sure indices to the state of the mind, because good actions may proceed from bad principles. With other men's principle, indeed, we have comparatively little to do. While their actions are good, and society sustains no injury, from a charitable though erroneous judgment of them, little inconvenience can result but in our own case, a mistake is fatal.

The Christian Observer, March, 1802. page 10. - ECLECTIC.

JUDGMENTS. - When misfortunes happen to such as dissent from us in matters of religion, we call them judgments; when to those of our own sect we call them trials; when to persons neither way distinguished, we are content to impute them to the settled course of things.

INTELLIGENCE.

BIRMINGHAM. - The Brethren here have a considerable room in prospect. We hear of a capital lecture by Bro. Jas. Flint. Bro. Evans is recovering slowly. The burglar who nearly killed him is committed for trial at the assizes. Bro. James Martin considers the Lamp good commercial value, but from another point of view above all price.

DEAL. - Bro. David Brown, writing on the 22nd September to Bro. Farmer, mentions his visits to Deal, and speaks of the unity of the ecclesia there.

DEAL. - Dear Brother: Enclosed, I have much pleasure in forwarding P.O. Order for 6s., being the amount of one year's subscription for Christadelphian Lamp, and could I possibly afford six pounds I should as freely send it; so that I might in any way help in the defence of the glorious truth that you have for so long, clearly and nobly, advocated. Yea, so mean and cowardly has been the attack, first on yourself, personally, and then on our ever blessed Lord, that whatever the sum might be at my command I should feel honoured in expending it in such a cause. With affectionate greeting to all who hold fellowship in the name of a sinless Christ, I am, dear Brother, your Sister in the love and support of the truth, SUSAN REYNOLDS.

DEAL. - It is with pleasure I address a line to you. I enclose a few verses, which when you have room, would perhaps be worthy of a place in the Lamp. I think the sentiment running through them will strengthen the tired child of God while passing through this pilgrimage. You will be pleased to hear that we are still clinging to the truth as it is in Jesus, and to one another, so that it may be said when God comes to number up his jewels, that we may be found in his book of remembrance, as often speaking to one another. I am thankful to tell that we have had Brother Brown here for a few days; it is a great boon to us to have a little help, for we are but a few solitary ones. We had looked forward to this season of the year, to have accepted the kind offer of brother Handley, although it was many months since that at our invitation he would come and lecture for us; but our hopes are now damped by his removal far from us.

Nottingham ought now to be a hot-bed for bringing forth the truth, so many useful brethren being planted there. God has promised He will supply all our need out of His riches treasured up in Christ Jesus. Enough for us to know our life is hid with Him, but we often tremble. Shall we, when weighed in the balance, be found wanting? I have had a long contest with a Plymouth brother, on the Judgment he has been in Deal, Lecturing on the Tabernacle, (Lectures there are well attended) he said the righteous would

have no judgment. An answer to that I should like to see in the Lamp when opportunity offers, if you think it worthy of notice. - E. EISIEN.

We hear that Bro. David Brown, of London, has been down to Deal again, strengthening the brethren by scriptural exhortation, and that the reports recently circulated to their disparagement are untrue. The foregoing note indicates the state of mind there at present.

DAWLEY, SALOP. - Dear Bro. Turney: Many thanks for the Lamp, which came to hand in due time. It is rightly named. My prayer is that you may have a good supply of "oil" so that it may shine brighter and brighter, and dispel the clouds of ignorance and error that so darken the minds of the people. I have no one to converse with. They are all Ranters and Methodists here, and they call me an infidel because I will not believe their fables; but I feel thankful for a text like this: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." - GEORGE B. FOLLOWS,

DEWARTOWN. - Brother E. Fairgrieve refers to the pleasure he felt at our "most excellent address" at Tranent. He says, "I have felt for Brother Turney. I am one with him in his teaching and have been for years. I believe to be an able teacher of the truth, and hope soon to hear him on another subject - that is - "life in the age to come." We Brother Fairgrieve and others do not expect that all will be deathless at the end of the thousand years. Their idea is before us, and when leisure presents itself we intend to consider the matter. On the 30th Sept. "I hope you will always have plenty of good oil, that the Lamp may give light to everyone, and the longer it burns the brighter. I believe this will not fail on your part."

DUNDEE - "I have been very much pleased with some of the articles in the Lamp so far as I am able to judge, I think its teaching in on the Christ quite in harmony with the scripture. It is a matter of deep regret that so much bitter feeling should have been shown by brethren who profess to be so far advanced in spiritual knowledge, and who are looked up to as leaders and guides to those who are enquiring after the truth. I shall be very happy to receive the Lamp." - J. F.

EDINBURGH. - Dear Bro. Turney: The Meeting at Bro. Mewhart's, mentioned in my last, came off as arranged, and was attended by some twelve or fourteen brethren and sisters, who, to say the least, have not yet arrived at that stagnant position occupied by those who are dependent on, and "committed" to, the writings of human authors.

The first item on the programme of our meeting was tea and bread and butter, which Bro. and Sister Mewhart very hospitably provided. While partaking of these bounties of Providence some little cross shooting took place over the table. A Bro. Cameron first fired at me, and I, in the most Christian-like manner possible, returned the shot. His powder was "damp" and his cartridges blank, and, therefore, perfectly harmless; and, if I mistake not, had been obtained from a manufacturer by the name of Roberts. We reminded him that our battle could only be profitably fought with ammunition obtained from the inexhaustible store-house of God's word, and at this early part of the proceedings tried to impress the minds of all present that the "Sword of the Spirit," and the "Sword of the Spirit" only, could decide the question we had met to consider. Tea being over and the table moved, we assumed the form of a half circle when Bro. Mewhart suggested that, for the meeting to be profitable, it must be orderly, and would some one or more, propose a plan by which the meeting should be conducted.

You will not be surprised to hear that "the Socratic method" was ultimately agreed to; and having reminded each other that this "method" only allowed one question at a time, the meeting commenced, each questioner to be allowed 15 minutes to present his questions, and as I was the only person present who had "renounced" the "heresy" that Christ was born in a state of, and owned by, sin and therefore had to pay its "wages," - death. - I thought well to have an understanding at the onset of our conversation, and so I turned questioner first. We all opened our Bibles at the Fourth Chapter of Romans, and the 12th verse was read - "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men. For that all have sinned." Addressing Bro. Philip Brown, who sat first in order I asked, "do you think Christ was included in the 'all' spoken of in this verse?" "I am disposed to think He was not," was his reply. Well then, said I, it will be necessary to present the same question to the next brother, (Bro. Gordon) who said, "there was a sense in which He was included, and a sense in which He was not." We then interrogated a third Bro. (David Brown), who said he "scarcely knew." The question being put to Bro. Cameron, who sat fourth in order, said, "I will say yes, He was." And I will say quite as emphatically "No, He was not," was my reply. The foundation, or understanding thus being established, the brethren proceeded to question me one after the other, for something like three hours, at the conclusion of which we exchanged positions, when I presented several questions, which were answered as well as could be expected under the circumstances. Of course I cannot think of filling your pages with all that transpired, or another enlargement would be necessary; but the general proceedings established beyond a doubt, to my mind, that the Edinburgh brethren, with the brethren in general, little understand the question at issue. The ground covered in our conversation is well known to yourself and to many of your readers.

Nothing of a very startling nature transpired. We laboured to show that the “all” mentioned in Rom. v. 12, was the same “all” as mentioned in 2 Cor. v. 14, and that Christ was not included in either of the “alls,” and for the simple and scriptural reason that He is said to be “separate from sinners;” whereas it is said that the “all” were under sentence of death because of their connection with the man who first introduced sin into the world.

It is said, “He died for” the “all” described in Paul’s second letter to the Corinthians, and in Luke it is said He “gave His life a ransom for many;” while it was possible for a sinner to die for sinners, it was impossible that any eternal results could obtain therefrom. Any blood would not do for a “ransom;” but blood it must be, for, without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sin, and therefore, no redemption. The blood of innocent animals won’t do, “for it is not possible for the blood of bulls and of goats could take away sin” (Heb. s. 4). The blood of Christ ONLY could pay the price of our redemption; therefore, “a higher value must be placed upon it than any other blood: and this entirely agrees with what Peter affirms in his first epistle, the 18th and 19th verses, that we are not redeemed with corruptible things, etc., “but with the PRECIOUS blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot.” A sinner’s blood could be shed, but a sinner’s blood could never be a ransom for the redemption of the race. The value, or preciousness, was not in the blood itself, for the life, or the blood of Christ was the same as the life or the blood of any son of Adam; but the life of Adam and all his descendants belonged to sin, and owned the wages thereof. Jesus, not having derived His life from Adam, but direct from God, He was not legally the property of sin; therefore, legitimately death had no claim upon Him. Hence, His life, or blood, was “precious,” and suitable for God’s redemptive purpose of RANSOMING the race. Adam, and all in him were by nature, “aliens,” “strangers,” “without hope,” “without strength,” “all dead,” “without God,” in and “of the world.” Jesus never was in these positions, but was, as Paul describes Him, “the SAME (in relationship) yesterday (in the days of His flesh), to-day, and for ever;” or, in other words, He was born King of the Jews; He was born the heir of the world; He was always God’s Son; He never was less and never will be less. All we are, we are by the grace of God, as manifested through Jesus Christ, His only begotten Son. Some thought this “was not so bad as Bro. Turney’s doctrine,” while others said, “it is nearly the same.” This last expression indicated that it was possible to find two “renunciationists” speaking the same thing, and encouraged me to hope that someday I might meet two “Adamites” who agreed together. I must confess it would be something out of the common. Bro. Smith has delivered himself several times publicly in my hearing upon the subject of the Christ. He seems to be a firm believer in the entire “Messianic character of Psalms,” for he most deliberately stated to the assembly in the Temperance Hall, that the passage in Psalm cxix. 9, “wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way,” etc., “applied in an especial manner to the Messiah;” and in essaying to expound the 39th and 40th Psalms, he, as well as others, saw nothing in them but prophetic utterances of the Christ. In commenting on the 12th verse of the 40th Psalm, he distinctly said Christ was a sinner in two senses; first, as the sin-bearer of the nation; and second, as being “full of a loathsome disease,” or full of sin. This was caused, said Bro. Smith, on account of His taking our nature, or “flesh and blood.” Heb. ii. 14, was quoted to prove this position, and it was also affirmed that it was only by dying that the devil or sin was destroyed. In a private conversation I had with Bro. Smith, he tried to make his position good in a very remarkable way, which is as follows: - In reply to a statement of mine, that Christ was never in Adam, in the sense we are, or were, he said, “Christ Himself acknowledged His descent from Adam, by calling him Father.” “Well,” said I, “I have never come across that statement, and if you can point it out to me you will do a good deal towards convincing me that Christ had two Fathers.” “Well,” said Bro. Smith, “He had two Fathers, and this is nothing strange; we all have two Fathers.” “Indeed,” said I; “how do you make that out?” “Why, we have our real fathers and our grandfathers.” “That is true,” said I, “but you know upon that principle it would be safe to say we had twenty-two fathers; at all events, it would prove, if Christ, as you affirm, was the Son of God, that He must have had three Fathers. But let me have chapter and verse for the assertion that Christ acknowledged His descent from Adam, in the sense of being his Son.” I hope none of your readers will think I have misquoted the passage, here it is: John viii. 44., “Ye are of your father the devil,” etc. “Do you quote that as a proof text for the assertion, I asked?” “Yes,” said he, “and to my mind it is very clear;” if you will look, you will find the word ‘your’ is in italics, and this shows that the word has been supplied by the translators. Its absence alters the sense considerably. Read as originally written: ‘Ye are of father the devil.’ I could not help smiling; it was such a strain, and, moreover, such an outrage upon the context. We had a tussle about the passage in 2 Cor., viii. 9, “For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ; that though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor.” Bro. Smith explained this by saying, “that Christ was born heir of the world, and therefore rich;” forgetting, doubtless, that by such an assertion he concedes the whole question; but, on being questioned as to when He surrendered His heir-ship, and became poor, he seemed a little embarrassed, and again took refuge on finding fault with the translation.

Bro. Smith thinks that the phrase, "He was rich," should be in the future tense, and therefore, should read, "He who is to be rich." We only require to complete the verse to show the absurdity of this liberty, "will for our sakes become poor." So, according to this new translator, Christ has yet to be rich, and He has yet to become poor, or to die. The first assertion is true, He will, one day be "rich," for He is to possess the whole earth; but, thank God, He is never again to be "poor," for He "ever liveth," and having ascended to His Father's nature, cannot "die anymore." I am very desirous for the enlightenment of the brethren upon this glorious subject; but while I try to exercise great charity towards all of them I cannot help thinking but that the Apostle would place Bro. Smith, and all such, amongst those who "count, the Blood of the Covenant an unholy thing." (Heb: x. 29). (to be continued).

[The reader will recollect that the editor of Christadelphian has affirmed that Jesus was a sinner in no sense, while his co-labourer, Mr Smith, declares that Christ was a sinner in two senses. The Apostle's advice - "Be ye all of one mind, speak the same thing" - is strangely exemplified by these teachers of the blind. - EDITOR.]

FETTERANGUS. - Bro. and Sister Kerr, writing to Bro. Farmer, say of the Lamp: "We think it is one of the best edited periodicals we ever read. Bro. Turney has no selfish aim as far as we can see, but a single eye to the glory of God and the good of the brethren. May he long be spared and continue to be a faithful servant of God our Father, and may His hand support him and enable him to search out the deep things of God. Now, brother, if you be willing to send the next vol. of the Lamp we will gladly accept of it. I would rather lose a portion of my daily food than lose it. It is delicious to the inner man, and all we have to cheer and help us to get into the feelings of our brethren."

GLASGOW. - Bro. Fleming corrects an inaccurate statement of ours in regard to advertisements. He mentions having been with certain others, out to Airdrie, where a new meeting has just been commenced. It appears that some had participated in the breaking of bread much to the annoyance of the new ecclesia, because they - the visitors from George Street - believed what was not true touching the Christ. Whereupon one of the new party went into Glasgow to take soundings for himself.

GLASGOW. - The lovers of the truth in Glasgow are cheered by the accession of John O'Neil. With such elements they will, no doubt, work hard for the spread of the good news in Christ. Bro. O'Neil writes: "I rejoice to inform you of my continued increase in the knowledge of the Son of God." We rejoice also at this news. It rings like the true metal. Would to God that many more would be frank with themselves and enquire, "Do I know the Father and the Son, whom to know is life everlasting?" "Do I know that my Ransomer was free, and not a poor condemned wretch like myself?" May the word of God awaken more out of their sleep and soften the stony heart of prejudice. Bro. O'Neil writes: I am happy to give an unqualified denial to a statement in the Christadelphian, two months ago, that a meeting in Airdrie was held on the same basis as the George St. ecclesia here. There is not one in Coatbridge, or Airdrie who hold the Adamite views of R. R. or his correspondents. On the contrary, there are about eight souls rejoicing in the Freedom of Christ, and in a knowledge of His relation to the Father. I fear that, as courtesy was shown to some in Coatbridge, it was taken as acquiescence in their belief; but such is not the case. The before-mentioned brethren and sisters went to Airdrie on Sunday two weeks, and held fellowship with those said to be on the bases of George St. If the statement in the Christadelphian had been true this could not be, as each well understood the faith they met in, vi. : the faith which saves, and not the faith which condemns the Saviour. Bro. Kerr, from Coatbridge, gave a suitable exhortation after the breaking of bread, and showed the necessity of continuing in the things taught by Jesus and Paul, and other Apostles, as also by Moses and the Fathers. This was followed by Bro. Flemming, who pointed out our duty to those in darkness, and prayed that their eyes might be drawn from looking to man, in whom there is no help, but to the God of Israel, who is mighty to save all who come to Him by His only Son, "Hear ye Him," -John O'Neil.

KILBARCHAM. - Bro. Farmer hands us an interesting letter from Sisters Spence and Nullings. They were giving up the Christadelphian, and desired to continue the Lamp in its stead. There are, they report, eleven brethren at Paisley who receive the Lamp, and express themselves much pleased with its contents.

LONDON. - Bros. Watts and Nichols inform Bro. Farmer that they have secured a considerable hall called the Priory, and are about to renew operations on a larger scale than heretofore in London. We are persuaded of their ability to do much good if they continue to be at peace among themselves. They report that a young man named Taylor could not approve of a condemned Christ, and was about to come over to them from the other meeting. We wish them all good, and hope that in sounding out the truth they may have much that is interesting to communicate for the encouragement of others.

LEICESTER. - Our meetings at the Temperance Hall continue, on the whole, well attended. Several friends are interested in the things brought before their notice, and are enquiry into them. We hope such enquiring may result in their laying hold on the only hope set before them for acceptance of the Scriptures

of Truth, the teachings of which are so utterly subversive of popular notions that it takes even an honest mind some effort to become persuaded that the men who have been educated as teachers of the people could, with all their learning and training, have got so far from the old paths. Brother Ellis, of Nottingham, lectured here on the 27th ult. His subject was, "The Unknown God, or Paul's preaching at Athens." Brother D. Handley lectured on the two following Sundays, his subjects being, "The saying of Jesus, 'Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness,'" and "Bought with a price, or God's plan of Redemption considered." We took advantage of a holiday, generally observed in the town on Thursday, the 8th (when the great bulk of the population go to see a few horses contend for prizes), to make arrangements for a tea-meeting, to which were invited as many of our friends as chose to come. About 50 sat down to tea, and a very enjoyable evening was spent. A goodly number of brethren and sisters from Nottingham were present, and the time, which seemed much too short, was spent in speaking and singing about the things on which our hopes are fixed. Since then, it has been arranged to hold a Bible discussion class in one of the rooms of the Temperance Hall, to which Bible students are invited. We hope some good may be done in this way. The intention is to take sundry prominent subjects in rotation, devoting as many nights to the consideration of each as may be required to elucidate the same. The first subject set down for consideration is, "The nature of man - do the Scriptures teach the Immortality of the Soul?" It would seem that this is beginning at the beginning, for certainly there seems little chance of the truth making any favourable impression until the mind is disabused of this and kindred glaringly unscriptural doctrines. Your intention to increase the dimensions of the Lamp, I have no doubt will find general acceptance, and is considered to be a step in the right direction. Trust there will be no lack of oil, but continue to shed its welcome light, till the more welcome luminary." The Sun of Righteousness," shall arise, and make it no longer a requirement. - CHARLES WEALE.

MANCHESTER. - My dear Bro. Turney: I have great pleasure in sending you the sum requisite for another twelve months Christadelphian Lamp. I like it much. May God's blessing attend your labours - JOHN TEASDALE, 7, Ogden-street. Ardwick.

MUMBLES. - We are very much pleased with the idea of the enlargement of the Christadelphian Lamp, and are assured, if the Editor will continue to draw his oil from the same source, as it increases in size it will also increase in light and splendour, and all those who without prejudice sit under its beaming light, and will be governed by, and carry out its teachings, will be well fitted for an abundant entrance into the glorious kingdom of a pure and uncondemned Christ, which we look for shortly to be established on the earth. More especially, if the Editor will continue to carry out the same even-handed justice to all brethren and those who are lovers of righteousness will study it themselves, and recommend it to others, as a Lamp worth buying. I expect we shall want a few more for this neighbourhood. I am happy to say the truth continues to progress. We have a candidate for examination next Sunday: a very energetic and promising young man. We have been much cheered today at the breaking of bread, by another addition to our number, namely, Edmund Sykes, Scrofield, 28, a Guard on the Midland Railway. He came to the Mumbles on Sunday, about three months ago, and was invited by Sister M. Hayward to our synagogue, when our lecture was, "Paul a prisoner at Rome, and what for?" At the close, he thanked her for having brought him, and said he would not rest until he understood the truth. He has attended every opportunity since, and on Sunday, Oct. 4, he was immersed into the Christ. He can now boldly say, There is no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit. - W. CLEMENT.

NEATH. - The following correspondence has been handed in for publication. With regard to Mr. Edwards's assertion of the immortality of the soul and eternal torture for the wicked, we hereby offer him sufficient space to calmly discuss the matter in the Lamp, and assure him of the fairest possible usage. EDITOR.

Old Market Street, Neath, Sept. 14, 1874. Mr. Edwards - Sir, I am greatly surprised at your not keeping your promise. Nine weeks have passed since you called to see me. I always had great faith in a Methodist preacher's word, but now it is shaken. My new friends, however, are not at all surprised. They told me from the first that they did not think you would come again, but I thought you would, knowing that it is a Methodist preacher's duty to look well after his flock. I have often thought of the words you used in conversation with Miss Heard, on the 11th July, when you were earnestly requested to put us right if we were wrong. You said, "It was a broad field to enter into." Surely it was not very difficult to talk to two young people like us. I thank God that ever I came to Neath. I was groping along in the dark, not understanding the word of God. But now I understand what I read I cannot find one text to prove what I have been taught from my early days, viz., that I have in my mortal body an immortal soul, and that when my body dies my "immortal soul" will find a home beyond the sky. Wesley teaches this doctrine in his hymns, but not a passage of scripture exists to prove it. There are plenty to prove that we are mortal, that

when we die we lose consciousness, and are no more until raised to life again. They that have been baptized into Christ and abide in Him, will rise to immortality. But you do not believe in such baptism. The blessed will reign with Christ on the earth. There is something delightful in this hope. The Bible plainly teaches us that no man hath ascended up to heaven. David is not there, and I don't want to go. I am waiting for that glorious time when Christ shall return to His own beloved city Jerusalem. If anything I have written is not in accordance with scripture, I shall be glad to have it pointed out. Yours once a believer in the Methodist delusion. M. A. TAYLOR. P.S. The enclosed tract "It is Written" shows what God teaches, and what man teaches.

8, Queen Street, Neath, Sep. 15, 1874. - Dear Miss Taylor: I am very sorry that your confidence in Methodist preachers should have been shaken by my delay in re-visiting you; I don't remember that I said I would come in a month or two, but simply that I would come again. Since that time, I have been from home, have had sickness in my house, and have had my hands full of work of different kinds; but I had not abandoned my purpose to see you again. As to the tract you enclosed in your letter it is a very ingenious play on words, and very calculated to mislead young and unstable souls, but it is a gross caricature of what I have often heard preached, and preached myself, and I cannot at all imagine who the "popular preachers" are to whom reference is made. For instance, and to cite only one example - "It is written" that Jesus is the Christ, the son of the living God, John vi 69 - Popular P's say that Jesus was not the Son of God, but the human nature in which the Son of God, or 'God the Son' dwelt, thereby manifesting themselves as of the Anti-Christ." Who says so? I say that Jesus was the Son of God - that he assumed human nature, not dwelt in it simply - that in His person two perfect natures, the human and the Divine, mysteriously unite - i. e., that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. 1 John iv. 2-3. When I read that Jesus said, "I go to prepare a place for you, and if I go to prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am, there ye may be also." I read also that "the earth and all things therein shall be burned up." I confess I hope for something better than a perpetual Jerusalem home on this earth - with which you seem so very content. I confess that Matt. xxv. 46, gives me the idea of endless existence for both the righteous and wicked, and as endless existence I understand Immortality; I distinguish between unending existence and eternal life, the gift of God through Christ - which of course will be possessed only by such as believe. But it will be utterly useless for me, on paper to endeavour to disprove your theories; and whatever proofs of my own creed I might adduce, I fear would seem idle words to any whose self-sufficiency is so manifest as yours, and you friends. Proofs are vain to obstinate unbelief. I cannot but deplore that you have been so entangled in what I cannot but regard as a dangerous delusion. Young, impulsive, and unable to discern between things that differ, you are puffed up with pride, and are ready to say "we are the people of the Lord, and all else are deluded heathen." The Methodist delusion" as you are pleased to call it has enabled believers in it to live happy lives and die triumphant deaths; its teachings have turned millions from sin to holiness, but till I met with you and your friends, I never heard of the Christadelphians, whose lamp burns now in dim obscurity, and will doubtless go out into utter darkness. That you may live long enough to renounce the errors into which you have been reduced is my Prayer, and that we may both attain unto everlasting life through Christ. - I am yours faithfully, J. Edwards.

NOTTINGHAM - The interest manifested in the public proclamation of the truth from week to week in this town is decidedly on the increase, and is very encouraging to the brethren who stand up in its defence. They have also been cheered by the visits of brethren from a distance, some of whom have addressed the Ecclesia to profit at their morning meetings. During the month, the following lectures have been delivered to very attentive audiences: - Sunday, Sept. 20th "Great Stir among the Jews;" "Probable Colonisation of Palestine;" "March of Russia in the East;" "Solution of the Eastern Question." Brother Hayes. Sept. 27th. "The Descent of Jesus to Mount Olivet, A Great Earthquake, Universal War." Bro Turney. Oct. 4th. "What are the grounds for believing that Jesus, the Christ, will reign on the Earth for a thousand years?" Brother Ellis, Oct. 11th. "Life only in Christ; Another Attack on the pagan doctrine of Immortal Soul." Brother Turney. A very large audience. Taking advantage of the holidays, it was decided to hold a tea meeting, which was very successfully carried out on the 5th ult., upwards of 80 sitting down to tables well supplied with the refreshments usual on such occasions. The meeting was specially convened for the purpose of finally deciding as to the advisability of establishing a Sunday school and also a reading-room. The want of a Sunday school has been long felt, and the question of forming one has latterly been much agitated among the brethren. The idea of using the school-room as a place of meeting where the members of the Ecclesia could read religious and political papers and periodicals, originated with Brother Farmer, and was very favourably received by the great majority of the brethren. After the tea was disposed of, Brother Hayes was called to the chair, and made a few introductory remarks on the topics referred to above; discussion followed, in which several of the brethren took part, including Brother Handley, of Maldon, and it was finally decided that the proposed plans for a Sunday school and a reading-room should

be carried into effect as soon as the necessary arrangements could be made. Five brethren, and as many sisters, volunteered their services as teachers in the proposed Sunday school, and were accepted, with power to add to their number, and to the ten volunteers, whose names were read over to the meeting, was committed the task of carrying out all the necessary details as to the management of the school. Brother W. Lewin has since been authorised by the managing brethren to purchase books and other things required in the teaching of the children, and it was further decided that a commencement should be made on Sunday next, October 18th. The teaching in the school to be mainly religious, but to include history, geography, and other branches of education, as far as practicable. Though specially established for the benefit of the children of the brethren, the school to be opened also for any others whose parents were willing to send them. With regard to the reading-room, after some further discussion, it was determined to commence operations forthwith according to the following programme: - The room to be opened every evening from seven o'clock to half-past nine (except Sundays and Wednesdays), and to be superintended on each occasion by a brother, whose duty it should be to maintain order and quiet. All the members of the Ecclesia (both brethren and sisters) to have free admission at all times, and to be permitted also to bring their friends or any interested strangers. In the event of any one present being desirous of putting a question, to a brother concerning the faith, or to discuss any point of doctrine, the parties to adjourn to the ante-room, so as to prevent those engaged in reading from being disturbed. The following books and periodicals to be supplied for the use of the members and their friends, "The Jewish Chronicle," "The Christadelphian" "The Christadelphia Lamp," "The Rainbow," "The Old Sun Dial," "The Bible Echo," "Public Opinion," "The Daily News," "The Standard," "The Nottingham Express," "The Nottingham Guardian," "Cruden's Concordance," "English Dictionary," "Gazetteer," "Atlas of Maps," also writing materials. The London and local papers to be varied from time to time, and books of a suitable character to be added, so as by degrees to form a library. The meeting was concluded in the usual way, and the brethren separated well pleased with the evening's proceedings.

PAISLEY. - The church in this town, though small, is composed of some really intelligent members, especially sisters. The meetings are held with regularity for the remembrance of the Lord's death till He comes.

RHYNIE. - Dear Bro. Turney: I indeed appreciate the Lamp, and was to have sent you something in the form of intelligence, but I must wait a short time as it is not convenient just at present. Would you send me a few "tracts" for distribution, and I will send you stamps as payment for the same? In this place I am subject to be imposed upon to receive things of that nature, so I would just give some of our wares in return. Don't send anything that would be calculated to raise the ire of the people, such as "Beware" of such and such things, which may be all correct, but for my part I prefer the truth in its original simplicity. - I am, dear Bro., yours in the hope of Israel, ALEXANDER TARDES.

STOCKBRIDGE. - Last month you were informed that we succeeded in obtaining the Union Hall for our use on Sundays. I am happy to be able to send you particulars of the opening of the same. On Sunday morning, Oct. 4th, we met for the first time in the new room, with which we are all highly pleased. Bro. E. Turney being present gave us a word of exhortation, pointing to the progress already made, as an encouragement to continue the good work. In the evening the town having been placarded, and hand-bills distributed during the week, a numerous audience assembled to hear the lecture by Bro. E. Turney, on "The future of the earth and man upon it, as taught by the Hebrew Prophets, Jesus, and the Apostles." The greatest attention was paid, while the subject was treated in a serious and impressive manner, to the no small surprise of many present, who, having been taught to believe in that horrible doctrine of the burning up of the earth, were ignorant of the glorious future set before us in the Scriptures. Many were evidently impressed with the reality of the promised blessedness, and we are patiently waiting for the fruit, being convinced that some of the seed has fallen upon "good ground." It was originally intended to have a tea party of the brethren and sisters on the following Tuesday, with another lecture at night, but there being no general holiday, and other obstacles being in the way, the idea was abandoned, and the weeknight lecture fixed for Wednesday. There was again a good audience, though not so large as on the previous Sunday; the subject being, "The promise of life in Christ - the doctrine of the soul's immortality unscriptural - the conditions on which man may live for ever." It was shown that eternal life had been made a subject of promise by God, that this promise was in His Son Jesus Christ, and that that, therefore, immortality could not at present be possessed by all men as commonly supposed. It was pointed out that although the Bible records so many instances of persons being brought to life again, yet not one word is said about their experience in the "intermediate state," affording the strongest negative evidence of the fact that "the dead know not anything" "and there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither we go." Christ's answer to the thief having been explained, the conditions on which eternal life is obtainable were pointed out, as faith in the promises of God, and obedience to His commands. The lecture

occupied over an hour and a half, and was listened to with the greatest attention. I am told of one person who, although a staunch Methodist, said, after hearing the lecture, that "it was all in accordance with the Scriptures, and, after all, the idea of souls living after death must be wrong." On the following Sunday, October 11th, we were pleased to have the company of Dr. Hayes, who addressed us in the morning, and lectured at night on "The great stir among the Jews - Probable colonization of Palestine. The march of Russia in the East - The solution of the Eastern question." It was remarked that some might consider that the subject savoured more of politics than religion. But the 2nd Psalm spoke of God setting up His king upon His holy hill of Zion who was to have "The nations for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession." This was surely a political question of great magnitude. The present stir among the Jews was shown to be indicative of the fact that the time is near at hand when Jehovah will "remember the land," and the Jews will be gathered again. The 38th and 39th chapters of Ezekiel and also the prophet Daniel were quoted from as indicating Russia's career of conquest, and her sudden overthrow at the land of the Lord. The lecture was most interesting, and was listened to with marked attention by an unusually large audience. Lengthy reports of the lectures have appeared in one of the local papers. We shall do our best to keep up the interest which has been aroused, leaving the rest to Him who alone "giveth the increase." F. N. TURNEY.

SWINDON - Bro G. Haines, the principal representative of the truth here is about to take up his abode in Nottingham, where, no doubt, he will make himself useful, and, perhaps, do something in the way of establishing a Sunday school, for which certain brethren seem inclined.

WISBECH. - Dear Bro. Turney: Enclosed, is P.O.O. for 10s., for one copy of the Lamp for one year. The extra please drop into the offerings for the spread of the truth, for me. My little plan of lending books may, or may not, bring forth fruit, but it has been suggested by Ezek. iii. 19-21; and I pray that the Author of Truth will bless the effort feeble as it is, to the good of some. I truly hope that your health is better, and that you will take care of yourself this trying weather, and be spared to labour for the Lord many a year. I am yours sincerely, in the Holy One, SARAH MARY ROGERS.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

RIVERSIDE, IOWA. - On September 23rd, Bro. Bingley sends a long epistle. He had seen a number of the brethren in different parts, who expressed a desire to see us early in the summer of next year. We must wait and see. Sister Thomas would like us to sell the Doctor's works. Nothing would give us greater pleasure if we had some in stock, but we cannot afford to pay for advertising and lose money on the orders for them besides. The large and increasing circulation of the Christadelphian Lamp would bring orders for a quantity, and do much good. It remains with her, therefore, to open the way.

SYDNEY ASHFIELD, - Dear Bro. Farmer: I received the five numbers of the Christadelphian Lamp and pamphlets, for which I thank you, and desire that you will continue to send the Lamp. Now this unpleasant subject, the "Sacrifice of Christ," unpleasant because it has caused much acrimonious feeling to be discharged by those we should have expected better things from; yet a very pleasant subject to all who will accept it as a great and glorious fact, which as such I receive it, thanking God for the same. Now there must be something besides a desire for truth on the part of the rejecters that keeps them from gladly receiving, what appears to me to be, an exalted Christ. From the first time that this matter appeared, my mind has been that all that was written on both sides should have appeared in the Christadelphian. I cannot see that the Editor of that publication had any right to put in only just what he liked. I have looked on the Christadelphian as a periodical that is the property of a body of men and women, for the purpose of unfolding truth. We often get truth through error. It is by many of the errors of the religious world that I gain strength in truth. I cannot think that the Christadelphian or Christadelphian Lamp is the sole property of the editors, but rather the property of men and women holding the one faith, and should be open at all times to the reasonable expression of their minds. Up to the time I received Bro. Turney's lecture, etc., from you there had been no means of knowing his mind in Sydney, as none of his writings had appeared in this place. I have lent them to all who call themselves Christadelphians. So far as I know, there are five and myself gladly receive the uncondemned Christ. For my own part, I was decided when I saw Bro. Handley's letter in the November Christadelphian, 1871. "No man can redeem his brother." In fact, if the Bible taught that Christ was sinless, and yet had to offer for His own sins, I could not accept it. I would conclude that such did not come from God. One thought I have to offer, that I have not seen yet in anything said on the Sacrament of Christ. What was Adam when formed before he received the breath of life? He must have been flesh and bone. - Please send twelve lectures, Sacrifice of Christ, and one

Diabolism. - Yours, in the Christ, PETER GRAHAM. P.S. – Please convey to Bro. Handley my thanks for his letter, and you can make me your agent in Sydney for publications. I enclose P.O.O. in favour of you for 15s. I think this will meet for lectures, etc., sent and those ordered. - P.G.

[Truth will prevail with all who love it for its own sake. Here, at the other side of the world, is an exhibition of its power. For ten months nothing had reached the writer but perversion and abuse. The light came at last, and was apprehended. Truth is in no hurry, but, nevertheless, wins the fight against error. We thank Bro. Graham for his interest, congratulate him and his friends on their perception of the beautiful and true, and shall gladly write him down agent for Sydney. - EDITOR.]

IMPURE VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE.

IT is not generally known that the “British and Foreign Bible Society” spends part of the money it receives from English Protestants in making and scattering Roman Catholic versions of the Bible, which contain many pernicious heresies; and by this means it helps to keep up Mariolatry, the worship of images, meritorious almsgiving, penance, worshipping a staff, invocation of saints, tradition, etc. These impure versions of the Bible it distributes in France, Belgium, Canada, the French Colonies; Spain, Portugal, and Portuguese Colonies; Poland, Germany, and Austria.

We give a few specimens of some of the translations:

“She shall bruise thy head” (Gen. iii. 15); instead of “It [the woman’s seed, the Christ] shall bruise thy head.” Supports Mariolatry.

“You shall not render to them [i.e. to images] the supreme worship “Ex. xx. 5); instead of, “Thou shall not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them.” Teaching by inference that an inferior worship may be paid to images”

“Redeem thy sins by almsgiving” (Dan. iv. 17). Teaching that men, by giving alms, can atone for their sins.

“By faith Jacob . . . worshipped the top of his staff” (Heb. xii 21): instead of, “By faith Jacob . . . worshipped, leaning upon the top of his staff.” Teaching the adoration of a staff.

“Turn to some one of the saints” (Job v. 1); instead of the derisive question, “To which of the saints wilt thou turn?” Teaches invocation of saints.

“ God . . . commandeth all men everywhere to do penance “ (Acts xvii. 30); instead of, “God commandeth all men everywhere to repent.” Teaching penance as a command of God.

“Earnestly contend for the faith, which was once delivered by tradition to the saints” (Jude 3). “By tradition,” is an interpolation. Teaches that tradition is to be relied on.

“Make your calling and election sure by good works,” - giving a wrong, because a meritorious place, to good works.

“The British and Foreign Bible Society” is responsible for perpetuating these errors by scattering editions of the Scriptures with them in; and so is every Protestant subscriber who, knowing the facts of the case, contributes another penny to its funds. - BIBLE ECHO

ZEALOUS men are ever displaying to you the strength of their belief, while judicious men are showing you the grounds of it. - SHENSTONE’S ESSAYS.

SLANDER. - “It does not depend upon me,” said the Grecian, to prevent being spoken ill of; “it is only in my power that it be not done deservedly.”