

The Christian Lamp

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

Vol. 2.

AUGUST, 1875.

No. 10.

CONTENTS

Page 320.	Concerning Angels	Editor
Page 322.	The Arch of Titus	Gleaner
Page 324.	Weak in The faith	Editor
Page 326.	The Farther and The Son	W. D. Jardine
Page 330.	A Tour of Scotland	W. Ellis
Page 332.	Answers to Correspondents	
Page 339.	Letters to the Editor	
Page 343.	Misunderstandings Concerning Holy Spirit	
Page 344.	J. Cameron and R. Roberts	
Page 346.	Intelligence	
Page 353.	Foreign Intelligence	

Among the diverse courses pursued by religious parties, one is common to all-elasticity and breadth during infancy and youth; rigidity and intolerance in manhood and advanced age. There is no difficulty in accounting for this unhealthy change; it arises from that greed of power which is never more manifest, never more repulsive, in any than in religious communities. Tenets which in the beginning were scarcely noticed are after-wards either transformed into indispensable articles of faith, or rejected as deadly poisons; those once esteemed perfectly harmless, not capable of affecting the quality of the “wine well refined,” come to be regarded as unpalatable and deleterious as the bitterness of the waters of Marah. Hence the just and cogent objection against creeds, and confessions of human device; hence their uniform and ultimate fate.

“Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you. For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened. If a son shall ask bread of any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone? or if he ask a fish, will he for a fish give him a serpent? Or if he shall ask an egg, will he offer him a scorpion? If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?”

Luke 11:9-13

CONCERNING ANGELS.

The ordinary sense conveyed by the word angel is that of a being more than human, both as regards nature and endowments, intellectual and moral. But there is nothing in the epithet itself of such import. The Greek word *αγγελος* signifies "a messenger," the bearer of orders, or tidings. It is applied also to animals, as a bird, by way of omen; and likewise in the sacred writings to meteors, as in Hebrews i. 7, our version reads, "He maketh His angels spirits, and His ministers a flame of fire;" or it may be rendered, "He maketh the winds His messengers, and His servants a flame of fire." In the Lxx the term stands for a prophet, Esdras i. 50, I. Maccabees i. 44; and in the N. T. for leaders in the churches, Rev. i. 20.

Nevertheless, it is largely used in Scripture to represent a class of beings infinitely superior to man in their physical, moral, and intellectual condition: "But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels." Luke xx.35,36. From this it appears that the order of angels here referred to are incapable of death; though this is certainly not the case with angels in general.

Whether Jehovah has created any angels deathless is a query we should not be inclined to answer affirmatively; still, we are not aware of any statement to the contrary. All his proceedings seem to be based upon a principle of progression. The original formation of the spheres of our material system, as far as the account goes, would suggest this to have been the method employed; further development noted by the observant of science corroborates this arrangement. The plan of the Eternal is that which reflects most His wisdom, glory, and goodness. As to power, doubtless he could have spoken every orb and man into finished, perfect being. But in the gradual creation we see patience and order, and are taught that the universe is governed by immutable law. All the ways of God made known to man, either by the volume of inspiration or the book of nature, must be designed for man's improvement; had perfectness burst upon the boundless void, wonder chiefly would have been stirred, while in the contemplation of the progressive scheme man becomes a progressist continually raised until he himself attains to god-like eminence. From all we can learn the inference would be that the highest angels have passed through a probationary career; that the Almighty has not seen fit to stamp ultimate perfection at once on any of His works.

By what means the present perfectness of the angels has been wrought out is purely matter of conjecture; and the mind can only fly to facts which belong to the proposed elevation of our race. But the redemption scheme pertaining unto the children of this earth could scarcely be the same, or indeed bear any analogy to the scheme – if such has been adapted to the denizens of some other world. The implied ignorance of the angels intimates this: "which things the angels desire to look into" I Peter, i. 12. The word *παρακωπτω* signifies to penetrate, whence it is evident that the plan of redeeming our race was not known to those intelligences, which would have been the case if they had undergone a like ordeal to man. For ourselves we can see no farther, though desiring "to look into" their experience, as they into ours, not a ray of light steals athwart this pregnant gloom. Possibly a future intercommunication with the angels may enlighten us. When they visited our planet and held intercourse with humanity, no hint was dropped. Probably many new revelations await the sons of men. Why should the Bible be the first and last? The guidance of future ages appears not to be fully disclosed in its pages. A few particulars respecting the Messianic government are given, but as to the vast Beyond, all is as silent as the grave,

The angels may be omnipotent in their own habitations; their knowledge and jurisdiction even seem to extend beyond their own places of abode; but it is certain, notwithstanding this, that their powers are limited. Respecting some things they are undoubtedly without cognoscence; of "the times and the seasons" wherein "the kingdom" is to be "restored again to Israel" they knew nothing; neither did they know "the day and hour" when the Jewish commonwealth should be destroyed. An insight into some things they have acquired, not by their own merits, but by the merits of Jesus Christ; to wit, the opening of the seven sealed scroll in the right hand of Him who sat upon the throne. The rough outline of events they had read in Daniel, but the details of the long period from the overthrow of Jerusalem to her restoration under Christ they did not possess. The ignorance of angels concerning things revealed in prophecy is further seen by the enquiry of one in Dan. viii. 13; "How long the vision?" That angels have a practical interest in the affairs of men is testified in several parts of scripture, but it is not easy to discover precisely in what way they operate. One assured the prophet Daniel that he was sent to make him understand that by which he had been deeply distressed - chap. x. 11. This divine messenger related that "the prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood him one-and-twenty days: but, lo, Michael one of the chief princes came to help me" - verse 13. This passage leaves us in the state of wonder and obscurity caused by very partial information. The first impression is that the angels were the prime movers in the politics of Persia and Greece, and were working in opposition to those who bore sway in those countries. Whether such

antagonism arises from party spirit similar to human party feelings, or whether it is of another sort, is difficult to determine. In short this kind of intervention is a subject of great abstrusity, if not unsearchable with our present limited knowledge. When we have observed that the Scriptures affirm it, that is about as far as we can go with confidence, beyond stating our persuasion that the angels ever act in harmony with the mind of the Deity. The preponderance of power seems to be on the side of the future rulers of the world. "For unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come;" implying that the present world is in subjection to them, and for the end just alluded to, namely, the possession of it by the saints. "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation." Hebrews ii. 5., i. 14.

In ancient days this ministering was sometimes conducted visibly to the human eye. The appearance of the angel in the bush, God's appearing to Abraham, the visit of the angels to Him, their stay with Lot, the obstruction of Baalam's path, God's appearing to Solomon, the angelic host at the birth of Christ, and so forth, all illustrates the truth of the doctrine that angelic beings do take part in the concerns of earth. David says "the angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear him," and it is not necessary to regard such statements as merely indicative of power from God without the proximity of some personal agent. As to visible interference few now believe in it. The wild assertions of Swendborg and Dale Owen find acceptance only with the credulous and superstitious. But these idle fancies claim no credence akin to that demanded by the testimony of Scripture characters for those divine manifestations in the past. As there were reasons for the visible operations of angels, so there must be equally good reasons for their invisible operations; but who can satisfy us about the latter?

The worshipping of angels is inculcated by the church of Borne under the transparent pretence of a reverence inferior to that paid to the Father and Son. The angels and saints are a sort of secondary mediatorial body, eminently useful in securing the favor of the Holy Trinity. To such as have been taught that the exercise of private judgment is a heinous sin, to quote passages of Scripture against angel worship would, of course, be wasting time. But those who doubt the propriety of the practice, and those who do not know on which side to stand for safety, may advantageously turn to the following admonitions of Holy Writ, and having read them can they suppose the existence of counter texts without the serious consequence of giving God the lie? "Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels." Col. i. 18. "I fell at his feet to worship him; and he said unto me, See thou do it not, I am thy fellow-servant, worship God." Rev. xix. 10. The same injunction occurs in chapter xxii. 8, 9: Neither in heaven nor upon earth is there any proper object of adoration but God. "Whom have I in heaven but thee? and there is none upon earth that I desire beside thee" exclaimed the sweet bard of Israel. Psalm Ixxiii. 25.

Among other reasons for not worshipping angels is this, that it would in effect be the master worshipping his servants. The saints are to be "made equal to the angels." If angels visit our globe, they must be subject to its laws. The saints will be its law-makers, and therefore angelic authority in their dominions must be subordinate to theirs, for, saith the Apostle, "He hath not put in subjection (to the angels) the world to come." But, as is fitting, should the saints journey to their spheres, then they must be in subjection to the angel rulers there.

Whether angels are incapable of sin is to be questioned. Some may be, and almost indubitably are. The wages of sin being death, we may conclude that those who "cannot die anymore," cannot sin any more. But we read that "the saints are to judge angels." Also that certain who "kept not their first estate, are reserved unto the judgment of the great day." Are these sinners immortal? We think not. If they be, death could never take effect on them. And yet, what meaneth Paul by the saying, "Know ye not that we shall judge angels? "Does he not speak here of the judgment of beings superior to men? The passage might countenance such sentiments. But are there any beings superior to men called angels, who are not deathless? No satisfactory answer comes to these enquiries. The most probable solution we can offer of *σγγελοὺς κρινούμεν* – we shall judge angels, is that the saints will wield administrative power over even the angels whenever they may visit our world. The idea of sitting in judgment on them as transgressors seems inadmissible. *Κρινω* means to judge in all its acceptations, so that the text presents no obstacle to such an understanding of it.

A very common belief is that there are two classes of angels - good and evil, and that there is a warfare constantly waging between these, similar to that carried on between good and bad men. By "evil," sinful angels are meant, and all, or nearly all, those passages about devils and unclean spirits, so numerous in the N. T., are called up to support the opinion that myriads of "wicked spirits" hover as tempters about mankind. A careful examination, however, of those texts will prove that human beings and diseases, mental and bodily, are really intended - that there is no ground from the peculiar form of speech employed, to assume the existence of superhuman, wicked beings called "evil spirits."

An angel may have evil tidings for the sons of men: he may be the dispenser of sore evils upon mortals without himself being at all evil, in the sense of wicked, that is, sinful. A proper discrimination between evil and sin would obviate much confusion and error. Evil proceeds from God, not from the Chief of "evil spirits," as many suppose. "I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace, and create evil: I the Lord do all these things." Isa. xlv. 7. See also Amos iii. 6, and many other passages wherein the word evil occurs.

Is it not monstrous to imagine the need of sinful angels, wicked immortal beings of superior, nay, almost divine attributes, to prompt sinful men to transgress against God? An inborn proneness to disobedience is surely evil enough. Yet such seems to be a general notion.

But this first-sight enormity is hardly a sufficient answer to some objections emanating from our opponents. The following passage is, probably, most favourable of any adduced on the side of "evil spirits." "Then there came out a spirit, and stood before the Lord, and said, I will entice him. And the Lord said unto him, Wherewith? And he said, I will go out, and be a lying spirit in the mouth of all His prophets. And the Lord said, Thou shalt entice him, and thou shalt also prevail: go out, and do even so. Now, therefore, behold, the Lord hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of these thy prophets; and the Lord hath spoken evil against thee." 2 Ch. xviii. 20-23.

We see no actual obligation to understand personality in this description; still, if the "spirit" were a person, is it imperative to regard him as wicked? The whole looks very like a parabolic account of the transactions of the false prophets who flatteringly counselled Ahab for war. To "put a lying spirit" into their mouths, may easily enough be taken to signify that they were judicially blinded as a just recompense for their hypocrisy. Paul speaks of the wicked being "given over to a reprobate mind." This may aptly be pictured by the "lying spirit." Otherwise there would appear to be a friendly conference between the Lord and lying spirits. What reward more meet for such prophets than to leave them free to pursue their own perverse inclinations, "to work all uncleanness with greediness?" The Lord is righteous in all His ways.

EDITOR.

THE ARCH OF TITUS, AND ITS TESTIMONY TO THE FAITH.

The venerable remains of Phoenician, Egyptian, Greek, and Roman antiquity have often been cited in illustration of the evidences of the Christian faith. These monuments are scattered over an immense area, extending from the Euphrates to the Guadalquivir, and from the Danube to the Desert of Sahara and the slopes of the Atlas Mountains. They vindicate the genuineness and authenticity of our sacred books by inscriptions, by painting, and by sculpture. Among the buildings which fulfil the latter office, the Arch of Titus at Rome, erected to commemorate the conquest of Judaea by that general, is not the least conspicuous. It is deservedly reckoned a perfect model of architectural grace and beauty, notwithstanding the ravages of time and the feudal wars of the Middle Ages, and the foolish attempt of the Frangipanni family, many hundreds of years ago, to improve it, by placing a sort of turret, or a crown, on the top. This excrescence has happily been removed.

The monument is situated on the foot of the Palatine Hill, the original centre of old Rome. It consists only of a single arch, whereas the arch of Constantine and that of Septimius Severus consist of a large arch in the middle with a smaller one on each side.

Let us suppose ourselves leaving the Colosseum, turning our backs to the gigantic building, and facing the somewhat distant Capitoline Hill. In front of us is the arch of Titus. Over the triumphal arch itself stands out, in big domineering capitals, which may still be read at a considerable distance, the following inscription: -

SENATVS POPOLOSQVE ROMANVS,
DIVO TITO DIVI VESPASIANI, F
VESPASIANO AVGVSTO.

(The Roman Senate and people to the
divine Titus of the deified Vespasian, son to the
Emperor Vespasian).

The achievements of the imperial general are displayed in various forms upon the structure. In Montfaucon's celebrated "Antiquities" there are several plates which represent the figures upon the arch

more exactly than they are now to be traced. In the first we see the emperor making his triumphal entry, in a round chariot called *thersē*, drawn by four huge war horses. This forms a bas-relief on the right-hand side of the interior of the arch as the spectator approaches from the Colosseum. A victory places a crown of laurel upon the head of Titus. In one hand he brandishes a *truncheon*, probably a symbol of supreme command, like the baton of the modern field-marshal; in the other he holds a somewhat mysterious scroll. The well-known figure, armed with a helmet and spear, which is found in so many ancient remains, and represents the tutelary genius of the city of Rome, appears doing honour to the conqueror by leading one of the horses by the bridle. His imperial majesty is surrounded by *lictors* and soldiers, all crowned with the customary chaplet of laurel. On the left-hand side of the arch, in a space exactly corresponding with that on the right-hand, is found a far more interesting and suggestive group of figures. Here is shewn the actual conquest of Jerusalem itself. Several legionaries, also wreathed with laurel, bear aloft the golden table which stood in the Temple that for so many ages glorified the sacred height of Mount Moriah. The two brazen trumpets, often alluded to in the Holy Bible, are borne by similar attendants. Crowds of warriors follow, some carrying the great golden candlestick with seven branches. All the bearers have staves to assist in supporting them under the enormous and crushing weight of these precious trophies. Some carry branches of laurel, and others tablets, on which were probably inscribed the names of the conquered cities. Montfaucon's work contains several other antiques, typical of the conquest. Among them, the river Jordan is borne along in triumph, represented by an old man lying down, and leaning upon an urn, which was a favourite Roman method of symbolising rivers. Contemporary with the erection of the arch, or nearly so, several medals were struck. On one of them, a woman sitting sadly by a palm-tree deploras her bitter misfortunes; behind the palm-tree stands a soldier with his foot upon a helmet, and the inscription is, "JUDAEA CAPTA," that is, "Judaea taken." A fearful picture of the daughter of Jerusalem, who so long sat and wept in the dust! The apotheosis of Titus is represented in the middle of the vault by the emblematic figure of the conqueror, home to heaven on the broad wings of a towering eagle.

Josephus corroborates many of the foregoing remarks, and minutely describes the triumphal procession of Vespasian and his son. Amongst other trophies carried before them, the rich spoils which had belonged to the Temple at Jerusalem were conspicuous. "There was the golden table," says the Jewish historian, "which weighed many talents. It was constructed upon a different principle from anything in use amongst us now. In the middle was the main stem, which rose out of the base; from this proceeded smaller branches, very much resembling the form of a trident, and on the top of each of them was a lamp worked in brass. There were seven such in all, emblematical of the seven days of the Jewish week. The Book of the Law was the last of the spoils, and closed the mournful procession."

This narrative would not be complete if we omitted to state that the material of which the arch was constructed came from the purest marble quarries of Pentelicus, white and glistening at first, but afterwards blackened by age and exposure to the weather. At last the building became so ruinous that it was taken down, block by block, during the pontificate of Pope Pius VII., (1800 to 1823) and entirely restored, Travertine stone being used for the new portions of the work. From the foundation to the frieze it is covered with suggestive sculptures. As one has felicitously observed, "it is a document in marble." It bears testimony that the sovereign pontiff, Vespasian, and his son, by destroying the Temple and the city, which seemed to crystallise the Mosaic dispensation, fulfilled the prophecies of Holy Writ, especially those uttered by the Saviour Himself.

The inscription on the side opposite the Capitol honours Titus for having "subjugated the nation of the Jews, and destroyed the city of Jerusalem, a fortress vainly attacked and besieged before him by generals, kings, and peoples." The conqueror's attire was that of Jupiter Capitolinus. "His face and his arms," says Josephus, "were like the statue of Jupiter Triumphant, enamelled with minium or vermilion." This stately colouring has long since disappeared, for every Jew who passes the arch flings a stone at the head of Titus; and no son or daughter of Abraham will, under any pretext, pass under the accursed gateway.

We have remarked that the arch and its sculptures form an impressive evidence of the fulfilment of prophecy. Jesus, on His last visit to the gorgeous Temple at Jerusalem, then recently restored by the Idumean usurper, Herod the Great, uttered these remarkable words: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not? Behold, your house is left unto you desolate." Shortly before, He had wept over the devoted city, saying, "If thou hadst known, even thou at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace, but now they are hid from thine eyes. For the days shall come upon thee that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, and shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy

children within thee, and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another, because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation.”

The word translated “trench” might be rendered rampart, for the earth and stones excavated to form a trench were used in piling up such a heap.

To all these utterances of the Lord, the event most critically and exactly corresponded. Josephus says: “When Titus attacked the city the Jews defended themselves so obstinately that he found there was no way to gain his purpose but to compass the city round with a trench and mound. By this means he kept the besieged in on every side, cut off from them all hope of safety by flight, and consumed them by famine. The work which he undertook was indeed a matter of extreme difficulty, for the wall measured thirty-nine furlongs, or almost five miles, and the towers were thirteen in number, every one of them ten furlongs in compass. Nevertheless, the whole was finished in three days, for the soldiers in performing the task were animated by a Divine impetus.”

We are informed by Maimonides, the learned rabbi of Cordova, in Spain, that the very site of the Temple was ploughed up, thus fulfilling the prediction, “Sion shall be ploughed as a field,”

It is said that Titus wished to preserve the Temple, and would have punished the incendiaries that set fire to its cedar beams and hangings of Tyrian purple, but that such was the remorseless malignity of the wild factions within the city, as much against each other as against the Roman forces, that the legionaries of Titus were roused to more than super-human rage. The infatuation, obstinacy, and purposeless atrocities of the Jews drove these to brutalities of which the “grinding to powder” of gems of architectural beauty was only the small material type. Thus were the Lord’s words, every jot and tittle of them, exactly accomplished. Stand out, old arch, still uttering thy silent testimony to the truth of Jehovah. (Selected.) GLEANER.

WEAK IN THE FAITH.

Among the diverse courses pursued by religious parties, one is common to all—elasticity and breadth during infancy and youth, rigidity and intolerance in manhood and advanced age. There is no difficulty in accounting for this unhealthy change; it arises from that greed of power which is never more manifest, never more repulsive, in any than in religious communities. Tenets which in the beginning were scarcely noticed are afterwards either transformed into indispensable articles of faith, or rejected as deadly poisons; those once esteemed perfectly harmless, not capable of affecting the quality of the “wine well refined,” come to be regarded as unpalatable and deleterious as the bitterness of the waters of Marah. Hence the just and cogent objection against creeds, and confessions of human device; hence their uniform and ultimate fate. The sublimity of ingenious folly in this species of manufacture was long since reached by the brilliant coquette and cruel woman whose dwelling is the “eternal city.” Her daughters and granddaughters have, at greater or less distances, trodden in her steps. She, by her inventions, has made the Bible a pernicious book to the million; tradition and fancy have been interwoven with its records and precepts to its practical exclusion; so that the sacred Book, once the standard and final appeal of protestantism, gives place to some catechetical synopsis of modern date, and perchance of contradictory teaching. That large embrace of charity which was wont to infold him who was weak as well as him who was strong, in the faith - the weak being upheld with more solicitude - has been thrust aside to make way for an iron handed master whose title is justice without mercy, and whose sovereign remedy is the latest creation of an overbearing will.

Time was when the learned and the unlearned dwelt together without hatred and strife, in the efficacy of Christ’s blood; baptism for the remission of sins; faith and hope of future reward and a dread of future punishment; vague notions of a kingdom; the restoration of Israel; dreamy thoughts of heaven, hell, the devil, the judgment day, and the disembodied state of the soul; such, we say, was once the general condition of spiritual affairs, and the few who were better informed excused themselves for their wide fellowship by the example of Jesus in retaining Judas in the apostleship. Under this tolerance many grew in knowledge; the steady shining of the mild light of truth dispersed the darkness from the eyes of many understandings, which a sudden and continued contact with the bright unguarded rays might have blinded or injured for ever. But was the tolerance motived by true charity, or was it due to fear of failure and strong desire for success? We do not presume to answer. Of one thing, however, no doubt exists, namely, that whether it were love or politic restraint of feelings, it has long since disappeared. At first the only formula were the apostles and prophets; indeed anything bordering on a creed was scouted. Whatever

question arose the Word was referred to for elucidation and settlement; and if there was less intelligence there was more harmony. One man did not judge another man's conscience. But when the spirit of "cut it down: why cumbereth it the ground?" set in on the part of some who ought to have been grateful for standing room and opportunity to instruct the ignorant; then some were destroyed precipitately, others shrunk away and gradually perished of cold or lack of nourishment; and the tree which was the Lord's planting was blasted or mutilated and stunted by those who should have watered its roots and pruned its branches with assiduity and tender care. The figure is simple and its transference easy - it requires not to be further elaborated.

As matters have stood for some time past they resemble a chain composed of a series of links, the number varying with the imaginary necessity for the quantity of material to be bound together. The chain with, say ten links, once encircled "the whole truth and nothing but the truth," but when more "essential truth" was discovered more links were forged and added. In another figure the amulet at first included every virtue; was efficient to supply all human needs; but as time wears on other "charms" are revealed, and unless these be conjoined, notwithstanding the previous perfection of the amulet, it now becomes entirely worthless, so that, as a logical conclusion, there is no good in any portion of it but the last, which does not remain the last very long. Some new positive is shortly brought to light, and if it be "heresy," its negative, though before undreamed of, is held up like the serpent in the wilderness, the sight of which in faith is life and health. This tendency is at once serious and absurd. It either renders ignorance a blessing, or puts the ban of exclusion upon all who have not accepted the latest talisman.

In certain provinces of the Russian empire children are devoted to saints, and despite an almost polar severity of climate, allowed to wear nothing whatever except one short garment of wool or cotton for seven years. The consequence is seen in the fact that not more than fifteen in a thousand live to manhood, and of those who do some present such wretched specimens of humanity that they are rejected by a not over scrupulous military service. This insane zeal devours the strength of the provinces where it operates. Thousands of children of ordinary vigour, who would rise to useful maturity, are doomed to suffer and die in infancy; for the really feeble there is not the least chance of existence. The religious extremes we are censuring, leave in like manner no chance for those who are weak in the faith. We anticipate the reply that though weak, the persons Paul referred to were nevertheless "in the faith." Granted: and when we consider what they who were "in the faith," held and practised, will it not teach us a salutary lesson in forbearance. Some esteemed vegetarianism a Christian virtue; being "weak," they "eat herbs," others made important distinctions in meats; others again had a reverential regard for certain days. But of these peculiar weaknesses how did Paul judge, and what counsel did he give. "Him that is weak in the faith RECEIVE YE" . . . Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; for God hath received him. He that regardeth the day regardeth it unto the Lord . . . He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks. Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea he shall be holden up: for God is able to make him stand. Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God. Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth. Let us not judge one another anymore; but judge this rather, that no man put a stumbling block or an occasion to fall in his brother's way."

That it is not possible to attain to unanimity of opinion in the detail arising out of great principles demands no argument; the whole religious history of man is an unquestionable proof. But while discord on minor themes has ever followed attempts to urge them upon all minds alike, it is a great relief to observe that general harmony can be maintained with respect to a few fundamental points of doctrine. In sects unusually given to reading and discussion the danger of disruption reaches its maximum; the existing state of parties is but too sad and unanswerable a testimony to the correctness of this inference; it therefore specially behoves such bodies to narrow down essentials to the smallest limits consistent with safety, and to accord full latitude to investigation and private decision. It is here that the apostle's advice is valuable: "hast thou faith, have it to thyself." To exalt every debatable topic into an infallible indispensable article of faith is to build up the house of most combustible materials, and to imagine if "the flame kindle" upon it that it will not be consumed. EDITOR.

The Father and The Son. Etc.

(Continued from June, page 15)

This I shall now bring to a close, and, with a view to shorten it pass over a few minor objections and refer to the most important. 1st, "That the fact that Jesus was born of a woman proves he was a son of

Adam is a popular error.” My reviewer in making this statement has not sustained it. In place of it being “a popular error,” it appears to me a well-established fact. Jesus was the son of a woman; this woman was a daughter of Adam; Adam was a son of the ground (for so the name implies), as well as a son of God; and hence Jesus, as a son of Adam on His mother’s side, was a son of the ground too. He was of the earth, earthy, to begin with, only he was not like the first Adam destined to return to it. But dust, as the first Adam was, he was also a son of God (Luke iii. 68); and as this shows that the former did not exclude the possibility of the latter, so, also, does it show that the latter did not preclude (for the conception of men was in the mind of the Father before the man was made) the possibility of the former. Hence, the conception of Jesus did not preclude the possibility of Jesus being both son of Adam and son of God. And so it was so; for though He is called the second Adam, this secondary feature as a representative head of a family did not begin until after He rose from the dead. Moreover, “Son of Man” is an oft repeated phrase in the Scriptures, but there could be no sense in it were this “Son of Man” not a son of Adam. Further, He was of the seed of David according to the flesh (Rom. i. 3). This makes Him out a son of Adam. But more explicitly still, He is called the One seed of Abraham (Galat. iii. 16). This surely proves Him to have been a son of Adam; and so, also, (directly and indirectly) do the genealogies of Matthew and Luke. The fact that Jesus did not naturally descend from Adam does not, cannot, set aside the fact that Adam the first was one of Jesus Christ’s parents. The fact that David called The Christ his Lord, did not ignore the other fact, that this same Lord, while he was in the flesh, “was of the fruit of the body of David,” and so, in as true a sense, was Jesus the fruit of the body of Adam.

2nd. In my statement, namely, “that under the law God required man’s obedience, and because man could not obey, the law required man’s life,” my reviewer sees a great fallacy. He says I place “the Almighty in a most offensive position. God is first made,” says he, “to baptize all Israel out of Adam, because death reigned over them; and then it is affirmed that they are placed under a law which consigns them to death for not doing what they could not do. Between this and the making of bricks without straw,” says he, “the balance is in favor of the latter; the idea defeats itself,” etc.,etc. Now, in this criticism, we have a remarkable example of putting a matter in a false light. I do not say intentionally, or wilfully; my reviewer is far above any such spirit. But had he driven his thoughts a little further in the same channel, he would have doubtless arrived at the conclusion that the Almighty must have been foolish in requiring of men to “be holy as He was holy,” or that Jesus must have been insane when He exhorted His disciples to “be perfect even as their Heavenly Father is perfect.” For, who can be holy as God is holy? Who can reach the perfection of the Almighty? Had God made no provision in the Mosaic economy for the forgiveness of sins, and if I had taken no notice of this, the objection he makes might have been justifiable. God consigned no Israelite unto death (after the baptism into Moses) without providing a way of escape when forgiveness was possible. And is it not a libel on the foreknowledge of God to say that God gave the law with the intention and anticipation it could and would be kept in every point by any one man? I think it should be sufficiently evident to man, not to speak of the omniscient One, that it was impossible for a lot of ignorant, superstitious, and idolatrous people as the Israelites (with few exceptions) then were, to keep the law given to them in many points, not to speak of every point. I think that if, after 1,500 years’ trial of the law, it remained true all through that “there is none righteous, no not one” this should convince the most stubborn that if the enlightened of the children of Israel were condemned by the law on the principle that “he that is guilty in one point is guilty of all,” how could it have been possible for God to expect the men in whose ears the law was first read to have kept it with anything like perfection. Besides, if it appears offensive to say that God gave a law which could not be kept, is it not as offensive to say that God held that man guilty of all who had offended in part (see James ii. 10). Does not this look like injustice? Shall we regard it too much to say that the man who but hates his brother is a transgressor of the sixth commandment? (1 John iii. to.) But the fact is, puny man imagines he can measure God’s justice by his own sense, or want of sense, of what justice is. That man is certainly to be pitied in this life whose standard of education morally, or intellectually, is such as he can surely and perfectly master. To have given the Israelites a law which they could have kept would have been to have given them one in keeping with their own desires. But the one they received was such as led them on and up towards perfection, in the measure towards which they received a reward in the knowledge they acquired from the law, and for the lack of that which they did not attain they had, in the sacrifices provided for them, a means of forgiveness through which they might be reckoned as perfect as though they had kept the law in every point. What more beautiful? what more just? And when we consider the object of the law, namely, to teach men the knowledge of sin (Rom. iii. 20), to be as a schoolmaster until Christ came (Gal. iii. 24), does it not appear as clear as noonday, that had it been a law which could have been kept, the pupil could have become as wise as his master, righteousness could have then come by the law, and the necessity for the sacrifice of Christ rendered void? But Christ was provided

before this law was promulgated, and for the very reason that man was unable to become righteous by any other way than “that shadowed forth in the law, namely, “the Way, the Truth, the Life.”

3rd. “SIN IN THE FLESH.” The objection to this phrase might be reasonable were another phrase put in its place to equal it in describing, or expressing, that condition of evil inherent to the nature of man, which Jesus indicates in these words, namely, “out of the heart proceed evil thoughts,” etc. But as it is sought to reject the phrase on the assumption that sin as a transgression of law cannot exist in the nature of man, - as if corruption, the natural origin of all that is now sinful, were not in itself a process of physical transgression of the law of life, - there is a necessity for contending against a course the certain end of which would be the denial of this great fact in Scripture, namely, that the nature of man is the source of sin. I am told, however, that I go farther than this, and charge God with originating it. True, it looks like it, for if the nature of man is the origin of sin, God is the creator of that nature, and therefore the prior cause. But such reasoning is very weak, as it cuts two ways. It can be used at the end of any argument of this kind, and plied as forcibly against one side as another; for example: If sin exists at all, why did God permit it to exist? If sin originates with an evil spirit, why did God create this evil spirit? And so on, and on, in endless bewilderment. For, if sin is an effect and only an effect, as some contend, of man’s will, surely the great first cause has as much to do with it as any secondary cause. Here, however, we should remember that as the stretch of our physical vision is bounded by a horizon where sky and earth seem to meet; so is it likewise with our mental perception. Many things which we know are far asunder as heaven is from earth, seem to link in one endless chain when we carry our reasoning to the farthest extremity of our power, but when we go forth to examine and realize this horizon, behold, how it recedes as we go! And so it is of evil and good. Reason of these how we may, GOD and SIN will ever seem to meet, but when we consider that sin serves to righteousness, as decay serves to growth, as death serves to life, “that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die,” when we consider these things, we need not stumble at the reflection, God made man with certain desires, and then made a law for him contrary to those desires. And looking at the philosophy of the fact, namely, that law is not made for the righteous, but for the lawless and disobedient, a principle that was recognised, I assume, before the sin that caused death in man entered into the world - looking, I say, at the philosophy of this, we may see, that, in the law being made, there was implied that Adam had in him desires as obnoxious to the law before transgression as after it, and that if he did not transgress before the law it was simply because there was no law to transgress, for where no law is there is no transgression, and sin in act is not reckoned where there is no law; yet it may have been, and the presumption is very strong that there had been, the sort of nature, and the same sort of actions obnoxious to law (if there had been a law) before the law came to him, as after it came to him. In fact the result proves this. It was by a pandering to unlawful desires that the sin which brought death entered into the world. The unlawful desires were there previous to his act of transgression. But, and if he had kept the law, those desires as a tempter, and the law his guide, combined, would have served to elevate him to the position of a righteous man. And so now, sin serves to make man righteous under grace. Sin, in the aspect of a tempter, is only evil to those who are obedient to it. It is of great good to those who resist it.

“Ruin is not ruin wholly;
Evil is not evil solely ;
Each to good its tribute pays.
Wisdom gathers wit from folly,
And in depths of melancholy
Genius sings its sweetest lays-
Ruin is not ruin wholly.”

But let us never forget that ruin is in us, and that the sin that is abroad in the world in the wreck and disaster which crime perpetuates, is that which comes out of us, out of our hearts. It is the fact that man in his native capacity, can originate nothing but sin. For, sure enough, “as face answereth to face in a mirror, so does the heart of man to man” all over the world. There indeed exists no more difference between one man and another in this respect, than there exists between the blood of one man and the blood of another. “There is none that doeth good” in the native aspect of the case, “no not one,” is the verdict of Scripture.

Good is only good as it can produce the highest good; and were it the case that man could originate this, namely, the only good which Scripture recognizes, the good not with which man is pleased or that which commends; but that with which God is pleased, then we might conceive that in his nature there is nothing but good. But, as this has yet to be discovered, and as it is one of the most prominent doctrines in Scripture that all good comes from above, James i. 17, then it is evident that all the good of any value

which comes from or out of a man, has, in the first place, to be put into him. The good a man does is based on instruction, and it is quite as reasonable to conceive of a man being born educated, as to conceive of him being born good, in the spiritual sense of the term. Of course he may be good after a fashion in so far as his organization is concerned; and such a good as this may be likened to good ground which in itself, if not cultivated, and sown with good seed, will only produce the ranker weeds; he may be good in so far as his health is concerned; he may be good as everything else is good in its relationship to the world of which it forms a part, but the good we have to look for is not this kind of good, but that which results from instruction into the things of the Kingdom and the Name of Jesus. Anything short of this, is simply vanity and vexation of spirit. Whatsoever is not of faith is sin. "Without faith it is impossible to please God," so that there may be very much good of a kind in the world that is really sin, because apart from the outcome of faith. Instruction in the faith, therefore, is the first antecedent to good in any one.

"A scribe instructed" says Jesus, "into the Kingdom of Heaven, is like unto an householder which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old." Matt. xiii. 52. Apollos was effective as a preacher because he was mighty in the Scriptures and instructed in the way of the Lord. Acts xviii. 24, 25. And it was only by being instructed out of the law that the Jew could know God's will and approve of the things more excellent. Rom. ii. 18. And so too as the object of the Proverbs is to give subtlety to the simple, and to the young man knowledge and discretion, Prov i. 2, 3, 4, it is as contrary to Scripture to say that man is naturally good as to say that subtlety is natural to the simple, or that knowledge and discretion are natural to youth. Where Scriptural instruction is wanting sin reigns, and finding this, it is ours to inquire into it. The sin which reigns is exemplified in the folly of youth and in the acts of the simple; and were we to say that these acts and that folly were not natural to the human mind in those described conditions, we would require to furnish a clue to the origin of the folly, etc., where it comes from, ere we could regard the assertion. Now, as in Scripture, the thought of foolishness is called sin, Prov. xxiv. 9, - wherein lies the difference between saying that sin is natural to these conditions, and the saying that ignorance, indiscretion, and folly are natural to them. There is no difference. These sins originate from man himself, and arise from a condition natural to his being. And this is the foundation on which the necessity for instruction is based. Deny this fact, deny that man is naturally indiscreet, ignorant, and foolish, and there is necessitated the creation of a new order of things which has no place in Scripture. "The devil and his angels," hitherto consigned in the theology of Christadelphians, to oblivion, would again need to be summoned to administer the affairs of Mammon. Legions upon legions of evil spirits would again need to be called from the vasty deep to go through the earth and walk up and down in it; and lo! in place of the doctrines of Christ, we would again need to preach abroad the fables of Christendom.

If man is good in the sense required for the negation of that condition of things called "Sin in the flesh," otherwise "I know that in me dwelleth no good thing;" then must he be a being capable of originating good actions in view of immortality, or he must at least be a being incapable of doing anything contrary thereto, - a being dependent for his becoming good or bad on the kind of instruction he may receive, - a sensitive, clean sheet of paper as it were, free from any pretty illumination or undesirable blot; and if so, it must be admitted that were his nature like this clean sheet of paper, the doctrine that there is no sin in the flesh would be wonderfully established. But what then? We would then see man at his birth in readiness for being written on of course. We would then see him ready for instruction, - free from any bias for evil or for good. And so, as we know no man can become good without instruction; so on the same principle, no man can become bad. And here, as there is a Father above so must we infer there would be another below; and just as the one is more vigilant or powerful, so is man impressed with the words and works of the more faithful and strong. The Book placed on his right hand directing his way upwards, would be confronted by another on his left directing his way downwards, and in the ratio he would receive instruction from, or apply himself to the study of either, so would he become a good or bad man.

But is this the case, that sin is introduced to man on the same principle righteousness is introduced? Or, that a devil introduces himself to man in a fashion like as God introduces Himself? Certainly not. And yet we see sin reigning in the world! Whence therefore comes it? Does it spring out of the dust? Does it ascend from the deep? Must a Living stone go and search for its source? Does not Jesus tell us, "It comes from within." "It is not that which goeth into a man which defileth him says He, "it is that which cometh out." Mark vii. 20, etc. "Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, etc. And then, as to the vent of the heart, that which gives expression to it, namely, that little member called the tongue. What says James of it? He calls it "a world of iniquity" and "full of deadly poison." Full of deadly poison? Yes. And no sin in the flesh? Impossible. The metaphor of the one is the metaphor of the other. The principle of the one is the principle of the other. The motive spring in each is the same. And yet in the face of this, in the face of man's utter ignorance of the human heart; for, "who can know it? it is deceitful above all

things and desperately wicked,” – in the face of all this, I say, must I believe, or affirm, there is no sin in the flesh? God forbid.

But here it may be asked “what is character? Is it not the manifestation of the qualities of the flesh?” And were this the case, the character of a good man would be evidence that his flesh was good; or putting it in another form, it would mean that a man without sin in character, would also be without sin in the flesh or nature. This, however, is controverted by another question, namely, what are the qualities of the flesh? These may be regarded in relation to the subject in hand, as one, and taking Jesus Christ’s teaching as our guide, we may say, that the character of man’s nature is absolutely dark, but notwithstanding, highly capable of receiving and reflecting light. “If the light that is in thee be darkness,” says Jesus, “how great is that darkness?” And contrasted with this, we are elsewhere told, “God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all.” Now, as in Scripture, this kind of darkness is inseparable from sin, it is reasonable to conclude that had man no sin in his flesh or nature, he would be like the Father of light, without any darkness at all. But is this the case? Assuredly not. The quality of man’s nature in so far as Spiritual Light is concerned, is simply receptive and reflective, and so some men can more readily receive, and so better reflect the Divine character than others, but however excellent in this way these may be, if the Light from God is shut out from their hearts, no matter how, what are they but dark bodies at the best? The moon, for example, is a beautiful, silvery, shining orb, but it shines with a borrowed light. When our planet comes between it and the sun, how dark it becomes? This shuts off from it all light by which it is made to shine. And so man, while he is covered with a covering that is not of God’s spirit, he is demonstrated to be dark as darkness itself. Reverting then, to the question What is character? And as a bad man is said to have no character; character is the reflection of the light from which the sun of righteousness penetrates the inner recesses of man’s dark heart. This is character; and it is anything but the quality of the flesh. Hence, Jesus Christ’s character was not the quality of His flesh, but the reflection from His fleshy nature of God’s law and testimony coupled with the direct illumination of God’s spirit. But now in Him the process differs, because His nature differs. His character, now, is the quality of His nature. His nature now, is a Holy-Spirit nature, by which He presents an express likeness of the Father of Lights, - a likeness in which there is no darkness at all.

Well now, looking at holiness, there are presented two aspects of it in spirit-nature. There is the holy nature itself, and there are the acts or conduct proceeding from that nature. And the nature is such that nothing else can proceed from it but good. Then on the other hand there is the negation of holiness which is sin - a state of being in which there is no Light within, and as holiness has two aspects so has sin. There is the sinful nature and there are the acts native to the nature. Any good that ever proceeds from it is borrowed. It is naturally dark and therefore cannot shine with its own light. Hence, “Let your light so shine,” that God may have the glory for it is His light not man’s.

With a few remarks more, I will now conclude.

Referring to Heb. ii. 16, the pronoun “he” in the last clause of the 11th verse; the pronoun “I” in the 12th and 13th. verses; and the pronoun “he” in the 14th and 16th verses, must all refer to one person; otherwise the Apostles’ argument, beginning with the last clause of the 11th verse and ending with the chapter, is inconsistent with itself. And the fact that the person referred to is Jesus Christ, this does not by any means ignore any other fact related thereto. A few other objections and criticisms I would have now liked to reply to, but these nevertheless may be safely left unanswered until a more fitting opportunity. When this presents itself, I shall then pursue the foregoing argument on “Sin in the flesh” a little further, and take up the other points in my course. W. D. JARDINE.

A TOUR IN SCOTLAND.

BY W. ELLIS.

Having a desire to visit my native country, arising from a settled conviction that the great central theme of the Bible, viz., Redemption from sin and its consequences, was not understood even by certain who profess to believe nothing but what is taught in that Book, or what is in harmony with its teachings; and circumstances favouring me with the time, I set out on the tenth of June. Before leaving home, an invitation reached me to visit the “little flock” in Liverpool, who are endeavouring to hold up the lamp of life to some who are walking in darkness, knowing not whither they go. The field in Liverpool is large, but the labourers are few. They stand in need of the exhortation Joshua gave to Israel when they were entering the land promised to their fathers: “Only be strong and of good courage.” Here I gave two

lectures on Sunday, June 13th, the first at three o'clock; and the second at half-past 6. The attendance was small on both occasions, but the people were very attentive. We pray that greater results may yet be attained. On Monday morning Bro. Lind, having some business in Manchester, wished me to accompany him thither, and to take the opportunity of seeing the few Brethren, and ascertain what they were doing. We called first upon Bro. Carr, who has from the introduction of the truth into Manchester taken an active part in its propagation. From him we learned that he was in the habit of attending the lectures of those who believe that Jesus Christ was born in the same condemnation as all the sons of Adam, and asking questions relating to that subject, but that instead of answering his questions and enlightening those present, the lecturer had attacked his moral character. *

[* *This is time badly spent. Why not preach the Kingdom of God to the people? - Ed.*]

This is a strange mode of answering questions: such teachers should have the attention of the School Board called to their defective training. To answer questions by abusing the questioner manifests incompetence, in addition to bad manners. We were glad, however, to learn from Bro. Carr that he intended to shew them a more excellent way, and we heartily wish him success. He had arranged for a lecture in their own hall in refutation of the mistakes they have fallen into concerning Jesus Christ, as well as those charges against himself. We hope that Bro. Carr and those with him will raise up their voices, and not be silent, until "the truth as it is in Jesus," and concerning his freewill offering, shall be stripped of the vain speculations of such as, in many parts, presume to teach their grandfathers in the Gospel. In the afternoon we spent a few hours in Stockport; after considerable enquiry found our Bro. Waite and several of his friends. We spent some time in conversation, and J. Birkenhead, of Sale, was there. The conversation commenced by my taking notice of the term Brother being applied to each of us as we entered the house. I gave expression to the uncomfortable state of ignorance I was in in relation to those we formerly associated with. Some called us Brethren as in the present case, while others denounced us "damnable heretics," who had renounced the truth, and as "reproved scorners," etc. Why is it, I enquired, that some call us Brother, and others of the same community denounce us in such terms.

One of the replies was that, on the principle of once a Brother always a Brother, we were called Brethren.

Another was, that I regarded them as not in the faith, and on that account our refusal to view each other as Brethren was mutual. To this I assented, making the remark that we both believed that Jesus Christ was "the only begotten Son of God;" but they had no sooner made this confession than they destroyed its value by saying He was as much a son of Adam, as if he were the son of Joseph. You, said I, have not arrived at a clear idea of "the truth as it is in Jesus." Here it was alleged that Jesus was a son of Adam. I replied, If you mean in the same sense as we are, then I deny it. He was a son raised up to Adam by the Almighty, and in the imputed sense He was a son of Adam, but that in no sense did He inherit anything from him, as he had nothing to bequeath.

Here I took the opportunity of pointing out a mistake I myself once was in, and which I find common to all who contend for Jesus being in the condemnation of Adam, viz;., that Luke in his Gospel gives the genealogy of Mary. This is not true. The genealogy of Mary is not given by either Matthew or Luke. (For information on this matter, see Eusebius' Church History, pages 51 to 55.) I also took the occasion to point out that, upon the principle of fleshly descent, Jesus was not the heir of Adam, as he was not his eldest son living at the time Jesus was put to death, and, besides, as Jesus died for those who were then unborn, He could not be a descendant of any of them, and therefore could not bear their sins upon the principle of descent. The conversation went on for a considerable time without anything offensive being said, and we parted in the hope of a better understanding being arrived at among those who professed to be Brethren of the one Lord. Leaving Stockport, we soon reached Manchester, and found we had just time to call on Bro. Teesdale before Bro. Lind could get a train for Liverpool. We found him at home, and, in the short time at disposal, he hospitably entertained us. Another Brother was there, but this division of opinion concerning the Christ has caused such a division of interest in each of us, that we had no conversation with him. At half-past 12 a.m., Bro. Lind returned home, leaving me to while away another midnight hour before I started for Scotland. We were not far on the road, when the darkness gradually rolled away and the east began to brighten before the rising sun. The coolness of the air was pleasant after the excessive heat, and the hills of my native country now came into view; but before we reached Glasgow the bright sunshine gave way to the shower.

Having arrived safely, I made my way to Bro. O'Neil's house, and found him at home. In the afternoon we went together to see Brethren Watson, Fleming and Neilson, who are all employed at one place. I told them the object of my visit, at which they all seemed heartily glad, and as they are engaged all day and out of town too, they left it with me and Bro. O'Neil, to find a suitable hall and get out the bills announcing the lectures.

Wednesday was occupied for the most part in these matters. On Thursday, I went to Wishaw, to see the friends there. While looking out for a seat I noticed Mrs. Hodgson, in the carriage, returning from a visit to Glasgow: after exchanging the usual enquiries I joined her on her journey home. I have been on intimate terms with Bro. and Sister Hodgson for the last fourteen years, without one jarring note until this question concerning the Christ came up among us. My change of mind has filled Bro. Hodgson with suspicion that some other motive than a conviction of what is the truth, has induced me to contend for the opinions I formerly opposed. From this cause my visits are not so much desired as previously. I agree with Bro. Hodgson that those who espouse any cause from dishonest motives deserve to be treated not only with suspicion, but with contempt. I had some conversation with several other brethren in Wishaw, on the points of difference between us, and those who hold opposite views, and I am happy to state that their practice is to give a fair hearing to all that can be said or written on both sides. If they continue this I know the truth as it is demonstrated in the scriptures concerning the free-will offering of Jesus Christ for our sins that he might deliver us from a present evil world, is certain to cast out the absurd error that he hung upon the cross because he had the effects of Adam's transgression in his flesh!

From Wishaw I returned to Glasgow. Saturday I spent partly in Paisley. There are a few in Paisley who love the truth and meet together every first day of the week, but beyond this there is no protest against the outer darkness. Sunday the 20th as arranged I spent in Glasgow. In the morning a small company came together to break bread in remembrance of the Lord's death, and to raise their thankful voices in praise and prayer to our heavenly Father because he did not leave his Son in the grave nor suffer His Holy One to see corruption, and for the promise He has left us that He will send His Son again to raise the sleeping saints and change the living ones into his own image. I am happy to state that the first lecture at 2 p.m. was fairly attended, there being about 70 present; the second was at half-past six, the attendance was much the same, and some interest was awakened. On Monday I went to Beith, 18 miles from Glasgow. Brother and Sister Lind were there on a visit to Mr. Gillies, and the little company in Beith consider that we are in error; nevertheless they heard us patiently and desired to take time to give the matter further consideration. This is as it ought to be, and we feel certain of the result being a gain to the truth. "He that doeth the truth comes to the light that his deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God." (To be continued.)

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The next portion of Scripture which D. C. asks us to explain is the following from Paul's Epistle to the Colossians: -

"Who (the Son) is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature: For by Him were all things created, that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by Him, and for Him; And He is before all things, and by Him all things consist. And He is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the first born from the dead; that in all things He might have the pre-eminence. For it pleased the Father that in Him should all fulness dwell." Col. i. 15-19.

Verse 15th. Jesus is the image or likeness of the invisible God. This declaration of the Apostle may be contemplated from two points of view: firstly in reference to character, and secondly as to nature or substance. The former was manifested when the Son of God sojourned on the earth, and outwardly appeared as other men, and the latter took place subsequently to resurrection, when He was changed from flesh to spirit. His perfection of character constituted His likeness to God while in the flesh, for in all that He said and did He showed forth the attributes of the Deity, - love, wisdom, knowledge, power, etc. He was, as John says, "full of grace and truth." Always doing those things that pleased His heavenly Father, and therefore God delighted in Him and called Him His well-beloved Son. "In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the God-head bodily." Col. ii. 9. But while thus perfect as to character, He was imperfect with respect to body until the period of His glorification, when He became, by transformation, a partaker of the Divine nature, being made incorruptible like the invisible God. What Jesus is now in His glorified state was representatively shown to Peter, James, and John when they were with Him in the Holy Mount, "and His face did shine as the sun, and His raiment was white as the light."

On this occasion they “beheld His glory,” though no actual change of nature then took place. It was a vision of things to come. This may suffice in explanation of Jesus being “the image of the invisible God.” In the second clause of the verse, the Apostle further affirms that He is “the first-born of every creature.” Macknight translates the words, *πρωτοτοχος πασης χτισεως*, the first-born of the whole creation, and contends that this is their true meaning. In this we believe he is correct, and think those of our readers who can look into the original for themselves will agree with him. It is so translated in Rom. viii. 22. The first question for our consideration in this statement is, Of what creation is Jesus the first-born? We answer unhesitatingly, according to the scope of the passage, that new creation of which He is the head, beginning, and chief, namely, His mystical body the church, composed of the faithful of all ages. This will constitute the whole creation among whom He will have the pre-eminence. Though neither the first created being nor the creator of the world as already shown in our remarks on the 1st chap. of John, yet the Lord Jesus is a Creator in a most important and special sense, for at His second and glorious appearing He will, by the power given unto Him, re-create and fashion from the dust His sleeping saints, as well as transform the righteous living, and associate them with Himself in the government of the world when all existing thrones, dominions, principalities, and powers will have passed away for ever. “All power is given unto me (Jesus) in heaven and in earth.” Mat. xxviii. 18 “Behold I make all things new.” Rev, xxi. 5. The world was created and inhabited for four thousand years before Jesus was born; He could not, therefore, be the first-born of creation in the literal sense. He was indeed a first-born, for He was the first-born son of Mary; but it is not of His birth that the Apostle is speaking in the passage under consideration. Moreover the word is used synonymously with Lord or heir. In the 18th verse of this 1st chapter of Colossians, Jesus is said to be “the first-born from the dead;” and in Romans xiv. 9, He is called “Lord both of the dead and living.” He is Lord of the dead in the sense of having the power to raise the dead. Absolutely, He was not the first who was raised from the dead, but He was the first who was begotten from the dead to die no more, and in this sense is first or chief, “the first fruits of them that slept.” Being the appointed Heir and Lord of all things, He is styled the first begotten and first born, and “the beginning of the creation of God,” Rev. iii. 14: because He is the One who is destined to exercise authority over all, and to be supreme in all things. All things were created for Him and on account of Him. Let the following texts be read and compared with the verses under examination in Colossians, namely: - Heb. i. 2, 3, 6; Rev. i. 5; Acts xxvi. 23; Ro. vi. 9 and viii. 29; Ps. lxxxix. 27.

As applied to Christ, all these passages contain the ideas of authority and pre-eminence over both persons and things in the highest possible degree. After what has been already advanced in this and our previous article in answer to D. C., it seems hardly necessary to go over the remaining verses in Col. more particularly. We may however add a remark or two on the 16th verse, which is perhaps the one most likely to be misunderstood. The things, then, spoken of in that verse are all things pertaining to the earth and having reference to the inhabitants thereof, that is to say, to the two classes of rulers and subjects, whether existing at the time the Apostle wrote or subsequently, all are alike to be made subject to the Son who is to put down all rule, and authority and power. The powers that be are ordained of God, in the sense of being permitted by Him to continue for a time, until He sends His Son from Heaven to take possession of all the kingdoms of the world, and to transfer them to Him and to His saints.

In concluding our remarks on this point, we cannot do better than quote the words of the Apostle, in the first chapter of his letter to the Ephesians, which are explanatory of what he wrote in his Epistle to the Colossians: “Having made known unto us the mystery of His will, according to His good pleasure which He hath purposed in Himself: That in the dispensation of the fulness of time, he might gather together in one (or, under one head) all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth: even in Him.” The Apostle then prays for the Ephesians in these words: “That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of Him: The eyes of your understanding being enlightened, that ye may know what is the hope of His calling, and what the riches of the glory of His inheritance in the saints; And what is the exceeding greatness of His power to us ward who believe, according to the working of His mighty power, which He wrought in Christ, when He raised Him from the dead and set Him at His own right-hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under His feet, and gave Him to be the head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.” Eph. i. 9, 17-23. But, says the same Apostle, in writing to the Hebrews, “we see not yet all things put under Him.” No, we wait for it, and long for His appearing, that the things written may be fulfilled. From all which Scriptural evidence, we trust the reader will perceive that so far from Jesus being the creator of the things mentioned in Col. i. 16, He is on the contrary destined to be their destroyer.

The verses of which an explanation is sought in the 1st ch. of Hebrews, have already been quoted and commented upon to some extent, though probably not so fully as our correspondent would desire; and some points have not as yet been handled at all.

Heb. ch. 1. 2. The “last days” of this verse in which God spake by a Son were the last days of the Mosaic age or system of things which had waxed old and was about to vanish away. This is proved by what is written in ch. ix. v. 26. of the same Epistle. “But now once in the end of the World, hath he (Christ) appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.” The phrase “the end of the world” is in the original *συντελεια των αιωνων* and should be rendered the finishing or consummation of the ages, that is of the Mosaic times or ages which at the crucifixion were figuratively nailed to the cross and taken out of the way.

3rd verse - What has been said about Jesus being the image of the invisible God is equally applicable to the first portion of this verse, to which the common version hardly does full justice, the words in the Greek Testament are *Ος ων απαυγασμα της δοξης και χαρακτηρ της υποστασεως αυτου* and they are more correctly translated in the Diaglott thus; “who being an effulgence of his glory and an exact impress of his substance.” This certainly has the merit of being nearer to the original than the version given by King James’ translators. The word *apaugasma* signifies light or splendour emitted or irradiated, effulgence, and is illustrated by the light or splendour which beams from the sun. This explanation answers very closely to the descriptions given by the Apostle John in that wonderful book the Apocalypse, of the visions which he had of the Lord Jesus, and which he narrates in such glowing terms. It was an overpowering splendour, too great for mortal eyes to look upon, and caused John to fall down as one dead when he witnessed it. It is similar also to what was seen by a chosen few on the Mount of Transfiguration, which was the only occasion when the Lord Jesus shone with this sun-like splendour. It was not, and for obvious reasons could not possibly be, his ordinary appearance among men. No halo of glory surrounded his head or person; on the contrary, he was “found in fashion as a man,” and outwardly manifested no glory which could mark Him out from his fellows as the Son of God. What then could the Apostle mean by the statement he makes concerning Him in this verse? Did he refer to His future glorification and change of nature in the resurrection state or to something else while the Lord sojourned on the earth? Undoubtedly he did allude to His future glory, but by no means exclusively to that. The following passages throw light on this matter. Thus when the Lord turned water into wine we are told: “This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth His glory, and His disciples believed on him.” John n. 2. This manifestation of glory then, which induced belief in the disciples, was not an effulgence of light or splendour, but a manifestation of power. Glory and power are synonymous terms in the Scriptures. Paul says Jesus was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, that is evidently by the power of the Father. The ministration of the spirit or of righteousness by Jesus and His Apostles was a ministration of glory, far exceeding that of the previous dispensation. And again Paul declares: “God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.” 2. Cor. iv. 6. From Him, as from a highly polished mirror, were reflected the Divine perfections. “We all, with open face, beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the spirit of the Lord” 2. Cor. in. 18. The teachings of Jesus and the miracles which he wrought by the power of God were manifestations of glory to those who witnessed them, and this glory shining into their hearts caused them to be transformed to his image. It was a moral not a physical transformation. Jesus attained to the latter at his glorification by the Father, and so will all his faithful ones at His appearing and kingdom. At that crisis they will be like him and see him as he is, for having conformed to his moral image while in the flesh, he will then change their vile body and fashion it like unto His glorious body. “Upholding all things by the word of His power.” This phrase has reference to the “all things” which Jesus said and did during His public ministry, ending with His submission to death on the cross, by which He “purged our sins.” He invariably so acted that the purpose of God in Him should be accomplished and the Scriptures fulfilled to the very letter. On this account He endured shame and reproach, and though possessed of infinite power always subordinated His own will to the will of His heavenly Father. The word rendered “upholding” in this verse also signifies to bear, sustain, endure, also to lead. In Rotheram’s New Testament this clause reads “bearing up all things by the declaration of His power.” This is an improvement on the common version, but we would venture to suggest bringing about or causing to come to pass as more in harmony with what we conceive to be the Apostle’s meaning. Verse 6, in this and the previous verses the Apostle is speaking of the superiority of the Son over the Angels. This is indeed abundantly evident throughout the Chapter. The time “when he bringeth in the first begotten into the world” or inhabited earth (*οιχουμενη*) is when Jesus comes a second time to establish His kingdom. Paul speaks of this period when universal homage will be paid to the Son in writing to the Philippians, saying, “Wherefore God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a

name which is above every name: That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.” Phi. ii. 9, 10, 11. See also Is. xlv. 23. “And let all the angels of God worship Him.” This is a quotation from the ninety-seventh Psalm and seventh verse, which reads, “worship Him all ye gods” or *elohim*. If this psalm be examined it will be found to treat throughout of the Lord’s reign on the earth and connected events. David commenced by saying, “The Lord reigneth, let the earth rejoice; let the multitude of isles be glad thereof.” Ps. xc. vii. i.

The previous Psalm also testifies to the same thing, especially the last four verses. 10th verse. Much difficulty has been occasioned by the supposition that this verse has to do with the creation of the world as related in the first chapter of Genesis, whereas the verses that immediately follow are sufficient to prove that such cannot be the case. Of the heavens there spoken of it is written, “they shall perish,” “wax old as doth a garment,” and “as a vesture be folded up and changed.” Let these words be compared with the 8th chapter of this epistle to the Hebrews, and the last verse, and we think it will be perceived that the Apostle is not here speaking of the creation of the world, but of the passing away of the old covenant or Mosaic order of things. “Heaven and earth shall pass away” said Jesus. Mat. xxiv. 35. To what did He refer? To the literal heavens and literal earth? Surely not. But to the then existing order of things, destined so soon to vanish away. That the expression “heaven and earth” is used in this figurative sense is abundantly evident throughout the Scriptures. Passages in proof in the writings of the Prophets and in the book of Revelation will doubtless occur to the mind of the reader without our quoting them. Moreover we are informed by the wise man that “the earth abideth for ever.” Ro. I, 4. It is nowhere said in the Scripture to be devoted to destruction except in a figurative sense. The Mosaic system of things was but temporary, foreshadowing that which should be enduring when the Son of God should reign. Hence the contrast the Apostle draws between them in these passages of his epistle to the Hebrews. In relation to the Lord’s reign on earth. David declares, “They shall fear Thee as long as the sun and moon endure throughout all generations. He shall come down like rain upon the mown grass; as showers that water the earth. In His days shall the righteous flourish; and abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth. His name shall endure for ever: His name shall be continued as long as the sun: and men shall be blessed in Him: all nations shall call Him blessed.” Ps. lxxii. 5, 6, 7, and 17. In these texts the sun and moon are used as symbols of the perpetuity of that order of things of which the Lord Jesus will be the supreme head.

The next passage to which our attention is called by our correspondent is 1st Co. viii. 6. and need not detain us long; indeed, some of the explanations already given apply equally to this. The words are, “But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in Him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we in Him.” The Apostle had just before been speaking of the gods many and lords many of the Gentile idolaters, and contending that though there be that are called gods, there was in reality but one God the Father, out of whom, (*ἐξ ου*) are all things and we in Him, or for Him (*εἰς*). A correct rendering of the Greek prepositions, which are somewhat elastic, removes the absurdity from such passages as these as already explained. God being the Creator of all things by His spirit, all things are said to be out of Him. By Divine power spirit becomes whatever He wills it should be whether persons or things. As John says, “All things were made by Him; and without Him was not anything made that was made.” John i. 3, The Lord Jesus was no exception to this, for He was a creation of the Father for a special purpose and through Him or on account of Him are all things. This phrase is parallel with that in Col. i. “by Him all things consist,” or in Him all things have been placed together (*συνεστηκε*.) That is to say everything has been arranged by the Almighty Father from the very beginning with reference to Him and His future supremacy over the habitable earth. And we, the believers, through Him (*δι’ αὐτου*) become related to the same things, sons of God through the faith, and joint heirs with Him of the same inheritance. The last passage which we are called upon to explain is contained in Paul’s Epistle to the Philippians as follows, “Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; But made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.” Phi. ii. 5 to 8.

The fifth verse is an exhortation to be humble and obedient like Christ, who is the believer’s example in all things. The next verse has given the commentators some trouble and been variously interpreted by them, one chief difficulty arising from the use of the Greek word *αρπαγμα* translated robbery, occurring only this once in all the New Testament. Parkhurst and other authorities learned in the Greek tongue contend that the authorized version is correct in so rendering it, and taking this for granted without troubling the reader with a variety of interpretations of this uncommon word, we will endeavour to set the matter in its true light, and we think we shall be best able to do this by keeping constantly before our mind the facts and circumstances of Jesus’ history as recorded in the New Testament. Though super-naturally

conceived Jesus being born of a woman was really a man like His brethren, and this was a necessity in the case in order that He might “make reconciliation for the sins of His people.” But though “found in fashion as a man,” Jesus claimed equality with God as a right and not as a robbery, or act of usurpation. The question is in what sense? John v. 18. is enlightening on this point. “Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill Him, because He not only had broken the sabbath, but said also that God was His Father, making himself equal with God.” “I and my Father are one” (said Jesus.) “Then the Jews took up stones again to stone Him. Jesus answered them, many good works have I shewed you from my Father; for which of those works do ye stone me? The Jews answered Him saying, For a good work we stone Thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that Thou, being a man, makest Thyself God. Jesus answered them, is it not written in your law, I said, ye are gods? If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken; say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest because I said I am the Son of God? If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works; that ye may know, and believe, that the Father is in me, and I in Him.” John x. 30 to 38. From these testimonies in the gospel by John it is plain that according to the Jewish mind, to claim sonship with God was the same thing as to claim equality with God. This Jesus admitted and pointed to them what was written in their law as well as to His own works in proof of the justice of the claim. He was therefore no blasphemer as they affirmed; and inasmuch as they were called gods unto whom the word of God came, surely He whom the Father had sanctified and sent into the world was justified in declaring himself to be the Son of God. It was no act of usurpation on His part to do so.

The expression “form of God” as applied to Christ Jesus, relates, not to outward aspect or appearance in the literal sense, but to official position, and stands in contrast to the phrase “form of a servant” in the next verse Jesus was born a king, and the appointed “heir of all things.” Such was His position. Yet, while he sojourned on the earth He did not comport Himself as a King. When He came to the nation over whom He was destined to rule, He came without any regal pomp or ceremony. He neither received honour from men nor sought His own glory. John v. 41. viii. 50. “When Jesus therefore perceived that they would come and take Him by force, to make Him a King, He departed again into a mountain Himself alone.” John vi. 15. So far from assuming anything like regal state, He on the contrary lived in poverty and suffered shame and reproach, taking the position of a servant and making Himself of no reputation. Though really Lord and Master; as He said to His disciples, “I am among you as he that serveth.” Luke xxii. 27. Thus He humbled Himself and “became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross,” that he might be exalted in due time to the position to which He was born. When He returns to the earth He will come in power and great glory to establish His claim to the throne of Israel and the world, for which He previously suffered and died. King elect from the beginning, He will then be King in fact, and as such will receive the honour which before He declined. See John xviii. 36, 37.

Let the things written concerning the Christ in the books of Moses, the Prophets and the Psalms be carefully considered and compared with the New Testament history of Jesus of Nazareth, and the apparent difficulties and discrepancies of the above passages of which D. C. has requested an explanation in the Lamp will gradually disappear, and in the end all will be found consistent and harmonious. “All the words of My mouth are in righteousness; there is nothing froward or perverse in them. They are all plain to him that understandeth, and right to them that find knowledge.” Ps. viii. 8, 9.

S. G. Hayes.

The following passages have been handed to us by a Brother, with a view to explanation. They arose in the course of conversation with a friend who quoted them to prove that “Christ is God as well as man.”

The texts referred to are as follows:

- 1). John i. 1, 2. 3 & 14.
- 2). 1st John, v. 20., with reference to the last clause of which verse the friend says, If Jesus Christ be not “the true God,” then the Christianity which John teaches is idolatry.
- 3). Rom. ix. 5. Referring to the words, “God blessed for ever,” it is said by the same party that the entire body of ancient interpreters, (Cyril, Origen, Cyprian, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, and others) agree in applying these words to Christ, and that the natural sequence and flow of the words require it.

4). 2nd Peter, i. 1. Here another translation is given, and it is affirmed that according to the original Greek, it should have been translated thus: "The righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ," for only one person is spoken of.

5). Titus, ii. 13. In this passage we are told the word and ought unquestionably to have been translated even; this old reading with and is an acknowledged error by all learned critics and divines.

With respect to the verses quoted from the first chap. of John's Gospel, we refer to the explanation already given in the June No. of the Lamp, on page 370, and pass on to the passage next quoted from John's First Epistle, where he thus writes; "And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know Him that is true: and we are in Him that is true, even in His Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life." Notwithstanding our friend's very confident assertion, we take the liberty to contradict him, and say that Jesus Christ is not "the true God," neither does it follow that the Christianity which John teaches is Idolatry. Writing on the last clause of this verse, Macknight in his Apostolical Epistles makes some very pertinent remarks, from which we extract the following. "This is the true God." "Because the person last mentioned in what goes before, is Jesus Christ, many commentators and theologians contend that the demonstrative pronoun, *ὁυτος* stands here for Jesus Christ, and that He is the person who is called the true God. But as pronouns often denote the remote antecedent, when the circumstances of the case require them to be so understood, others are of opinion that *ὁυτος* in this passage refers not to Jesus Christ, the near antecedent, but to *τον αληθινον*, the true one, or true God, whom the Son of God had given the Christians understanding to know, and this opinion they think probable, because, if the Apostle by *ὁυτος*, means Jesus Christ, he maketh Him the true God, notwithstanding in the sentence which immediately precedes *ὁυτος*, he distinguishes the true One, from His Son Jesus Christ; *και εσμεν εν τω αληθινω, εν τω υιω αυτου Ιησου Χριστου*: And we are under the true one, under His Son Jesus Christ. Now, although our translators have destroyed that distinction, and have made Jesus Christ the true God, by inserting the word even, in their translation, between two clauses of the sentence in this manner, And we are in Him that is true, even in His Son Jesus Christ; yet as they have inserted that word without the authority of any ancient M.S., the critics who make *ὁυτος* refer, not to Jesus Christ, but to *τοναληθινον*, think their opinion ought to have no weight in a matter of such importance."

In proof that pronouns often denote the remote antecedent, the same author in (Eph. iv. 63.) quotes two instances, one from Luke v. 17. "The power of the Lord was present to heal (*αυτος*) them; not the Pharisees, who are mentioned immediately before, but such sick people as were in the crowd. The other is found in 2. Thes. ii, 8. "Shall render ineffectual, by the brightness of His coming (*ου*) of whom the coming is after the strong working of Satan." Here *ου* - of whom, refers not to the Lord, the immediate antecedent, but to the lawless one, mentioned in the first part of verse 8."

But leaving the grammatical argument, we think the very chapter from which the disputed verse is taken, is of itself sufficient to overturn our friend's position. For instance the things affirmed of Jesus Christ in the sixth verse cannot possibly apply to "the true God." The Apostle is here bringing forward the evidence to prove not that Jesus is the true God, but that He is the Son of God, and he concludes this part of his argument by saying "this is the witness of God, which He hath testified of His Son." In this statement it is perfectly clear that two persons are spoken of, and that the one testifies certain things concerning the other. To suppose that the two are one, in the sense of being one and the same person, is to introduce an element of confusion, and argues misunderstanding and consequently unbelief of "the record that God gave of His Son." Such a notion confounds the Begetter with the one begotten, and is as contrary to Scripture as it is to reason and common sense. It is admitted that the words "God blessed for ever" in Romans, iv. 5. apply to Christ, but this by no means proves that Christ is "the true God." It simply proves that He occupies a most exalted position, as the Apostle Paul says, "God hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name." Phi. ii. 9. And again He says, "He (God) hath appointed a day in the which He shall judge (that is rule) the world in righteousness, by that man whom He hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that He hath raised him from the dead. Acts xvii. 31. When Christ returns to the earth He will sit on the restored throne of the Lord in Jerusalem, reigning over all, and blessed for ever. God will then dwell there in the presence of His Son, who will bear the glory and sit and rule upon His throne, as saith the prophet Zechariah, ch. vi. 13. Moreover the term God is not applied exclusively to the Deity, it is also applied to men in the flesh occupying high positions as rulers or judges, of which the following are instances:

"Thou shalt not revile the gods, nor curse the ruler of thy people." Ex. xxii. 28.

"He judgeth among the gods, I have said, Ye are gods; and all of you are children of the most High: But ye shall die like men, and fall like one of the princes." Ps. lxxxii. 1, 6, 7.

“And the Lord said unto Moses, see I have made thee a God, to Pharaoh.” Ex. vii. 1. Thus was Moses God’s representative for the time, acting for Him and speaking by His command, and Christ was God in the same sense and will be also when He comes again. The idea therefore that because such a title is applied to Christ, he must necessarily be “the true God,” is evidently a mistake. It needs only to be examined by the light of Scripture to make the error manifest.

After what has been said above, we have little to add in reference to the two remaining passages quoted by our friend from the 2nd Epistle of Peter and the Epistle to Titus respectively. We are perfectly willing to accept the amended reading in both places; believing it to be correct. But we maintain that neither of these passages, even in the amended form, give the slightest countenance to our opponents’ view that “Jesus Christ is the true God.” They are to be explained after the same manner as those already commented on. Jesus Christ is not the Saviour apart from “the true God,” neither is God the Saviour apart from Jesus Christ, both are absolutely necessary in order to the carrying out of the great plan of Redemption devised by Infinite wisdom from the beginning. This plan necessitated the coming of precisely such an one as Jesus of Nazareth, a God-begotten and God-like Being, not of the nature of angels but of our nature, not a God but a man, one capable of dying and shedding His blood for the remission of sins; in a word, just such an one as the Prophets predicted and the Apostles preached, “the man Christ Jesus,” “manifested in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world received up into glory.” 1st Timothy, iii. 16.

A theory that would make Jesus Christ “the true God,” upsets the scheme of redemption from Alpha to Omega and stultifies the wisdom of the Most High. S. G. H.

DEAR BRO. TURNEY, - Will you have the goodness to answer the following questions, for the benefit of an inquirer, in your next issue, and oblige,

Yours truly, H. J.

1. Is not the Holy Spirit one person of the Triune God?

ANS. - We do not read in Scripture of “the Triune God,” but only of ONE God.” The Lord our God is ONE Lord.” Deut. vi. 4; Mark xii. 29. Therefore until it can be proved that three are one, and that one is three, we shall reject the idea of a “Triune God,” and believe in the One God of Israel, beside whom God Himself declares He knows not any. Isaiah xlv. 8.

2. What do you understand by the Spirit?

ANS. - We understand (A.) God. “God is a Spirit.” John iv. 24. (B.) The power of God which proceeds from Him as light and heat from the sun.

3. What is Holy Spirit?

ANS. - Holy Spirit is the same as “the Spirit,” for there is but “one Spirit.” The Spirit or power of God is termed holy, that is, separate, set apart for a special purpose, when it is used for religious ends; otherwise it is called “Spirit,” and “free spirit.” Psalm li. 12.

4. In what sense did the prophets and apostles possess the Holy Spirit?

ANS - They possessed it miraculously: and by it did many things impossible to all other men.

5. Cannot the Holy Spirit be possessed except in the miraculous sense?

ANS. - We know not a single instance in which the Holy Spirit was possessed, that is, apart from miracle.

6. Is it not miraculous to have the gift of faith?

ANS. - Yes. But “the gift of faith” and that “faith which comes by hearing” are totally distinct, and different in every sense, except that both were originated by God. “The gift of faith” was extraordinary power which might remove a mountain and cast it into the sea. But “faith without which it is impossible to please God,” comes from understanding and believing His Word, and such understanding and belief arise entirely from “the exercise of our senses by reason of use.”

7. Does not the Holy Spirit assist the mind and help the enquirer to understand?

ANS. - There is no proof of the supposed fact. As we said before, every instance of the action of the Holy Spirit is miraculous, showing that it was given to confirm the Word preached, not to assist men to comprehend the Word.

8. Is it not written, “the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal?”

ANS. - In I. Cor. xii. 7 we read: “But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal.” And the context shows clearly in what way the Spirit was manifested. 1. The word of wisdom. 2. The word of knowledge. 3. Faith. 4. The gifts of healing. 5. The working of miracles. 6. Prophecy. 7. Discerning of spirits. 8. Kinds of tongues. 9. The interpretation of tongues. It should be remembered that all the persons who enjoyed the use of the Spirit in its manifestations as here enumerated, had previously believed and obeyed the gospel, so that any one of these gifts was something in addition to their knowledge and wisdom in that respect. The “every man” is undoubtedly limited in extent. It did not

apply to every man in the city of Corinth; in fact it was confined to those through whom the Spirit was manifested as before described, and, for any person who cannot give satisfactory evidence of having the same order of power it is a self-deception to lay claim to it. "Every tree is known by its fruits."

9. Does not the statement "no man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Spirit" go to prove that all men who intelligently affirm that Jesus is the Lord, do so by the aid of the Holy Spirit in addition to the written word?

ANS. - No. We have in the nineteenth of Acts mention of "certain disciples" who had not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Spirit, and yet they regarded Jesus as the Christ, for they were the disciples of John, whose mission it was to prepare His way. A further proof that Holy Spirit is not requisite to impart a knowledge of the meaning of the Word is seen in John xx. "But these (signs) are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ." Any cause which produces an effect is sufficient, without any other being added to it. The written signs were intended to create the belief that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God; and when once that belief was created no more was required to establish faith in the Christ. From these testimonies it is plain that Holy Spirit in addition to the written Word was not necessary to induce the conviction that Jesus is the Lord. But there were cases in which the Holy Spirit by some miraculous interposition might do that work. For example, a Pagan idolater, ignorant of Moses and the Prophets, hearing Paul, could be so convinced; but wherever there was access to the Word and time to search the Scriptures, it is evident from Paul's letter to Timothy, that they are able to make wise unto salvation every one that believeth.

10. In the case of prayer offered for the recovery of the sick; if the person prayed for be soon restored to health, is not this a sign of "the gifts of healing," similar to that we read of in Corinthians?"

ANS. - By no means. "The gifts of healing" displayed by Christ and His Apostles took immediate effect. True, Jesus in one instance made clay, anointed the man's eyes, and bid him go and wash, but no one would conclude that the clay and water contained miraculous virtue, or that the exercise of such virtue depended in the least upon those simple elements. Doubtless Jesus had some reason for what he did; but we know from many others of his works he could have restored the man's sight by a single word.

11. Is it Scriptural to pray for the sick?

ANS. - Certainly it is. But as we have no divine power bestowed for the purpose of raising up the sick, and as we do not therefore know whether it is God's will to save them or not, our prayer should be one of simple earnest request subject to the Father's will. But in Apostolic times the case was very different. Power was divinely vested in "the elders" for that special purpose. The command therefore was to send for them, not for the members in general. Let it be assumed that some modern church of God appoints elders, that said elders are sent for, that they pray for the recovery of a sick brother; will their prayers be any more efficacious than the prayers of the same number of men in the church who are not elders?

If not, what authority have they to take such power into their hands; causing the simple and illiterate to believe that they have power with God? All such proceedings are delusive and dangerous. We have heard men pray to God in a most random manner; dealing out wild statement, and furious declamation, demanding what, if granted, would prove the fickleness of the Almighty, and that an earnest assault would procure an entire change of His purpose; would amount, in fact, to an impeachment of His wisdom, and the immutability of His counsel. Prayer is designed to lift men up and draw them near to God; not to bend the will of God and bring Him down to men. EDITOR.

Taste is pursued at less expense than fashion. - Shenstone.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

21, Ann St., Aberdeen, June 28th, 1875.

DEAR BRO. TURNEY: I have often thought of writing to you, to give you thanks for the Lamp, which you have so kindly forwarded to me regularly without money and without price. I should have liked rather to pay for them, to have been a little help towards the cause you are trying to promote, but through affliction in my family, and ill health in my own person, I have had to get help in place of giving; but, thanks to our kind Father in Heaven, I have for some time had that measure of health that has enabled me to earn my bread by the sweat of my brow, and now I send you a few shillings to help to clear the

expenses of the Lamp: also the price of the "Treatise on the two Sons of God." I am very much pleased with the manner in which you conduct the Lamp, that you open its pages for those who may not see eye to eye with you in everything. The Brethren have suffered a little from the publications among them, being shut up against those who differ in some things; but who has made us to differ? and what have we that we have not received: if we have received it, why do we boast as if we had not received? Those who are open to conviction may come to have more understanding than all their teachers. I studied the nature of the Christ since the beginning of the dispute between you and Bro. Roberts, and I thought that I did not agree with either of you; but surely you have altered a little, or I had misunderstood you from the beginning, for it seems to me now that I do agree with you; but, on the other hand, I do not think that Bro. Roberts believes that He died for Himself. Christ was not born dead in trespasses and sins as we are; He knew when He would die, He could say, "My time is not yet come," but your time is always ready. He did not need to be born again to make Him a Son of God, the same as we do (but I am sorry to say to you that the new birth has caused a division in the meeting in Aberdeen,) He was that from His mother's womb. I thought at the first that you denied His relationship to man, that although He was born of a woman, He had no connection with her nature no more than the man that is born of water is water; but He is the Mediator between God and man, and is equally friend to both. So now I see you believe Him to be bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh, and I can quite agree with you. You might send me a variety of the tracts for distribution mentioned in the Lamp. I see your reply to the 13th verse of the 3rd of John in this month's Lamp, but I cannot agree altogether with what you there say. I have an idea of the meaning of that passage, in connection with some others, but you have freedom to differ from me. I was very glad to see your mind upon the temptation of Christ in the wilderness, and the same has been my mind for sometime back. You will see it was after the forty days was ended that the tempter came to Him. He was the prophet like to Moses, and he was forty days upon the Mount with God, receiving the law, and Jesus was forty days with His Father, receiving the instructions of His mission and the time of His death, as also Paul was caught up to the third heaven, to receive the revelations He got from the Lord - and he explained this to be into Arabia. So I take it that it is John that is giving the account of Jesus in this 13th verse, and he wrote after Jesus had ascended, after His resurrection; but the coming down was previous to His death, for He says the bread of God is He which cometh down from Heaven, and giveth life to the world. "I am the living bread which came down from Heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world, as the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is that bread which came down from Heaven: not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead. He that eateth of this bread shall live for ever. If language has any meaning, He was in Heaven in His flesh and blood state. He saith "Not that any man hath seen the Father, save He which is of God, He hath seen the Father; and I came down from Heaven not to do my own will but the will of Him that sent me." The Baptist said of Him; "He that cometh from above is above all; he that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the earth, He that cometh from heaven is above all. And what He hath seen and heard, that He testifieth: and no man receiveth His testimony. And He said, "What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before?" This is an outline of what I believe to be the meaning of that and other passages. I do not believe He had any existence before He was born. No, God spake in time past in divers manners unto the father by the prophets. It was only in the last days of that age that He spake to that nation by His Son. John the Baptist said, "This is He that cometh after me, and is preferred before me: for He was before me." The difficulty with some of the Brethren was in the words, "He was before me," when all the time John was older than He; but I think the meaning of it is this, that Jesus was in the desert till the day of his showing unto Israel, but Jesus was born and brought up among them, and they knew Him not, and in this sense He was before John; for John saith," Here standeth one among you whom ye knew not." - If you think proper, and have time, I should be very glad of a few lines from you. I may yet give you an outline if the division in the Meeting. I and a few others are expelled, but we have taken a hall to meet in, and we will try to do what we can. Your brother in the faith and hope of the Gospel. John Mitchell.

REMARKS

There are several points in this letter which call for remark. It is said that Paul explains his being called up to the third heaven to signify his going to Arabia. The first objection to this explanation is that it is nowhere to be found in Paul's writings, nor, so far as we are aware, in any other, except the letter before us. We are not acquainted with any text of Scripture which indicates that heaven, either the first, second, or third, is to be found in Arabia. "The third heaven was to the Jewish mind, that part of the firmament just above the clouds, but we never heard of Arabia being up there. Then when the Apostle was caught up to the third heaven, he did not know whether he was in the body or out of the body; but respecting his

journey into Arabia he writes: "But I went into Arabia, and returned unto Damascus." Gal. i. 17. It is highly probable that Paul in Arabia was the same Paul who was afterwards at Damascus, "and through a window in a basket let down by the wall," to escape the governor. Our correspondent holds that Jesus "was in Heaven in His flesh and blood state," and in proof of this quotes those texts which speak of Him as the bread that came down from Heaven. But surely this language is figurative. Jesus was not literal bread, nor is He literally eaten. The sense is, "the words which I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." So Peter understood the matter when he said to Jesus, "Lord to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life." The sense in which Jesus was before John is explained in the twenty-seventh verse of the first chapter. "He it is, who coming after me is preferred before me, whose shoes' latchet I am not worthy to unloose.

EDITOR.

Geneva, Kane Co., Illinois, June 16th, 1875.

EDWARD TURNEY, DEAR BRO. ; I have waited till the June Lamp has come to hand for the May number, but its non-arrival has caused me to cease expecting it. Will you please mail me a copy for May? [We have done so. ED.] I do not desire to write in a controversial spirit, but this much excuse for alluding to a remark in the Lamp of June, that you might notice the subject pertaining to Thurman's views in a serious manner; implying, as I take it, that what you said was otherwise than serious. I do not accept all Thurman writes, but I still think he was and is right in Daniel's 2,300 prophetic days expiring on the 19th of last April, Roman time. He, with others, jumped at conclusions as to what was to transpire at that particular juncture of time, just taking it for granted that the translation of waiting ones was to occur. But when the event failed as looked for, it instantly occurred to my mind that it was lacking proof that the Lord would in that moment come in His thief-like way. I have been unable to see, since he wrote and published his "Sealed Book of Daniel Opened," in 1864, that his chronology has ever been proven incorrect; and it has been often attacked, but I think as often failed. His chronology you will remember was Eclipses of Sun and Moon, proving Ptolemy's Canon in error, which has been taken as the standard by those who have been considered the great lights on chronology in more modern times; to wit: Bishop Usher in particular. The ending of the 2,300 days in April last, rests upon the same evidence proving that Jesus was the Christ, that he was born B.C. 5 years before our A.D., that he was crucified in A.D. 30, that Jerusalem was besieged A.D., 65, and other dates that are well substantiated in harmony with the same. In examining the types in the law of Moses, it will be seen that the Jubilees of release did not occur at the Passover, but nearly six moons later - and that the great Jubilee of Jubilees will answer to that period of Daniel, when "many that sleep, etc." I will only say further at this writing by way of suggestion, hoping you will give the subject some earnest thought; Is the coming of the Lord of less importance now than the flood was to Noah and his family; or the birth of Messiah of more importance than His second coming? Was not His birth known as to the time; I think it was from the testimony: see good old Simeon, and the Magi, how can those circumstances be harmonized with not knowing the time. I think the oft quoted Scriptures, just one or two texts, are very improperly applied, because they stand in the light as applied; contradicting a more numerous class of Scriptures. "The secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him." He will do nothing but what He revealeth to His servants the prophets. etc; etc.

JOHNSON WHALY.

REMARKS.

Dr. Thomas said that if his latest conclusions in chronology proved incorrect he should believe that the true chronology of the Bible was lost. We are almost of this opinion. The times are very obscure when anything like exactness is sought. The different readings of one or more of the principal dates are very perplexing. In fact touching the whole matter of numbers there is a good deal of contradiction in the Scriptures; still it consists for the most part of such errors as were not unlikely to creep in through transcription. But will a wise man cease on this account to look for the appearing of Christ? Will he close his eyes to all that is written concerning the state of the world political and religious immediately preceding His appearing? By no means. And if we have been thought to despise Thurman's effort to untie the Gordian knots of Bible chronology, and to treat the second appearing of the Christ with indifference, we can only say that our correspondent has entirely mistaken us on the subject. On the contrary, we literally sigh for the event. We have little or no confidence in preaching in this age of religious indifference. Men are not now, as they used to be, pledged to what they find proved by reason, history, and inspiration. The only thing the multitude can enter into with spirit is making money and spending it in the gratification of their appetites, and in very few instances comparatively does this last run in intellectual grooves, much less often in religious. Men who a few years ago were servants of servants

are now seen playing at aristocracy, and, by reason of their non-improvement of mind, bringing at every turn to the remembrance of the observant, the story of the ape who desired to pass for a man. These things being so, and men's minds becoming duller every day through indifference and the failure of well-meant efforts to "discern the time," it is highly probable that the Lord will come in on a sleeping world, and perhaps upon some sleeping saints also. It is needful therefore to re-ignite the general spirit of our brother Whaley's remarks, and give the subject serious thought; and while avoiding rash speculation and unsupported dogmatism, never to lose sight of the signs and the promises.

EDITOR.

Dewartown, June 27th, 1875.

DEAR BRO. TURNEY : Having received the Lamp on the 25th, I was pleased to see Bro. Cunningham's letter, and though sorry that you have not had time to make any remarks thereon, yet we trust it will do good by directing the minds of the Brethren to the subject; for if the law of life in the age to come, as stated in Bro. C.'s letter, be correct, then it does away with the necessity for a second resurrection, which we know many of the Brethren believe in in the face of no testimony to support their position, as the only verse that gives any countenance, Rev. xx. 5, is spurious according to Tischendorf, the Siniatic manuscript, which is the oldest extant, say : "But the rest - were finished" (a mere error). We have the testimony of Isaiah the Prophet that "Israel's judges will be restored as at first, and thy counsellors as at the beginning. It will be called then, the city of righteousness, the faithful city. - I enclose an order for eight shillings for the treatise. I think it would be well to intimate through the Lamp the amount of postage it would require. I will either send mine in stamps or add to the order for Lamp, as I do not know how much it will be. With kind regards, Yours fraternally, A. PEARSON.

[We invite remark upon the view held in this letter and the one referred to. It is hoped that the 2s. will include the postage of the Treatise, but we are not able to say until the weight of the book is known.]

- EDITOR.]

[The following communication requires no explanation. Everybody will see the force of it, which was felt, no doubt, by the gentleman who neither published it nor gave his reasons for not doing so. Here is another proof of that bravery which is prepared for all comers! - EDITOR.]

DEAR BRO. TURNEY: I forward the enclosed copy of letter. You will see it is dated April 7th, 1875. Three issues have since appeared, but no answer; hence I have sent it on to you to deal with as you think best. I consider that it completely shows that R. R.'s style of reasoning would set him against the Apostle Paul and all other inspired writers, and am surprised he cannot see the falseness of his position. - In haste, F. M. LESTER.

[COPY:]

To the Editor of the Christadelphian:

DEAR SIR: In the recent controversy concerning the sacrifice of Christ and his relation to the law of sin and death, you have endeavoured to prove that Jesus of Nazareth was a lineal descendant of Adam, and that as such He was as much under the power of death as those for whom He died; alleging, as proof thereof, the fact that He had in his veins Adamic blood, derived from Mary, His mother. Now, in view of this, I would submit for your candid consideration the following questions, which please answer in your next monthly issue: - Ques. 1). Had not Jesus Levitical blood in His veins, derived from Mary, His mother, who was a Levite? Ques. 2). If the possession of Adamic blood in his veins would constitute Jesus a lineal descendant of Adam, would not the fact that He had Levitical blood in His veins likewise constitute Him a lineal descendant of Levi? - Ques. 3). How, then, could the Apostle Paul prove the Melchizedec order of the priesthood of Christ by declaring, "It is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah, concerning which tribe Moses says nothing concerning priesthood." Heb. vii. 14. Yours respectfully, F. M. LESTER. Leicester, April 7th, 1875. Adeline, Ogle Co., Illinois, June 21st, 1875.

BROTHER E. TURNEY: I here enclose five dollars in currency, for which you will please send me the Treatise on the Two Sons. I am very much pleased with the way you have set forth the nature and sacrifice of Christ, and your Treatise on the Two Sons. It gives me much pleasure to see the manner in which you have discussed it, showing that your desire is the truth. - I am, yours faithfully in the Christ, - A. COFFMAN.

DEAR BROTHER TURNEY: I observe that the change of name has afforded an opportunity for R. R's sneers. But his statement that Christadelphian is a verbal symbol of the truth, etc., is just another assumption of the infallibility of himself and his thirty-five articles. And for years back the symbol has been of a chameleon character, not only among various groups of brethren (markedly here about Edinburgh) but even in the citadel at Birmingham. I intended to have referred more at length to his use of the terms "carnal," "flesh," etc., as conveying a change of moral delinquency in relation to doctrinal differences. But possibly another opportunity may offer for this purpose. I remember, in reading "The sad story" affair, being struck with his admission of failure to furnish a single fact to bear out his charges. Want of common fairness, with a continual boasting of perfection in morals, seems his failing. I have been struck with the former in connection with his reproduction of Dr. Thomas's articles. A "Sister," in praising the Dr's "Life," (Christadelphian, Nov. 1873,) mentions the "unfortunate agitation" then raised up, and says - "No one can read through the Dr's life without having light thrown on this as on other subjects, for he seems to treat on nearly every question in those sparkling letters and articles, which would have been lost to us if you had not reproduced them from his early writings. In the same number in 'Notes,' on second page of cover, I find the following - "T.O. In reproducing Dr. Thomas's old article, we of course subject them to editorial revision "to harmonize them with matured apprehension of the truth he finally reached, after years of continuous study of the holy oracles." He then adds that the need for this is slight, etc. In the same number is an article from the "Herald of the Kingdom, August, 1852. "Now if this (or any other article so dated) has been "subjected to editorial revision" of the character indicated, is it not a falsification of the fact that Dr. T. wrote a certain article at such and such a date? The motto of the ambassador was "A wicked messenger falleth into mischief, but a faithful ambassador is health." Another piece of boasting with detraction characteristic of the man I am sorry to say. Do you know if anyone has been at the pains to ascertain to what extent said "editorial revision" has been exercised?

[We do not; but it is considerable. ED.]

All honour to Miss Rogers for her intelligent independence in asserting her privilege to differ from "the Editor." I sincerely hope, though with little prospect of realization, that the eye salve so kindly proffered may be applied and be found efficacious. The parlour interview smacks of the confessional and inquisition. But his knowledge of human nature is rendered of none effect by his egotism. If he had inserted her letter and accompanied it with a suitable reply, he might have retained her. But his policy of keeping his readers so much in the dark would not admit of this, and he and his cause suffer, and yet he does not see it. Is it not "vaulting ambition falling on the other side?" - With kind regards, and best wishes, I remain, yours truly, J. CAMERON.

MISUNDERSTANDINGS CONCERNING HOLY SPIRIT.

Our present object is not to refute the doctrine that the Holy Spirit is one of the persons in the Trinity, nor to deny that men, both under the Old and New Testament dispensations, have been guided by the Spirit of God; but it is briefly to discuss the idea that in the present day some Christian men are strengthened and directed by the same agent. Nothing is easier than to select a few texts of Scripture in which Holy Spirit occurs, and make a false application of them to ourselves. Where this practice is indulged to any great extent, it puffs up the subject with pious conceit, and leads him in a short time to the belief that he is the especial favourite of Heaven. This religious disease has been witnessed among Quakers in some of its most repulsive aspects; no sect, perhaps, is entirely free from it, and but few individuals, comparatively speaking, escape the contagion. We are of opinion that before men and women venture to take to themselves this unction, they should pay more attention to the dictates of common sense. It is, however, not at all rare to see people who fancy they are impelled and helped by Holy Spirit, betraying a grievous lack of sound understanding. These, wrongly despising or undervaluing the faculties with which their Creator has endowed them, resort to the additional and indefinable aid of the Holy Spirit, persuading themselves that all they think and do that is good results from this assistance, and that without it they could neither plan nor perform anything that would not be better undone. Another serious evil which has ever attended the idea that Christians are now possessed of Holy Spirit is to habituate the clodhopper to esteem himself as wise as the wisest Christian philosopher. Are we not all taught of God? Is it not the same Spirit guides me that guides him? The conclusion from these premises is obvious: all are on a level, not merely as creatures of the Father's hand, but as regards all knowledge of a religious kind. Knowledge of the laws of religion, It is erroneously supposed, is not to be attained by dint of mental

labour, like a knowledge of the laws of chemistry or astronomy; no, it comes by the Spirit. But why so; are not these sciences parts of God's ways quite as much as religion; and where is the Christian man of science that assumes his deductions to be the help of the Holy Spirit? Here we begin to discern the fallacy of this notion. The work of the Holy Spirit, be it remembered, was not confined to New Testament times; all that is prophetic and miraculous is of the same order, and this appears at a very early stage of the Biblical history of the world. Let us observe that, no matter how varied were the operations of the Spirit, we are, or may become, acquainted with those operations. That is to say, we can see what was wrought, and that it was out of what is called the natural order of things. In this wide field surely we can make some selection analogous to the claim under consideration. What authority have we for expecting the Spirit to help men now in a manner totally different from that of apostolic or pre-apostolic times? Are we to believe that the Divine agency will work some altogether new result? This brings the subject to a point. Show us any result, mental or physical, today, which is like any mental or physical result recorded in Scripture. If you choose the mental because you feel the utter impossibility of sustaining your case by the physical, then we shall require demonstration that this same mental result cannot be reached without Holy Spirit, so called. We say, what advantage is the pretended Holy Spirit, since precisely the same ends are everywhere attained without it? We know, however, that it is scarcely practicable to reason thus with persons who have satisfied themselves that they have this spirit and can have it for asking, without their imagining that such reasoning proceeds from a carnal mind. Having constituted their own pious fancy their Deity, they are shocked at the assaults of proud incredulous man. But pious feeling, how intense soever, must never be permitted to set clear reason and plain sense at defiance. No amount of praying will get men out of a difficulty without the exercise of their natural powers. A man's judgment cannot assent to that which is not at all supported. When we can see the same results - any one of them - as we read of in the Word, we shall believe they are produced by the same cause; but so long as the results we see all around are produced without any pretension to the use of that cause, it is impossible for us to believe that such cause is the origin of any of them, though well-meaning Christians may assert it.

There is a sense in which claim is laid to the Spirit much below the miraculous; nevertheless definite enough to be understood and examined. As for example, when a person prays to God for a right understanding of His Word, and in arriving at what he conceives to be that understanding, attributes the effect to Holy Spirit co-operation with his mind. Some go so far as to affirm that no one can comprehend anything aright without the Spirit. Here we pause and demand proof. Are not facts arrayed against this belief? From the standpoint of one sect the conclusions of another are heterodox; and the individuals who once thought their knowledge was once thought their knowledge was attained in this manner often come afterwards to opposite decisions. Is he Spirit the author of contradiction? Now in whatever way the Holy Spirit may be supposed to illuminate man's minds there can be no doubt that such light would be pure, that the guidance would be infallible. This is in fact exactly what the Church of Rome arrogates - the infallible guidance of the Holy Spirit. But what do Protestants say to this? Do they not refute Rome's claims by the contradictions in her teachings, and the gross absurdity, and even villainy of her deeds. Until we are prepared to accept the proposition that what we know and do as alleged by the help of the Spirit is infallibly perfect, we ought to be very cautious about fancying we enjoy such aid. It is not at all difficult to show that the actions of men, after praying to divers gods, are identical in character that offering prayer stimulates alike the nerves of Turks, Jew and Christian; that hostile Christian armies pray to the same God for help and believe they receive it; that preachers of adverse dogmas pray for light and imagine they have it by this means. In view of such conflicting claims who will dare to say who really have the Holy Spirit. It is because the effect of praying is not considered that mistakes are made on this subject. We have seen an African Lion hunter standing at one end of the den, calm and deep in prayer to his God for protection. The devotion finished we have marked the undaunted courage; the steadfastness of his eye: the beasts have felt it and submitted. But for this preparation the hunter's nerves might have been unstrung, the beasts might have perceived his timidity and set upon him - perhaps killed him. We need not multiply illustrations. No matter to what object - even to a stock or stone - prayer may be directed, the effect is the same where faith and confidence are equal. Ignorance may attribute it to Holy Spirit. It will probably be asked then, of what use is prayer addressed even to the true God? We answer that an enlightened man knows to whom and for what he prays; that the exercise brings his mind into sympathy with God's just in proportion to the extent and correctness of the knowledge he possess of His will and purposes and no further. If he is aroused beyond this it is blind affection and ignorant zeal, and may prove a source of mischief.

EDITOR.

J. CAMERON AND R. ROBERTS

In the Christadelphian for May, the Editor has some remarks on a reprint of two articles from the Christadelphian Lamp, - one by Wm. Laing, and one by myself (with Preface), on the differences between the so-called Dowieites and Christadelphians. As several of his statements call for correction, I will thank you to allow the following observations in reply a place in the pages of the Christian Lamp.

If one might condescend to use a vulgar phrase, R. Robert's article might be described as mere "dirt-throwing," for he deals out a series of foul epithets among both sections of those who differ from him, without stating a single FACT to warrant them. Thus, he charges the Dowieites with "latitudinarian and flesh-pleasing principles" - "entrapping by plausible speeches contrary to truth" - "carnal Laodeiceanism, which is detestable to a child of the Spirit" - "not helping, honouring, and loving the truth" - "fruits of the flesh," etc. Those he calls the Renunciationists he couples with such expressions as "vindictive acts of a reprov'd scorner" - "an evil work and evil men" - "false friends" - "treachery to the truth" - "want of principle" - "carnal."

To print and publish to the world such charges, without accompanying them with even an attempt at proof, shows a high-handed disregard of the commonest principles of fair play, not to speak of generosity. It can only have been intended for a section of his readers - I hope for the credit of the brotherhood, a small one - namely, those who accept for gospel everything that drops from the lips or pen of "the Editor." Surely this indicates an over-weaning self-conceit on his part, scarcely less than that so well described by Shakespeare - "I am Sir Oracle, and when I ope my mouth let no dog bark." It is a mistaken policy, however, thus to ignore the common sense of the brethren, and is sure in the end to defeat itself with all who can and will think for themselves. Bodily ill health might be a good reason for not touching the subject at all, but surely it does not indicate a spiritually healthy condition to stuff a short article with vile charges without proof. And the less so since he affirms that there is no need for it - "for the brotherhood, as a whole, are too wide awake to be entrapped by plausible speeches, which are contrary to what they know to be true." Then what does the Editor fear? Is it not evident that he thinks the wide-awakes are not so numerous as he would like, and that his ipse dixit is necessary to assure the sluggards that all is right. He forgets that the articles were written for all conditions of mentality among the brotherhood, and that it is just two years ago that a large section of the brotherhood asserted their right to think for themselves on a point of Christadelphian doctrine, and that although it led them to differ from "the Editor," as well as from the late Dr. Thomas. It is a pity that so much zeal should be expended in thrusting unproved statements before those who are entitled to expect to be treated as reasonable beings.

Before noticing the main points in R. R's article, I would briefly dispose of one or two of less importance. He calls the matter in controversy between you and him "a subtle part of the truth." He surely forgets here that "subtlety" is never in Scripture predicated of any part of gospel truth. If any part of Christadelphian truth is "subtle," it is the strongest proof that it is not "the truth as it is in Jesus;" for when Paul describes how he preached "the truth," he said it was "not with ENTICING words of man's wisdom," and those who were called by such preaching were "not many wise men after the flesh." Subtlety is a quality of Satan, and is dangerous to the truth. Paul well knew this, and uttered a solemn warning against it. "I fear," said he, to the Corinthians, "lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve, through his subtlety, so your minds should be corrupted from the SIMPLICITY that is in Christ." And, on another occasion, addressing Elymas the sorcerer - "O full of all subtlety and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?" I have no hesitation in saying, that everything put forward as the gospel of Christ, that is characterized by subtlety, is a libel on Christ and his apostles, and is sure to meet merited condemnation from the Judge when he comes. How can Dr. Thomas be a Dowieite when he declined, when requested, to heal the breach in Edinburgh, in 1862? - I am not aware that the Dr. was requested to heal the breach, but assuming that he was, and refused - there is no evidence that it was because of any doctrinal difference, but because certain brethren in Edinburgh had written to him pointing out what in his writings they considered an unchristian style of treating outsiders who differed from him, and I heard one of the Dr.'s best friends in Edinburgh admit that the Dr. lent too ready an ear to one-sided representations in matters affecting the brotherhood. In these circumstances his alleged treatment of the request referred to is quite compatible with the position he maintained to the last as to the first principles of the gospel. "Many of whom (Dowieites) never read those writings (Dr. T's), and some of them (and these the principal) made it a matter of boast that they did not do so." Well, I never heard of either class, and as to the latter, decline to believe the statement without proof. The two diverse platforms "may at another time, if necessary," be shown to be identical. This is good. It may be necessary to do something in the way of proof. The "wide-

awakes “ may have dust thrown in their eyes by the ingenuity of this Dowieite suggestion, and we may require to show its fallacy. Supposing this were effected, however, the Editor must not forget that after he has proved the Dr.’s platform to be the same as the Birmingham one, he will require to show that the latter is identical with “the Faith once delivered to the Saints,” a thing he has never yet attempted, though repeatedly asked.

“It is in our hearts to help, honour, and love all who help, honour, and love the truth, without respect of person.” But, suppose a man simply holds the truth, and from some weakness, mental or moral, shows no sign of helping, honouring, and loving it, according to R. R.’s standard - is he to get not only the cold shoulder, but an increasing opposition. Are we not enjoined to “comfort the feeble-minded, to support the weak, and to be patient towards all?” But “the truth” means the truth according to the Birmingham thirty-five articles, and how can anyone be expected to help, honour, and love the truth as there defined, when he does not believe it to be of Apostolic authority? But if a man helps, honours, and loves the truth, as defined in the article by W. Laing, he is not worthy of any sympathy from R. R., simply because he does not acknowledge R. R.’s definition of the devil, etc., and that for the simple reason that it has not been proved that Christ requires it.

“The laxity of the Dowieites in their treatment of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul in fellowship was the one point on which the Birmingham withdrawal from them was expressly founded.” This is correct so far as the Birmingham church is concerned, but not as to R. R. himself, who had previously withdrawn from G. Dowie for a difference regarding the devil. And it is not true, so far as the Edinburgh Christadelphians are concerned, who had withdrawn, in 1862, for reasons apart from matters of faith altogether. At the same time a regard to truth requires me to state that the doctrine of the immortality was never knowingly fellowshipped by those withdrawn by the Birmingham church. They only declined to agree to a written statement on the subject, satisfied that the understanding they had acted on in the past, and intended to act on in the future, was sufficient. That understanding was that eternal life is attainable only through Christ, in the faith and obedience of the Gospel.

“They opposed the preaching of the word years ago.” These words are easily written, and they may mean much or little. But no facts are stated for the information of the reader. I must therefore deal with the charge as we find it. The Edinburgh church, numbering 20, was formed in 1853. During the first half-dozen years of its history there was among its members more felt need for up-building in the faith than there was qualifications for public preaching. The spread of the truth was therefore left to private effort, and their number was something like trebled during that period, exclusive of removals, etc. I think it was during this period that Mr. Robert Norrie, his wife, their daughter Jane (now Mrs. Robert Roberts), and others of their family, were baptized. But I find I shall best illustrate this little item of church history by gleaning a few extracts from the Intelligence department of the Messenger of the Churches, a printed magazine maintained by brethren for eleven years, and edited by George Dowie. Here, then, is a brief notice of the seventh anniversary of the church. - “The review of the past year was gratifying. A retrospect of the whole period of the Church existence also called forth lively gratitude to God. The original number with which they started, 23, has increased to 69. But this is the least. There has been a steady growth in knowledge, in love, and in influence. They have not courted public attention; but diligently laboured in their own little field, and good fruits have sprung up. The sympathies of all for each are very strong, and the help ready. Their intimacy with all the churches, and frequent communication with them, enhance their enjoyment very much, and add a heavy burden of responsibility which they delight to bear. This heyday of theirs, they hope through the favour of God, will not pass into the gloom and darkness of cold indifference, but increase to a warmer glow of pure divine love.” - Vol 1. 1860.

“At a gathering at Nottingham in the same year, the following particulars are given of the Edinburgh Church. “Their meetings are as follows: - Sunday, 11 a. m., for worship, breaking of bread, exhortation, etc.; 2¼ p.m. for examination of the Scriptures and worship; 7 p.m., Christian evidence class; Tuesday, 8½ p.m., reading, conversation and music; Thursday, 8½ p.m., Scripture study and music; Friday, 8½ p.m. for literary composition. The internal condition of the Church is described as in a healthy state. There is general activity, interest in one another’s well-being, love for each other’s society, readiness to help one another, and a peaceful harmonious life. They have not made any extra efforts for the publication of the truth during the past year. What they have relied upon as most suitable to their circumstances and needs has been the assiduous use of private means and appliances - reading, conversation and tract lending; and although their increase has not been great, it has been satisfactory, six having been added to their number since the publication of the Church roll in August, 1859. The only suggestion they offer for a wider dissemination of the truth, is the careful and steady use of what means are available. They do not say that public address is unserviceable, but deem the most useful means, in their circumstances, to be private and

INTELLIGENCE.

BIRMINGHAM, - Dear Bro. Turney: We are still persevering in the good work of proclaiming the glad tidings of salvation to those that are out of the way, and also trying to show the way of life to those who oppose themselves. The lectures have been pretty well attended the last month, but the public have a disrelish for divine things, especially during fine summer weather. The Sunday evening addresses are as follow: June 20th, “The Destiny of the Earth.” Bro. James Martin. June 27th, “The Gospel preached to Abraham.” Bro. H. Turney. July 4th, “The death of Christ: did He die for Himself, or for the sins of the world.” Bro. Henry Turney. (This was an interesting lecture, albeit it was a lamentable sight to see that Mr. R. R. so clearly condemns himself to impartial witnesses of being in direct antagonism with himself; and in his latest attempt to patch up his flimsy house, really takes away the foundation stone upon which the Gospel is based, by openly declaring that “Adam was not mortal or immortal,” a fact which, if he had not proved to our conviction some eight years ago, “both by nature and revelation,” we could not have accepted the truth which we still hold and mean to adhere to. We shall see what his policy will bring him to of altering his own plain statement of years ago and also of revising in his editorial sanctum the writings of Dr. Thomas.) July 11th. “The good time coming.” Bro. Geo. Haines, of Nottingham. On Tuesday evening, June 29th, Emma Brown, 15, domestic servant (sister of our Bro. Thomas Brown) was immersed. She was fully intelligent in the hope of the Gospel, having been connected with the Christadelphians a long time, and, though young in years, possesses a sober mind, and was fully aware of the fact that out of Christ there is no hope of life eternal. She expressed a fervent desire to be united to Christ by immersion. These things were duly considered, and after a careful examination by several Brethren, it was thought that by refusing her request we should be under a dangerous responsibility. We have been without the good services of Bro. W. Ellis this month, he having left us for a time to labour among the Brethren in the north, with the hope of strengthening them in the knowledge of God and Christ Jesus our Lord. The quarterly (business) meeting of the ecclesia was held last Tuesday evening, July 6th. The accounts shewed an improvement upon last quarter, the deficiency being reduced, notwithstanding some extra expenses incurred and efforts put forth, the results of which we cannot immediately see. - CHARLES JENNINGS.

DALKEITH. - Although the progress of the Gospel of the Kingdom of God is slow here, we have lately received some encouragement by the addition of two persons to our “little flock.” On Sunday, June 13th, William Noble, of Bonnyrigg, and Janet Stokes, of Dalkeith, were united to Christ by immersion, after an intelligent confession of their faith in the things concerning the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ. They are now in fellowship with us, observing the Apostles’ doctrine, and waiting for the Lord from Heaven. Sister Stokes is sister in the flesh to our Brother and Sister Stokes. - G.
FAIRGRIEVE.

DEAL. - Under great difficulties the truth is preserved in this place, and to the honour of the few sisters, especially Sister Risien, its influence is to some extent spread abroad. What is done is chiefly in the way of lending books, tracts, and private conversation. Occasionally a little discussion is provoked, some intelligent lady or perhaps a minister is fallen in with, and while they are endeavouring to disperse what they imagine to be a new and strange kind of intellectual darkness, they suddenly and unexpectedly find themselves confronted by some startling and well-sustained proposition about heaven, hell, or the soul; and before they can get away, discover they are caught and helpless. Fancy a well-educated preacher eagerly beset by a simple, unlearned woman on the subject of the immortality of the soul; he is confident and triumphant in manner; he almost sneers in his pious pity and self-complacency for his “weaker” opponent; she fairly “tackles” him; defies his whole armoury; almost taunts him to find a single text in proof of his notion: at length he begins to look like a preacher who has “lost the place,” or forgot his notes, or, perhaps, put the wrong sermon in his hat: confusion is too visible; and after some shuffling and hesitation, the time of day comes gratefully to his relief; he suddenly recollects an important engagement, nervously seizes his hat, puts on one of his most forced smiles, promises to call again, and off he goes with the proverbial sensation of a man “with a flea in his ear.”

DOUGLAS (Isle of Man). - Dear Bro. You will remember that for some time past it has been our custom to visit this "isle of the sea" in the season. We have lifted up our voice many times in this town, so that those who have ears to hear" may know the truth and obey it. We are about to repeat the effort, and we do so this season with peculiar pleasure, on account of the fact that during the past winter Mr. Hobson, the incumbent of Douglas, has preached and lectured upon the vexed subjects of "Immortality" and "Eternal Torture," affirming that the commonly received views of immortality have been derived from the Pagans, and that the Scriptural doctrine is immortality only for the righteous, and annihilation for the wicked. We intend supplementing his labours. The lecture is announced for the 18th of July, and, should anything of an interesting character transpire, will forward for next issue. - J. M.

GLASGOW. - Dear Brother Turney: Bro. Ellis arrived here all safe on the 15th June, and we made up our minds that he should deliver six lectures; we set about looking for a Hall, which after some difficulty we secured, viz., - The Atheneum, for two week-nights and two Sundays, which required him to deliver two lectures each Sunday and one each week-night; the subject of lectures you will have received from him. They were but thinly attended on the week-nights, but cheerfully on the Sundays. The audience seemed riveted on Bro. Ellis, as he in clear and instructive language exposed the fallacy that Jesus Christ was sinful flesh, and had to redeem himself from Adam's curse. Bro. Ellis remarked that the same idea was held by a portion of Christadelphians, and showed that they and the popular churches are identically erroneous on this point. A number of sisters from Paisley attended both Sundays, also a few of the brethren and sisters from George Street, who are not afraid to trust themselves out of leading-strings. On Sunday, the 20th, the brethren and sisters who love the truth for the truth's sake, broke bread at 11 o'clock, and were joined by Brethren Ellis, Russel, Kerr, and Hunter of Coatbridge, Bro. Ferguson, Wishaw, and Sister McGavin, Paisley. On the 27th the brethren broke bread together in the same place. We have been strengthened by the addition to our number of Bro. Ferguson, from Wishaw, who is intelligent and firm in his advocacy of an uncondemned Christ; others from the same place sympathise with us in our views, and have assisted us in the propagation to the public. On the whole we have great reason to rejoice at the encouragement we have received from a knowledge of the Truth. No matter how foes may combine to destroy the Truth, God is stronger than all, and can, through the foolishness of preaching by the weak ones he chooses, confound the wisdom of the wise. On the Sunday after Bro. Ellis left us, we met in the Cooking Depot (Great Western), 289, Buchanan Street, which we have taken at considerable expense. On last Sunday, 4th July, we met and broke bread together, and determined to stand together in defence of those views which we believe above all that we have ever yet heard. Bro. Ellis's visit has added new power to us. I enclose you an advertisement, which I put into papers here, so that all who can meet us on the grounds set forth therein we shall be glad to receive. In all, Bro. Turney, we have managed to do that which we were in duty bound to do. Regarding Bro. Ellis and the Truth, no doubt had all been anxious, Bro. Ellis's expenses would not have been so much. We are grateful for his visit, and return our Father thanks for all we have received from his hand, and for having raised up those who love the truth, and who are willing to spend and be spent in his service. - J. O'NEIL. [Adv. not received]

HALIFAX. - Concerning the Condemnationist movement, Bro. Swindel writes as follows: - "For some weeks past there has been quite a commotion in the Halifax meeting, created by the proclamation of D. Bairstow's dogma that it was impossible for Jesus to sin! This teaching was warmly opposed by several of the members, and, after considerable squabbling, Tait, of Edinburgh, and Shuttleworth, of Birmingham, were brought over to settle the matter; but the efforts of these authorities were not successful, and last week thirty separated from the rest in Bedford-square, and met last week in another room. You would, perhaps, notice an answer to X 92 in the Christadelphian for June. I gave Tait a precisely similar explanation of my view of the question; he, however in effect, told me that I could not understand the question, or I could not put it in that way; so of course according to Tait, the editor of the Christadelphian does not understand the question. Then you would notice no doubt, the editor's note in last Christadelphian to D. B. and A. T., in regard to a letter they jointly forwarded to him for publication; this plainly tells both these giants that their view of the question ignores the Deity's way of dealing with men. Which meeting, I wonder, will "the Protector" now be pleased to recognise as the Christadelphians of Halifax! A funny phase of the matter is this, according as I understand it. Shuttleworth, during the editor's absence at Llandudno, sympathised with the party opposed to Bairstow, and so was sent for while Tait was here. Tait succeeded in converting Shuttleworth to his and Bairstow's view of the matter, and now Shuttleworth will find he was reckoning without his host -his master, "the Protector," being against him. The master will, of course, have turned the deputy right again, by the order, "As you were!" Probably there will be something further in next month's Condemnationist." - REMARKS. This is a very pretty piece of business. If Messrs' D. B. and A. T. only knew the phrenological estimate "the Protector" has

long ago taken of their crania, for “the Protector” is inter alia phrenologist as well as “Pope,” they would be at no loss to understand his snubbing them, his refusal to publish their joint epistle, and also his previous patting and cooing with all the softness and mellifluousness of spiritual habit. Down with cant, but especially spiritual cant! Thanks to memory, it is not long since “the field was widened and whitened;” a jingling alliteration intended to point to a seer-like eye, and produce a charming astonishment throughout all the tribes of the Condemnationists, what time our modern Moses and Aaron stood between the dead and the living, and (as they proclaimed) the plague was stayed! The catastrophe was so magnified by these Birmingham priests that one might almost have applied the rest of the quotation, namely: “Now they that died in the plague were fourteen thousand and seven hundred, beside them that died about the matter of Koran.” But “leprosy” and “virus” are apt to lurk in the blood, and we wot not that through ignorance a few more meat offerings and oblations must needs be presented to the priests for their effectual cleansing. Figures and irony aside, it is plain enough that neither the editor nor his people understand the Christ. Their minds are insensibly a prey to Calvinistic teaching concerning original sin, the corruptness of flesh, etc., etc., which completely embarrasses them when they try to reason out the justice, wisdom, and pity displayed in the great redemptive work of Jesus. Not understanding the estate, physical and moral, of the first Adam, they cannot possibly comprehend the nature and relations of the second. They puzzle and bewilder themselves and others to discover remedies for evils which never existed, while they are blind to the simple and beautiful adaptation of God’s means to His ends. This is very sad when we regard their insufferable egotism while they preach humility and moral perfection. There is no pride so abhorrent as humility which vaunts itself; no ignorance so dark as that which boasts its spiritual insight; no envy so base as that which covers itself with a plea “for the glory of God;” no consistency so absurd as that which neglects its own precepts. - EDITOR.

LEICESTER. - Dear Bro. Turney: It is again my pleasing duty to ask you to place on record, in the forthcoming issue of the Lamp, two additions to the household of Faith. Mr. Samuel Edward Kemp, on the 17th June, and Mrs. Mary Rodgers, on the 12th July, were buried by baptism in Christ’s death, and are now rejoicing in the Apostolic declaration, that “there is now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus.” Mrs. Rodgers is mother of Sister Rodgers, late of Wisbeach whose removal to Leicester was noticed in the June number of the Lamp. Mrs. Rodgers is 71 years of age, and is not a little joyed at having found her way out of the old Adam into the new. The lectures during the past month have been exceedingly well attended; particulars as follow: - June 20th, by Bro. F. M. Lester, subject: “The doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul not being taught in the Scriptures a proof of their Divine origin.” - June 27th, by Bro. E. Turney, of Nottingham; subject: “The Kingdom of Christ to be established by War.” On this occasion the hall was crowded, and we trust that fact will afford encouragement to our Brother to visit us as often as his other duties and engagements will admit of, feeling sure that the soil of Leicester is not a bad one, but wants a diligent turning over and over, and, under God’s blessing, fruit will be brought forth. Sunday, July 4th, was devoted to answering questions arising out of the lectures delivered the previous month, and in pursuance of the healthy admonition of the Apostle, “Be ready always to give to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you;” and we have the hope that in so doing it will contribute to the cultivation of a more intimate and friendly understanding between ourselves and the public who come to hear. Bro. D. Handley, of Nottingham, lectured on Sunday, 11th; his subject, “The Word of Life,” was very plainly opened out, and most attentively listened to. - CHARLES WEALE.

LIVERPOOL. - Dear Brother Turney: Enclosed are the Intelligence forms, some of which should have been sent last month. You will see by them that we have had the pleasure of visits from several of the brethren and sisters. Bro. Richmond spoke morning and evening, as also did Bro. Ellis. The subjects of his lectures are on the hand bill which I enclose. - May 16th, Morning, Bro. Atkinson, subject of exhortation, “Bread of Life,” attendance, good. Evening, Bro. Atkinson, subject, “Faith,” attendance, good. Visitors, Bro. and Sister Turney, and Sister Jennings, of Birmingham. May 23rd, Morning, Bro. Atkinson, subject, “The Light of the World,” attendance, very good. Evening, Bro. Lind, subject, “Matt. xvi.” May 30th, Morning, Bro. Lind, subject, “John vii,” attendance good. Evening, Bro. Atkinson, subject, “The Gospel,” attendance, fair. - June 6th, Morning, Bro. Richmond and W. L. Atkinson, attendance, very good. Evening, Bro. Richmond, subject, “Popular preaching shown to be a delusion,” attendance, fair. June 13th, Morning, W. Ellis, attendance, very good. Afternoon, W. Ellis, attendance, good. June 20th, Morning, W. L. Atkinson, subject, “Jesus, the Resurrection and the Life,” attendance, good. Evening, W. L. Atkinson, subject, “The Good Shepherd.” attendance, poor. W.L. ATKINSON. Another account. - Dear Bro.: On our return from North Wales we met several of the brethren, and spent some time with them on the evening of the 15th ultimo, and talked over several matters of interest in the house of Bro. Hughes, where also we met Bro. and Sister Mede, late of Leicester. Things are not as they should be, there is much misrepresentation and consequently much error and misunderstanding. Persons

who have the credit of being “renunciationists” are treated with great suspicion, not to say contempt. Bro. Hughes is very hearty and enthusiastic, talks by the yard, but we are sorry to say, thinks very little, while Bro. Mede neither talks or thinks; he did open his mouth once or twice during the evening, just to tell us that he did not require any instruction upon any matter from us, and he might have added “for ignorance is bliss.” I should not like to see in print all that transpired, for much that was said and done was a disgrace to civilization. An hour and a half having passed, and seeing that it was very like throwing time away, after some explanation about an advertisement in the Bible Echo, and terms of fellowship among the “Renunciationists,” we separated, requesting the friends who had behaved so badly, “to be children in malice and men in understanding.” We then, though at a late hour, wended our way to the house of Bro. Boote, a brother who is “swift to hear and slow to speak,” and which is better still, “slow to wrath;” he is not quite clear on the question of “Substitution,” and other things connected therewith; but he is seeking, and we can but hope that such will find. He reads the Lamp, and I believe, is pleased with the contents. Our time was very short together, as our motto at present, is “onward.” - J. M.

MUMBLES, JULY 12TH, 1875. - Dear Brother Turney: I am very pleased to communicate to you another addition to the family of the Deity at this place, in the person of Mrs. Sarah Row, aged thirty-four, who in her early days was dipped in water by the Baptists, but coming to the Mumbles some time ago, was led to the Christadelphian synagogue, and at first was very much offended at what she heard, but upon further hearing and reading of the Scriptures, she was led to see that she was wrong, and applied for Christian baptism, and after a careful examination she was baptized on the 25th of last month, into the undefiled and uncondemned Christ of the Scriptures. We have been very much cheered by a visit from Bro. Williams, of Birmingham, and who, on Sunday morning, July 4th, gave an instructive address on the “Nature of Christ,” and at night delivered a lecture to an attentive audience on “The Teachings of the Bible v. the Traditions of Men.” I am heartily pleased with the new name given to the Lamp, and I have no doubt but that it will have a much wider circulation, and therefore be the means of doing more good. Hoping it will continue to give both sides of questions, not fearing the wrath of the Birmingham dealer in dust, because it exposes the unscriptural doctrine of his unclean Christ, who he says came into the world under the condemnation of Adam, and whose blood was impure and full of sin. The late Dr. J. Thomas in the Herald of the Kingdom, of 1851, page 174, clearly teaches that Christ’s blood was pure and innocent of the great transgression, and if that is the case, Christ could not be under the condemnation. You will see by the intelligence from the Mumbles that the doctrine of the Christ uncontaminated by sin, is prospering, and fully convinced am I that if we continue to advocate the whole Truth in the same manner as the Apostles of our Lord did, as is found in Paul’s 2nd letter to the Church of Corinth, 4th chapter, and the two first verses, the same results must follow. Yours in the one hope, WM. CLEMENT.

NOTTINGHAM. - Since our last report there has been another addition to the ecclesia, by the immersion of Mrs. Ann Richards, formerly Baptist, who had been attending the lectures for some months; and there are several interested enquirers who are expected shortly to render the required obedience. The School report is encouraging; there are now 70 scholars on the books, who are making satisfactory progress in Scripture knowledge, as evinced by their answers to questions put to them by the teachers. Bro. Windle has read some short essays to the children on various Scripture characters, and afterwards catechised them, eliciting good proof of their understanding of what had been said. On Monday, the 27th, a Tea Party was held expressly for the scholars, who were accompanied by their parents and friends. It was intended to take them as far as Wilford, but the weather proving unfavourable, they were regaled with tea and cake in the schoolroom, where they greatly enjoyed the amusements provided for them. The only thing wanted to complete the success of the School is an extra teacher or two. The Sunday Evening Lectures have been extremely well attended, the subjects were the following: “The Kingdom of Christ to be Established by War,” “The Horrible Doctrine of Hell Torments,” “Who made the Soul Immortal,” and “The Mission of John the Baptist.” The first three by Bro. Turney and the last by Bro. Handley. At the Wednesday Evening Bible Class the last essay read was by Bro. Handley, on “The Powers of the World to come.” It occupied two nights, and excited a good deal of interest among the brethren. On Sunday Evening, the 4th instant, a commencement was made of speaking in the open air. The spot chosen was the Mansfield road, where several roads converge. A goodly number of persons soon collected and listened attentively to what was advanced, without any attempt at interruption. Brethren Hindley, Brierley, and Haines spoke in succession for about a quarter each, chiefly on the Immortality Question, and at the close the bystanders were invited to come to the synagogue. Some discussion took place after the proceedings terminated, in the course of which the usual objections were urged, and the oft refuted texts, supposed to favour natural Immortality, again brought forward. Last Sunday some of the brethren addressed the people from the same place, and in the afternoon also, from the rising ground of the Forest. On both occasions there was a

patient hearing, and it is hoped the efforts thus made will not be altogether in vain. The intention of the brethren is to continue them as long as weather will permit.

RHYL (North Wales). - Dear Bro. : Early last week we weighed our anchor and left Birmingham on our annual northern journey. The first place touched at was Sparchford, where Bro. Beddoes arranged for a second lecture for the benefit of his work-people in his house. There was not a large attendance, but some seemed interested, and expressed a wish to hear more at some future time. From Sparchford we left for Liverpool, where we found the Brethren and Sisters doing their best to "work out their own salvation," and to get others into the way that leads to life. Finding that no effort could be made to get the ear of the public, we immediately left for Rhyl, where we purposed holding an open air meeting by the sea shore, although we should have liked much to spend the Sunday with the Brethren in Liverpool. Arriving at Rhyl, we found the weather exceedingly stormy, very much more like October than July. This spoiled the object; no open air meeting could be held, and all that could be done was to distribute a few Old Sun Dials, and converse with a few friends. On the evening of Sunday, July 11th, we attended the preaching services of one Mr. Blake, in the Baptist Chapel here; his subject was "The Prodigal Son." At the onset he took occasion to speak of the "compassion" of the Father; and to our surprise and gratification, he said that "God had been, and was still, misrepresented, and that the harsh views that Christians generally held of the Divine Being must be numbered among their blackest sins. How often," said the Reverend gentleman, "have the people left their respective places of worship with their nostrils sniffing the brimstone, just because the minister has shook them, as it were, over the mouth of perdition." But Mr. Blake did not improve as he proceeded, for before he got through he talked about "immortal souls" and "eternal torture," and a whole host of other heresies. We left Rhyl for Liverpool again on Monday, with the same feeling we leave many other towns, viz., that "the teachers of the people cause them to err," and that the only remedy for this and all other evils is the second coming of the Christ to rule in righteousness. - J. M.

RHYNIE. - Dear Bro. Turney: I return you my sincere thanks for the large parcel of lectures, etc., for which the few pence I sent would have done but little in the form of paying the expense. [This belongs to Bro. Farmer.--En.] I found the lectures to be of great value to myself, as I read the whole of them before I circulated any. All the parties who received them had some remarks to pass: some said they were strange things for me to believe; however, we can bear all that and something more for the sake of the Truth. I had an interview lately with a man who resides here; the same has a great regard for the Truth in his own way, and with him I have had many a conversation, and also given him some of our "Literature." Our conversation was something like this: He said that he wondered at me, as he believed I once had the Truth, but now I had lost it all and turned Thomasite. I replied that he was mistaken; that before I turned a Thomasite (as he was pleased to call me), "I was without Christ, an alien from the commonwealth of Israel, and a stranger from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." He rejoined that he could not read our books, as they would turn all that he had believed upside down. I told him they were intended to do so, and when they failed to do that they did not accomplish the desired purpose; that, before truth could be properly established, it was necessary to have error exposed and removed out of the way, that unless he unlearned first, he would make but slow progress in learning, and only have a muddled conception of what the one Gospel is. We had various things taken in hand; among the rest, the Devil was brought to the front, and I must confess, of all I have ever heard say where the abode of the "Agent of evil" - as he was pleased to call him - is, this man endeavoured to point out to me the most erroneous and the most novel. He said the Devil was in Heaven! and that he would prove it from the Book. I was somewhat startled at the assertion, and demanded the proof, when he asked if I believed that Jesus was in Heaven. I replied in the affirmative. Well, he said, the Devil is there also; and, as proof, quoted Eph. vi. 12, putting stress on the words in the marginal rendering, "wicked spirits in heavenly places," and that these are said not to be flesh and blood; then he quoted Rev. xii. 7-9. I endeavoured to show to him that the words, heavenly or even heaven, did not mean the place where the Deity is; that they in many cases meant high or exalted places or positions, and that the proper understanding of words could not be arrived at unless he understood the subject as a whole. I also told him that he was wrong in trying to support his theory from the passage in Revelations, as, if that were to be understood literally, he would be compelled to receive the chapter from the beginning in a literal sense: and tried to instruct him in what I believed it meant, when he said he believed it was yet in the future, viz., the casting down of the Devil, and that he expected to have the pleasure of giving him a kick out of heaven. All the efforts I used to remove the stumbling block seemed to be of no avail; the mind appeared to be in such a state that it excluded reason. Were it convenient, you might give me your views on the words, "Not flesh and blood." I enclose a P.O.O, for 6s. 6d. Let me have one copy of "A Treatise on the Two Sons of God," one copy of

“Diabolism,” and put the remainder into the “Charity Box.” I should be glad to see any of the Brethren here who would proclaim the truth, - Yours in the hope of the Gospel, ALEXANDER TARVES.

[REMARKS. “Flesh and blood” is simply a Hebraism for men. The wrestling refers to Olympic games. The Apostle’s warfare was not carnal but spiritual. - ED.]

SKEWEN. - Dear Bro. Turney; For the first time I have much pleasure in addressing you. Being but a very young Christadelphian, I scarcely know what to say, but feel that I cannot be too thankful that, by the untiring and earnest teachings of Bros. Morgan and Beard, by carefully and prayerfully reading the Scriptures, I have been brought out of “gross darkness,” and am now rejoicing in the truth as taught by Christ and His Apostles. We had a treat on Sunday last, being visited by Bro. Clements, from Mumbles, who gave us two very stirring addresses on the Kingdom of God - what it is, where it shall be established, by whom, and when. We commemorated the death of our blessed Lord in the morning by the breaking of bread, and established an ecclesia in this place. In the afternoon we were visited by some of the Brethren and Sisters from Neath, and two or three friends who seem to be deeply interested.

We are holding evening reading meetings here, on Tuesday and Wednesday alternately, which, I think, will be the means of doing much good, for some already attend, and they confess that what we believe and teach is according to the Word of God. An old woman in this place, about eighty years of age, who has been a member of the Wesleyans nearly all her life, says she is glad that she is able to hear the glad tidings of salvation, and see things in a new and better light. She told my wife that she reads the Bible two or three hours every day on her knees, and that now, by the simple reasoning of my wife, she is enabled to see things clearly which before appeared dark and mysterious. Dear Bro. Turney, I am but a poor labouring man, but I thank my heavenly Father that He has adopted me an heir to that Kingdom which shall be established by Christ at His coming, for the which I am patiently waiting, knowing that Christ has died and risen again, that all who believe and obey the Gospel shall be saved. - Humbly yours, EDWARD TAPPER. -

[REMARKS. The words of James are appropriate here: “Hearken, my beloved brethren, Hath not God chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith, and heirs of that Kingdom which he hath promised to them that love Him?” We heartily congratulate Bro. Tapper and his co-labourers upon their zeal in beginning to form a “church of the living God” in their village, and we hope, by the aid of Bro. W. Clements, they will get together a good company of obedient believers of “the things concerning the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ.” - EDITOR.]

SPARCHFORD. Dear Bro. Turney: On the 4th of this month, Bro. Martin again addressed a few of my poorer neighbours, who assembled at my house, in answer to a general invitation to “Come and hear.” Thanksgiving and praise for past blessings were first offered, with prayer that the gracious promise may be fulfilled to us on this occasion, which says that “whosoever two or three are gathered together in my name, there will I be in the midst of them.” The chapter which describes the death and raising of Lazarus was then read, after which Bro. Martin proceeded to show, by arguments the most forcible and plain, that the dead are really and surely dead, and, though righteous and beloved of Jesus, yet do not go to Heaven, nor enter anywise into the blissful state promised by the Scriptures eventually as their glorious reward. This must be so, or poor Lazarus was very hardly dealt with, if he had gone to Heaven, and now brought back again to all life’s pains and sorrows, cares and troubles, having succeeded so well in his first trial of life, now to have a second one in which he may fall, and so lose the blest reward which once he was allowed just to taste of, but destined in the end to lose again. And all this loss to him merely to gratify his sisters and an exhibition of Jesus’s power. The people, some twenty, went away expressing great satisfaction at what they had heard as they have done on many former occasions when I have addressed them myself - but there they stop. There is no following of it up, no desire to obtain more knowledge, and “wash and be clean.” We thought to have given the town of Ludlow, our market town, another lecture or two, as we did a year ago, some of us having expressed a desire to hear him again, but the time could not be given for the thing to be well advertised, before his business and duties called him to the north; but we hope at some future time to wait upon them. The truth meets with much opposition there, and those who desire to give it to them are called anything but gentlemen for disturbing the public mind when the “Rev. Ministers” are endeavouring so earnestly to make them proper and pious, by giving them coals and blankets, tea and tobacco, and filling their minds with all sorts of superstitious vanities, which they desire to pass off as the truth. But, dear Brother, we may take heart and be thankful at the fact that Satan’s kingdom will soon break up. It is so “divided against itself” that it is impossible for it to “stand” much longer. May the Lord of heaven and earth hasten the day when it shall fall for a thousand years.” The saints call, “How long O Lord? etc., and yet would say, “Not our will, but thine be done” - Ever faithfully yours in the hope of that day, JAS. BEDDOES.

STOURBRIDGE. Dear Bro. Turney: I am afraid the intelligence this month is very meagre. On June 20th, we had Bro. Jas. Martin over from Birmingham, who gave a very acceptable lecture, entitled, "Where are the Dead?" The audience, on account of the weather, was rather small. The other lectures of the month have been as follows: June 27th, "The Blessed Hope," Bro. F. N. Turney. July 4th, "The Blessing of Abraham," Bro. H. Turney. July 11th, "The Kingdom of God," Bro. Wooton. I am sorry to tell you that we have been obliged to discontinue our Thursday Evening Bible Class, for want of a room to meet in, the large Hall being too expensive for our small number. We shall endeavour to make arrangements however, to hold the meetings elsewhere. We do not get so large an attendance of strangers as we could wish, but we have hope of several more, who have been regular attenders for some time, soon putting on the saving name; and while praying the Father to increase the number of our small church, we do not forget to "exhort one another," that "being knit together in love" and holding the Head from which all the body, by joints and bands, receives nourishment, we may increase with the increase of God. - F. N. TURNEY.

WISHAW. - Bro. Chas Reid, formerly of New Pitsligo, has recently removed to this place. He reports that matters in connection with the one faith are very quiet in Wishaw. We trust his presence and labour will put some "new blood" into the concern.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

ADELINE. - We have a lengthy and interesting epistle from our aged Bro. and staunch supporter of the one faith, T W Coffman, but our space is already too full to admit it. We have also promise of an account of the conference held at Adeline, in June - this, if it reach us in time, will appear in our next issue. It is said to have been attended by brethren from eight of the American States, and to have been most successful and harmonious.

BUFFALO, N. Y., June 22nd, 1875 - Dear Bro. Turney: We are happy to inform you that on Sunday last, June 20th, we had the following addition to our small ecclesia. Bro. Thomas Beattie, aged 35 years, formerly neutral, and Bro. George Elliott, aged 16 years, son of Bro. and Sister Elliott of this ecclesia, who put on the saving name of an uncondemned Christ by immersion, assisted by Bro. William Oakley. Bro. Beattie was at first greatly opposed to our doctrine, but he, like a great many others, condemned a doctrine he never examined, and after a thorough examination and a continual study of the Scriptures, he was fully convinced that we had "the Truth," and saw that without baptism he was an alien from the commonwealth of Israel, and a stranger from the covenants of promise. Bro. Geo. Elliott has been a listener to the truth for a considerable time, and, although young, seems to fully realize his position and the step he has taken; we are in hopes of further additions shortly. A few weeks ago we decided to hold our meetings regularly at the house of Sister Clayton, at the corner of Summer St. and "The Avenue;" previous to this we met from house to house. We have also started a Sunday School, which is held at the same place, and is, of course, on a small scale, but we are confident of good results. We mention this for the convenience of any Bro. or Sister who may be passing this way. - Yours in behalf of the Brethren, Jos. W. OAKLEY.

[We are glad to see this spirit of perseverance in the day of small things. - ED.]

JONESBORO. - W. C. Aroin informs us that the Lamp is highly appreciated here, "he does not know what he should do without it." It is to be regretted that the hard times pressing for the present on America, hinder the willing flow of liberality in support of the periodical.