

THE
SANCTUARY-KEEPER:

A QUARTERLY MAGAZINE
FOR THE EXPOSITION AND DEFENCE
OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

EDITED BY

J. J. ANDREW.

VOL. II., 1895-6.

PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR,

26, DOUGLAS ROAD, CANONBURY, LONDON, N.

PRICE—GREAT BRITAIN, UNITED STATES, AND THE COLONIES, 6D. PER COPY,
OR 2S. (OR HALF DOLLAR) PER ANNUM, POST FREE.



John James Andrew

The Sanctuary-Keeper:

A QUARTERLY MAGAZINE FOR THE EXPOSITION AND
DEFENCE OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

"Ye Aaron and his sons) shall keep the charge of the sanctuary, and the charge of the altar;"—(Num. xviii. 5.)

"Ye (brethren of Christ) are . . . an holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices," (I. Pet. ii. 5.)

"Thou hast kept My Word and hast not denied My Name;"—(Rev. iii. 8.)

No. 5.

JUNE, 1895.

VOL. II.

"A Polished Shaft."

This expression is part of a description which Christ is represented as giving of Himself in Isa. xlix. 1, 2—a description which commences with His birth, and goes forward to His second appearing. He introduces it by saying, "Listen, O isles, unto Me; and hearken, ye people, from far"—words put into His mouth, not when He came to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. xv. 24), but when He comes to take possession of His "inheritance" (Ps. ii. 8). To "the heathen" or Gentiles He will then announce who He is: "The Lord hath called Me from the womb; from the bowels of My mother hath He made mention of My name. And He hath made My mouth like a sharp sword; in the shadow of His hand hath he hid Me, and made Me a polished shaft; in His quiver hath He hid Me; and said unto Me, Thou art My servant, O Israel, in whom I will be glorified." The use of the "sharp sword" is to "smite the nations" (Rev. xix. 15), and their kings, unless they consent to "serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling" (Ps. ii. 11). He has been for the last eighteen hundred years, while "within the veil" (Heb. vi. 19), hidden in the shadow of God's hand, in fulfilment of the anticipation to which He gave expression: "For in the time of trouble He shall hide Me in His pavilion; in the secret of His tabernacle shall he hide Me" (Ps. xxvii. 5). When the time arrives for His "enemies" to be made His "foot-stool" (Ps. cx. 1), He will come forth from "the secret" of God's "tabernacle" to be the manifestation of His Father in spirit-nature.

The passage as a whole is evidently not confined, in its application, solely to the future; for after Jehovah says to His Son, "Thou art My servant, O Israel, in whom I will be glorified," the Lord Jesus replies, in a state of dependency, when viewing the small results of His ministry to the nation of Israel, "I have laboured in vain, I have spent My strength for nought, and in vain" (ver. 4). During the whole period of His public ministry—from the time He first "taught" in the "synagogues" of Galilee (Luke iv. 15) until His crucifixion, He was in a state of warfare with the house of Israel. "The sword of the spirit" was constantly in His "mouth" for the purpose of slaying the offspring of the fleshly mind in one form or

another. When setting forth Divine truths He aimed a blow at the prevalent "commandments of men" (Matt. xv. 9) which made void Moses and the prophets. And when He was assailed with questions and objections by His opponents, His sharp sword-like words cut their sophistical reasoning into fragments. Whether the attempt to "entangle Him in his talk" (Matt. xxii. 15) was made by Pharisees, Sadducees, or Herodians, they all retired discomfited and chagrined. The effectiveness of His replies, which produced astonishment in the minds of many of His hearers, has been the admiration of all succeeding generations. Those replies consisted either of quotations from the existing writings of the Spirit, or they were provided for the occasion by the Spirit which dwelt in Him without "measure" (Jno. iii. 34; vi. 63).

From the "ungodly nation" (Ps. xliii. 1) which treated Him thus, Christ prayed to be sheltered:—"Hide Me from the secret counsel of the evil-doers; from the tumult of the workers of iniquity," who have "*whet their tongue like a sword*, and have aimed their *arrows*, even *bitter words*, that they may shoot in secret places at the perfect, suddenly do they shoot at him, and fear not" (Ps. lxiv. 2-4, R.V.). Though so well able to meet the onslaught of His enemies Christ knew that their sword-like attacks meant mischief, and hence His desire to be hidden from their "secret counsel." This prayer was in due time answered, but not until "reproach had broken" His "heart" (Ps. lxix. 20).

The word rendered "arrows" in the quotation just made from Ps. lxiv. is the same as that which is rendered "shaft" in the passage under consideration. "Arrow" is indeed used as its English equivalent in about fifty passages, but only in Isa. xlix. 2 do we find the word, "shaft." It would, therefore, have been quite correct to have used the expression *a polished arrow*, and this would have harmonised with the context which describes it as hidden in Jehovah's "quiver." The difference between the arrow-like utterances of the Jews and those of Christ is obvious. The one class was aimed at truth, and the other at error; a poisoned arrow was met by a "polished" one.

The word used for "polished" is also rendered "clearly" (Job xxxiii. 3); "pure" (Zeph. iii. 9; Ps. xviii. 26); "purified" (Dan. xii. 10); and "purge" (Dan. xi. 35). From this we learn that the Anointed Arrow of truth underwent a purifying process before being brought forth from the Divine "quiver." Though the details of this process are not recorded, we are not left in ignorance as to its nature. It is embraced in the statement that "though He were a son, yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered" (Heb. v. 8). The task of learning obedience was not confined to His public ministry; it embraced the whole of His previous life. His obedience for those thirty years was, indeed, a necessary equipment for the work He had to do after being "baptised of John" (Mark i. 9). He must, therefore, have "suffered" in some way during His private career. During all that time He was keeping the Mosaic law perfectly—doing all that was commanded, and abstaining from everything that was forbidden. It requires but a superficial acquaintance with that law to perceive how completely it must have affected every thought and feeling of "sinful flesh." To "love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind," and "thy neighbour as thyself" (Matt. xxii. 37-39), as expressed in the multifarious enactments of the Sinaitic covenant, involved the daily and hourly crucifixion of the desires of the mind. It is, therefore, fittingly described as a "circumcision" or cutting off all round of the evil desire which had become an element of human nature through the disobedience of our first parents. It was a "circumcision made without hands" (Col. ii. 11) in that it was effected by the Holy Spirit. The conflict which this involved could not but have produced suffering. It was the condemnation morally

of "sin in the flesh," in order to prepare Christ for its condemnation physically when on the cross (Rom. viii. 3).

The hidden character of the polishing process is involved in the expression "mystery of godliness" (I. Tim. iii. 16), the meaning of which is *the Secret of Godly reverence or Godlikeness*. Of this Godlikeness Jesus was a perfect embodiment, both in His private and public career. For thirty years it was a "secret"; but when, on the banks of the Jordan, the Father said "This is My beloved Son in whom I am well-pleased" (Matt. iii. 17), Godliness was "manifested in the flesh." To effect this was the primary object of John's mission:—"I knew Him not; but that *He should be made manifest* to Israel, therefore am I come baptising with water" (Jno. i. 31).

Well may this "secret" be styled "great"; for the person and character of Christ have been the subject of more misconception than anything else in the revealed Word. One class has viewed Him as wholly a man, another as wholly God, and a third as a combination of God and man. Every variety of conception has been set forth, from that of Second Person of the Trinity to that of Joseph being His father. His nature has been confounded with His character, and His mission as a Saviour has, in every feature, been misrepresented.

Apart from our training in a false theology, we all approach the subject, consciously or unconsciously, with ideas at variance with the Divine plan; and it is only by acquaintance with the Inspired Word that we realise the wide difference between the thinking of the flesh and the thinking of the Spirit. Thus, when we read that the Son of God, though "tempted in all points like" ourselves (Heb. iv. 15) committed no sin, we are inclined to attribute this result to a nature different from our own—a nature free from the evil desires which we experience, or possessing greater strength of mind to overcome them. But when we consider the source of our temptations—from within as well as from without—we perceive that Jesus Christ must have inherited, as we do, an inclination toward evil, and when we give due weight to the testimony that He was "made in all points like unto His brethren" (Heb. ii. 17) we see that whatever the cause of His moral victory, it was not due to superiority of nature.

We cannot fail to observe that none of the righteous men who preceded Jesus Christ were able to keep the law under which He and they were placed. We admire the meek Moses, the courageous Joshua, the devout Samuel, the warm-hearted David, the suffering Jeremiah, and the faithful Daniel, and yet we know that they all yielded to temptation in one form or another. And when we inquire the cause we are informed that it was "through the flesh" (Rom. viii. 3). As the flesh of Jesus was "the same" (Heb. ii. 14) as theirs, it is apparent that the source of His strength was not in that which He inherited from His mother. Whence, then, did it come? From His Father in heaven. "God was in Him" (II. Cor. v. 19; Matt. i. 23). "What the law could not do . . . God" did in the person of His Son. Where unaided flesh failed Divinely-aided flesh succeeded.

Proceeding a step further, we find that the sacrificial mission of Jesus Christ required that He should be sinless in character throughout the whole of His life—not only in adult years, but also in childhood. From this it follows that God must have dwelt in Him from infancy, for He was amenable to the Mosaic law, through His parents, from birth. But, when reminded that fallen flesh is denominated "sin" (Rom. vii. 8, 13), and that even the Mosaic tabernacle—composed as it was of inanimate materials—was not a fit dwelling-place for God until it had been ceremonially cleansed, we are led to ask how could the Holy One of Israel dwell in a child which, though begotten by the Spirit, was nevertheless "made" of "sinful flesh?" To this question we obtain an answer in the blood-shedding ceremony which the Mosaic law prescribed for all Jewish males when eight days old. In this we

see a type of the cutting off of Christ by crucifixion, and therefore a ceremonial cleansing, in shadow, of those on whom the operation was performed. For the first seven days of its life the Child Jesus was a defiled and empty tabernacle; but on the eighth day it was ceremonially purified, and thereby fitted for being tenanted by God through the Holy Spirit.

The statement that after baptism by John "God anointed Jesus with the Holy Spirit and with power" (Acts x. 38) does not imply that the Spirit had not previously dwelt in Him; but that it had not been given to Him "with power" or without measure (Jno. iii. 34). It was there, not for a public, but for a private purpose. It was required for thirty years, not to show forth by miracles the power of God, but to instruct the Son of Mary in Divine things and aid Him in the complete observance of God's law; in other words, morally to "condemn sin in the flesh" (Rom. viii. 3), and so polish the Arrow of Jehovah.

A recognition of these facts obviously excludes the idea favoured by some that the nature of Jesus Christ was composed of flesh and Spirit. Such a union, apart from rendering death impossible, would have deprived His temptation of its reality. His victory over sin would have been comparatively mechanical, and He would not have been fully qualified for being "a merciful and faithful high priest . . . able to succour them that are tempted" (Heb. ii. 17, 18). Such a method is not to be compared with the plan which the Author of perfect wisdom devised and carried to a successful conclusion. By this the Son of Mary was caused to feel to the fullest possible extent the weakness of sinful flesh and His continued dependence on His Father to keep it under control. Faith, love, prayer, and gratitude, were thereby developed to such perfection that the Will of the Father became also the Will of the Son.

The fact that God's "first-born" was "polished" is evidence that a process involving friction was necessary to produce the perfect obedience which He exhibited; and the same experience is necessary for His brethren. Hence the statement—which has special reference to the closing times of the Gentiles—"many shall be purified (*i.e.* polished), and made white, and tried" (Dan. xii. 10). The frictional rubbing by which this result is produced may be by temporal or spiritual circumstances, or both. It is not precisely the same in all cases, for no two are alike. He who is "a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart" (Heb. iv. 12) knows exactly how much roughness there is in each one, and what amount of rubbing is needed to produce the required smoothness. This experience is not "joyous, but grievous," and some "faint" under it; but "unto them which are exercised thereby it afterward yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness" (Heb. xii. 5, 11). The testimony that "the Lord scourgeth every son," and that without it we should be "bastards" (ver. 6-8), is equivalent to saying that none can have a faithful probation without "the chastening of the Lord." It does not follow from this that all so dealt with are purified, for, unfortunately, all are not "exercised thereby;" that is, they do not reflect on their troubles and recognise the hand of God to be in them. On the contrary, they fret and chafe under that which is disagreeable, attribute it to natural causes, and come out of it in a more or less rebellious state of mind. They have not learned to "humble" themselves "under the mighty hand of God," and therefore for them there will be no exaltation "in due time" (I. Peter v. 6).

It has been said that it required a universe to produce a pebble. First, there is the rock, whose existence is attributed by science to volcanic action; then, the disintegration of the rock by water from the clouds; after this the wind blows small pieces of the rock into the sea, where a multitude of forces combine to give the motion—in the tides, storms, and ocean currents—by which corners are knocked off and a smooth round stone is produced.

To this there is a spiritual counterpart. What has been required to enable a Gentile *now* to become a son of God? First, the promise in Eden, and its consequent justification of our first parents by being clothed with animal skins; then the events of the antediluvian world—to show the necessity for God's favour being confined to one line of descent—followed by the call of Abraham and the removal of Jacob's family into Egypt to preserve the chosen people from death by famine: after this, the preparation of Moses, the plagues on Egypt, the exodus of Israel, the wilderness journeyings, and the establishment of the Twelve Tribes in Canaan—which "things happened unto them for examples" (I. Cor. x. 11). The following fifteen hundred years of Israel under the law were apparently needed to show the impossibility of unaided flesh fulfilling God's requirements, and thus to demonstrate the impotency of fallen man to deliver himself from his lost condition. Then God stepped in and provided One who, with Divine aid, carried out His will perfectly, and was, as the result, made "the Author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey Him" (Heb. v. 9). The preaching of the Cross to the Jews, and its rejection by all but a comparative few, justified Divine action in cutting off the natural branches and grafting wild ones. But when the Gentiles imitated the corruption of the Jews darkness enswathed the whole world for centuries until the covering was somewhat lifted by the Reformation. Since then the people in whom antagonism to Rome took the deepest root, have been blessed with greater prosperity, political liberty, and religious freedom than any other—with this result, that among them alone, or almost so, is Apostolic truth now to be found. From this racial rock the "hammer" of God's word (Jer. xxiii. 29) has knocked off a few pieces here and there, which, by tossing about in the national "sea," become more or less polished. Their Divine relationship is unknown (I. Jno. iii. 1) to the symbolic "waters" (Rev. xvii. 15) in which they are submerged, and hence the object for which they suffer friction is unseen. Like "the stone which the builders rejected" they are, for the time being, hidden; but if they take a polish which reflects the Divine image, they will, in due time, be brought forth from the unseen to adorn the crown of Him who is "altogether lovely."

EDITOR.

"Blessed are the Dead which die in the Lord."

These words are familiar to us by reason of their frequent quotation on memorial cards and tombstones. They are supposed, by believers in a false theology, to teach that the righteous pass, at death, into a state of conscious blessedness. And by some of the One Body they have recently been quoted as proof that only the faithful dead are in Christ, the unfaithful being in Adam!

The supporters of both these interpretations ignore an essential part of the Spirit's utterance; they omit to quote the words "from henceforth"; and, as a consequence, they apply to past and present times an announcement relating to a future epoch. By some this may be thought to be immaterial; but such a view cannot be entertained: it is equivalent to saying that the Spirit used words without a meaning.

The chapter which contains this passage (Rev. xiv.) commences by describing the faithful in their immortalised state. They are significantly spoken of as "the first-fruits unto God and to the Lamb" (ver. 4)—an

expression which implies the subsequent ingathering of a much larger number who shall constitute the harvest. This "first-fruits" is then represented as a symbolic "angel" flying "in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth" (ver. 6). "To every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people" they say, "Fear God, and give glory to Him; for the hour of His judgment is come: and worship Him that made heaven and earth, and the sea and the fountains of waters" (ver. 7). This is followed by an announcement that "Babylon is fallen" (ver. 8), and then comes another proclamation that "If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God" (ver. 9, 10). After this the Apostle John "heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; and their works do follow them" (ver. 13). The remainder of the chapter describes the reaping of "the harvest" of wickedness and the cutting down of the poisonous "vine of the earth" by the sword of Divine judgments (ver. 14-20).

A consideration of these events, in their chronological order, shows at what time the "voice from heaven" speaks. It is *after* resurrection and judgment at Christ's return, after the immortalisation of the approved, after the inauguration of the work of the multitudinous Christ, after the fall of Babylon, and during "the hour" of Divine "judgment." At this juncture a blessing is pronounced on "the dead which die in the Lord." For how long the blessing will operate the passage does not state; the words "from henceforth," though definite as to the time of commencement, give no clue as to its duration.

The passage is usually understood as pronouncing a blessing on "the dead" which *have died* in the Lord; but this is not what it says. The blessing is for "the dead" who do so "die"; that is, they are "dead" before they "die": they are "dead" at the time the "voice" speaks, and a blessing is ensured for such as "die in the Lord from henceforth." This, though the plain grammatical sense conflicts with the literal interpretation of the words "dead" and "die." Therefore some other meaning must be looked for which will harmonise with the construction of the sentence.

In the Apocalypse death is used literally (as in ii. 10; xii. 11), politically (as in ix. 6; xiii. 3), ecclesiastically (xviii. 8), symbolically (vi. 8; xx. 13, 14), and spiritually (iii. 1). In the last instance "the ecclesia in Sardis" is described as having "a name that thou livest, and art dead." If the brethren of Christ composing it continued in this condition to the end of their lives, it could be said that the dead had died—that is, that men dead in one sense had died in another. Such an application of the term "dead" in one part of the Apocalypse obviously admits of a similar use of it in another. And that which is true of the last inspired book is true also of the preceding ones. Thus we read of Christ's brethren at Ephesus having once been "dead in trespasses and sins" (Eph. ii. 1), and of those at Colosse having been "dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh" (Col. ii. 13). But they are said to have been "quickened," or made alive. They passed from a dead state to a living one, and yet as far as the natural man could see they were in just the same condition afterwards as before. What was essential to effect this change of position? A death:—"Ye died" (Col. iii. 3); "We thus judge, that one died for all, therefore *all died*" (II. Cor. v. 14). The nature of the death is indicated in these words:—"Ye died with Christ" (Col. ii. 20). "We died to sin" (Rom. vi. 2); and it is identified when the Apostle says, "We who were baptised into Jesus Christ were baptised into his death" (ver. 3). The "one baptism" is thus a *death*, and as Christ is the "One Lord," they who submit to it are said to die with, or *in, the Lord*.

The language used in Rev. xiv. 13, is identical with the description in

the Apostolical Epistles of the act of union with Christ, and there is no reason for giving it any other meaning. If elaborated in harmony with those writings it would say, "Blessed are the dead in trespasses and sins who, by baptism (or some analogous Divine ceremony), die in the Lord Jesus from henceforth." The blessing implies, of course, that they have believed "the everlasting gospel" then being preached (ver. 6), for without faith in God's revealed purpose they could not become dead to sin and alive to righteousness. The tenor of the gospel-preaching is concisely defined in ver. 7 as "Fear God, and worship Him"—injunctions which cannot be carried into effect without a justification through the death of His Son. The utterance of the "voice from Heaven" is thus a necessary sequel to the proclamation in "mid-heaven." It is the re-opening of the door of salvation after being closed by Christ's appearance as the judge of His household.

The blessing on those who comply is identical with that which is now enjoyed by believers when they rise from their watery grave, of whom it is said, "Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin" (Rom. iv. 7, 8) : "Hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly things in Christ" (Eph. i. 3). These blessings comprise "forgiveness of sins" (Eph. i. 7), "peace with God" (Rom. v. 1), freedom "from the law of sin and death" (Rom. viii. 2), heirship "of eternal life" (Tit. iii. 7), joint heirship with Christ "of the kingdom" (Rom. viii. 17; Jas. ii. 5), &c. In that epoch they may be accompanied by temporal blessings, such as exemption from the tribulations pertaining to "the hour of judgment." He who preserved Israel after the flesh from the plagues poured upon the rest of the land of Egypt can as easily shield from the unequalled "time of trouble" (Dan. xii. 1) those who, though living on the territory of "Sodom and Egypt" (Rev. xi. 8), give heed to the "mid-heaven" proclamation and the "voice from heaven." He can do more. He can give them a foretaste of the blessings in "basket and store" (Deut. xxviii. 17) to be enjoyed by "all families" in the Millennial age, and preserve their lives until that age has commenced. The Abrahamic covenant having been brought into force by the immortalisation of "the first-fruits," the blessings it provides for the mortal inhabitants are offered to such as comply with the conditions. The plagues of "the hour of judgment" are for those who, after being warned, continue to "worship the beast and his image" (Rev. xiv. 11), or to form part of the "harvest of the earth" (ver. 15) or "the vine of the earth" (ver. 18).

One object for which "the dead" in trespasses and sins "die in the Lord" is "that they may rest from their labours." What are these? Surely their fruitless "labours" as "servants of sin" (Rom. vi. 17). Even now believers when baptised "do enter into rest" (Heb. iv. 3) within certain limits. They then "put off the old man with his deeds" (Col. iii. 9). And as Christ, who "hath suffered in the flesh, hath ceased from sin"—that is from the sin-nature—so they who have been crucified with Him are required "no longer" to "live to the lusts of men" (I. Pet. iv. 1, 2).

The other expression in reference to those who "die in the Lord," viz. : "their works do follow them," doubtless means that their good "works" during probation follow their initial act of obedience.

What length of time will elapse from Christ's return to the "mid-heaven" preaching of the gospel it is impossible to say. Probably but a few years. If so, many will hear it who were more or less instructed in the things of the kingdom and the name before Christ's arrival on the earth—some, indeed, who turned a deaf ear to the preaching of the Truth when Christ's brethren lived in their midst. Who shall say how many of such will give heed to the "voice from heaven"? Their attention will have been aroused by a series of startling events. They will have seen some of their neighbours, friends, or even relatives disappear from their midst, by which

they will have been reminded of the Apostolic prediction about the brethren of Christ who are "alive and remain" being "caught away . . . to meet the Lord" (I. Thess. iv. 17). They will have read in the newspapers of the overthrow of Gog's host on "the mountains of Israel," of the earthquake which is to divide Mount Olivet into two, and of "that great city Babylon" having "fallen" (Rev. xiv. 8). Events so significant, if they reflect, cannot but arrest their attention. They will see with their own eyes the fulfilment of prophecies which they may have heard explained from the platform or read about in the literature of the Truth; and they who refused to give heed to Christ's brethren when in the flesh may be among the foremost to listen to their "voice" when exalted to the "heaven" of Israel's kingdom.

If it were true as taught by some that all rejectors of the Truth will be brought before Christ's judgment-seat, those living at the time of His return would be excluded from the "mid-heaven" proclamation; for they would be "caught away" with the brethren of Christ and be condemned with the unfaithful to a death from which none can escape. But the wisdom of God is superior to that of man; and hence He does not by the coming of the Bridegroom to the Bride destroy the opportunity of such to change their attitude and enter into His "everlasting covenant." The New Testament says nothing about any outside Christ who are alive at His return being carried away to the judgment-seat. The words, "we who are alive and remain" (I. Thess. iv. 15), confine the statement to Christ's brethren.

There is in the Protestant world a considerable sprinkling of those who believe not only in the downfall of the Papacy, but also in the restoration of the Jews and Christ's reign on earth. The minds of such are prepared to some extent for the establishment of a new government at Jerusalem and the judgment on Babylon; and it is pre-sumable that they will be among the foremost who will give heed to the "mid-heaven" proclamation. The religious awakening which has been taking place the last three hundred years, but especially in the present century, is a part of the preparation process for the epoch succeeding Christ's return. In this the Christadelphian community has, during the last forty or fifty years, taken a leading part. Thus seed sown in the closing years of the present dispensation will bear fruit in the next. The thought of this should be an encouragement, if such be needed, to maintain, with vigour, the preaching of the Truth until Christ's return. Though this arduous work has little visible result now, faithful stewards of the Word will have the satisfaction of witnessing some of its fruit after their marriage with the Bridegroom.

EDITOR.

Infallibility of the Bible.

The "Encyclopædic Dictionary," commenced in 1872 and completed in fourteen volumes at the close of 1888—first published by Messrs. Cassell, Petter & Galpin, but now being re-issued by Edward Lloyd, Limited—devotes two columns to the word Bible; in the course of which it says that the Book of books "is believed by the vast majority of Christians to be (with allowances for minute diversities of reading and errors of translation) the actual Word of God, and therefore infallibly true . . . and scattered through the several churches are a very large number of persons who hold that the Bible contains a revelation from God, instead of being of itself 'the Word of God,'" (p. 523). This quotation shows that the application of the word "Infallible" to the Scriptures is not new, as alleged in the Inspiration controversy of ten years ago, but that it was previously recognised to be a definition of Divinely Inspired Writings.

“The Blood of Christ” and “Righteousness from God.”

These are the titles of two pamphlets published since the issue of No. 4, *Sanctuary-Keeper*. The first, which is by the Editor of *The Christadelphian*, is a practical admission that the subject has not yet received in the literature of the One Body the attention to which it is entitled. It also appears to be an attempt to re-instate the author in the position he formerly occupied. How far he is successful in this object will yet be seen. The subject is treated on the whole in a very superficial manner, though important principles are recognised which in effect admit much of my contention.

In describing the “shadow institution” which God provided “at the very crisis of transgression and condemnation,” Adam is referred to as being in an “alienated and condemned position” (p. 11). And when defining the position of Christ the following statements are made:—

“He was of our condemned and weak and mortal nature . . . sin had hold of Him in His nature, which inherited the sentence of death from Adam” (p. 16).

“Jesus came in the flesh, that is, . . . flesh mortal because of sin.” He was “in the channel of death so far as the nature was concerned.” “He was the very nature condemned in Eden” (p. 17).

“Wisdom and justice . . . required that He should appear in the nature of Abraham and David, which was sinful nature” (p. 24).

“He has come under the dominion of sin in coming under the hereditary power of death” (p. 26).

What do these statements, which are perfectly Scriptural, teach? That condemnation pertains to the nature of all Adam’s descendants, and that they are under the dominion of sin and the power of death because of his transgression. On this basis, the author of *The Blood of Christ* rightly shows that the Crucifixion was necessary to fulfil Divine justice or righteousness—as witness the following extracts:—

“The death of Christ was ‘to declare the righteousness of God.’” “As we look at Christ, we find in His death the declaration of that righteousness.” “The death of Christ was ‘that God might be just’ while acting the part of justifier or forgiver” (p. 13).

“The way which has been adopted” is “to enforce the law against sin.” “He was born that He might die, as the first necessity in the case; for thus was the righteousness of God to be declared, and sin condemned in its own flesh.” “All these aims required that the sacrificial victim should be a *perfectly righteous man*, as well as a possessor of the nature to be sacrificially condemned” (pp. 15, 16).

“Christ could not righteously die if death had no dominion over Him.” He was “in the channel of death so far as nature was concerned.” “He was the very nature condemned in Eden, and, therefore, wrong was not done when He was impaled upon the cross” (p. 17).

“The human race is, as it were, crucified in His Son. In Christ crucified, man is put down, man is killed; God is exalted and glorified.” “It would not be righteous to put to death one on whom death had no claims” (p. 19).

“The crucifixion of Christ as a ‘declaration of the righteousness of God’ and a ‘condemnation of sin in the flesh,’ exhibited to the world the righteous treatment of sin. It was as though it was proclaimed to all the world, when the body was nailed to the cross: ‘This is how condemned human nature should be treated according to the righteousness of God; it is only fit for destruction.’ The shedding of the blood was the ritual symbol of that truth; for the shedding of the blood was the taking away of the life. Such a declaration of the righteousness of God could

only be made in the very nature concerned; a body under the dominion of death because of sin" (p. 21).

"It pleased God to require the ceremonial condemnation of this sin-nature in crucifixion in the person of a righteous possessor of it, as the basis of our forgiveness" (p. 26).

These quotations, in substance, affirm that the nature inherited from Adam is sinful, and that the taking of life by crucifixion was necessary in order to condemn that nature, to enforce the Divine law against sin, and to fulfil Divine justice.

In harmony with the foregoing statements one section is headed "Christ himself benefitted by His own death" (p. 9). To what extent He benefitted is not defined, but the reader is left to form his own conclusion from two passages which are quoted. The first states that "God . . . brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus . . . through the blood of the everlasting covenant" (Heb. xiii. 20); the second, that "by His own blood He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained in Himself eternal redemption" (Heb. ix. 12, corrected rendering).

Christ was "brought from the dead" when He came forth from the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea, and He "entered into the holy place" when subsequently changed from flesh and blood to spirit-nature. These benefits were obviously due to the shedding of His blood; for without it He would have had neither the one nor the other.

"The death of Christ" is rightly described as the "foundation for the forgiveness of sin" (p. 13) "without the compromise of wisdom and righteousness" (p. 20). But such forgiveness is not offered by God "apart from submission to the declaration of His righteousness in Christ crucified" by being "baptised into His death (Rom. vi. 3) and buried with Him in baptism" (Col. ii. 12) (p. 20).

"We are cleansed from sin by this beautiful means, that God forgives us because of what Christ has done, if we will accept Him and be baptised. In baptism we are provided with a ceremony in which we are baptised into His death, and in which, by a figure, we are washed from our sins in His blood" (p. 19).

The recognition of baptism as a symbol of Christ's death obviously implies a parallel between the symbol and the reality. Hence that which was effected by the death and resurrection of Christ must have its counterpart in the baptismal ceremony. The extracts already given indicate what that is. Christ's death is not only described as an act of justice, but the reason for it is given: "Death once had dominion over Him" (p. 18). "It would not be righteous to put to death One on whom death had no claims" (p. 19). With equal truth may it be said that it would not be righteous to subject a man to the dominion of death except for sin. Seeing, then, that Christ committed no sin, how could He be righteously subjected to the dominion of death? By putting upon Him the sins of those for whom He died? That would be a species of substitution which the author of *The Blood of Christ* rightly condemns. To avoid any injustice Christ must individually be under the power of sin. There is only one way in which this could be, though it may be described in varied language: primarily it was through the sin of Adam, and secondarily through the sin-nature inherited from him. This is in effect affirmed in the extracts already given from the pamphlet in question: the sin-nature being "fit only for destruction" (p. 21) required to be "sacrificially condemned" (p. 16). This is an admission that blood-shedding is necessary for a defiled nature as well as for individual transgression; and as the Crucifixion is described as an act of justice, it necessarily follows that it was a justification for Christ's benefit in the first instance. That justification must also be required by others.

Christ being under the dominion of death because of his sin-nature so must they; and as his sin-nature needed blood-shedding so must theirs. How, then, can they obtain this requirement? By baptism into the death

of Christ. By this act they admit that their “condemned human nature should be nailed to the cross” as Christ’s was (p. 21), that their “body of sin” deserves to be slain both for what it is by inheritance and for what it has done. They also recognise that, through the forbearance and mercy of God, they are at the same time justified from all sin to which they are then related—*sin in their nature and sin in their actions.*

How do the foregoing extracts compare with utterances from their author in 1894? When asked in the Responsibility Debate whether all the descendants of Adam were born under condemnation because of Adam’s sin, he evaded it and affirmed that, though mortal because of Adam’s offence they did not come under condemnation until they became sinners by their own actions (pp. 12, 13, and 22), and that “sin in the flesh” is not in itself, apart from what it does, the subject of Divine condemnation or wrath (p. 14).

As the result of these statements, parents congratulated themselves that their children were not born under condemnation for Adam’s sin, and others felt relieved that they were no longer expected to apply to Christ certain passages which placed Him under the power of sin. What will all such now say to the foregoing extracts from *The Blood of Christ*? Will they admit with its author that Christ was of our “condemned and weak and mortal nature” (p. 16), “the very nature condemned in Eden” (p. 17), and that, therefore, everyone of woman born inherits a condemnation for Adam’s offence? Or will they have the audacity to say that there is no contradiction between the statements made in April, 1894, and in March, 1895? Unfortunately the partisanship so conspicuous in the political world is not unknown among those who profess the “one faith.”

In the Responsibility Debate the Editor of *The Christadelphian* was asked this question:—“Did Christ not require to shed His blood to cleanse Himself from His own sin-nature, and has not God made that the basis by which those in Him may be justified from the sin of that nature and have forgiveness of sins?” How did he answer it? “I prefer the Scripture description of what was done by the death of Christ. *The Scriptures never use the word cleanse in that sense*” (No. 401). Subsequently he said, “*Blood shedding is never spoken of except in connection with actual sin*” (No. 406).

There is but one conclusion to be drawn from these answers, viz., that, as Christ was free from “actual sin,” He did not require to shed His blood for Himself, and that consequently God, in effecting His crucifixion, dealt with His beloved Son unjustly—the very reverse of the argument in *The Blood of Christ*.

How does the author explain the contradictory positions which he has occupied? He says:—

The stress of controversy always leads to apparent extremes. But men of eyes can see, and hypercriticism can never be silenced. Things come level afterwards, like a rolling vessel which seems as if she would go over in the storm, but steadies with the subsidence of the storm. Even in the Scriptures one truth is sometimes insisted on to the apparent exclusion of another, e.g., Paul’s faith *versus* works; acceptance *versus* the judgment-seat, &c. (*The Christadelphian* cover, February, 1895).

This is ingenious, but unsound. Specific contradictions cannot be called “apparent extremes,” neither can they be compared to the Scriptural instances of one truth, or one phase of a truth, being “sometimes insisted on to the apparent exclusion of another.” To say of Christ that “it was a necessity that He should offer up Himself for the purging of His own nature, first from the uncleanness of death, that having by His own blood obtained eternal redemption,” &c. (*The Christadelphian*, 1873, p. 468), and at another time to say that “blood-shedding is never spoken of except in connection with actual sin,” and that “the Scriptures never use the word cleanse” in

the sense of Christ shedding His blood to cleanse His own sin-nature (Responsibility Debate, 1891, p. 22), is not to indulge in "apparent extremes," but to make statements which nullify each other.

The reason for the position taken up in the Responsibility controversy is obvious. The argument antagonised was that the condemnation inherited from Adam was the subject of a justification, through the death of Christ, by baptism into His name, and that, therefore, any so justified must rise, and any not so justified must remain in the grave. This conclusion being the subject of strong objection, it was deemed necessary to destroy it. No flaw could be found in the argument if the premises were admitted. What, then, was to be done? Deny the premises. Accordingly it was boldly stated that there was no condemnation inherited from Adam; that if there was, it did not require the blood of Christ to be shed; that such condemnation was not in any sense taken away by baptism into Christ, but that baptised believers were purged from it by their own death. This was one way of meeting the contention, but at what cost? Religious Robbery. God was robbed of the justice with which He treated His Son; Christ was robbed of a part of His redemptive work; and His brethren were robbed of a present privilege bestowed through Him. The fearful danger of such conduct has apparently, to some extent been seen; and hence the re-affirmation of foundation principles formerly defended but recently denied. What is the practical effect of this? To grant the premises on which was based the argument for the resurrection of those only in Christ. The denial of the premises being a practical admission that the argument was sound, it necessarily follows that when the premises are conceded the conclusion cannot logically be rejected. Thus, if Christ required to shed His blood to deliver Himself from the condemnation inherited from Adam, every other member of the human race must, for the same object, require the blood of Christ; and it further follows that such as participate in Christ's death by baptism are so far freed from such condemnation that their death is not a necessity, and, should they die, death cannot hold them.

In support of this reasoning I call as a witness the Editor of *The Christadelphian*, who once wrote as follows:—

Part of the righteousness of Christ was His death, which was the necessary declaration of the righteousness of God (Rom. iii. 25). With this part of His righteousness Enoch and Elijah identified themselves by sacrifice, and latter-day believers by baptism unto His death; and therefore *there is no absolute need for their death*. But Christ could not escape it; His death, as their representative, was the necessary foundation of the release of the others, and of Himself (by resurrection) as one of them. *Without it none of them could have escaped.* [Italics mine.]—(*The Christadelphian*, 1876, p. 39.)

The pamphlet entitled *Righteousness from God*, by "William Brittle, Mahanoy City, Pa., U.S.A.," is avowedly a counterblast to *The Blood of the Covenant*. It is occupied principally in antagonising the statement on page 33 that "at baptism the righteousness of Christ is imputed instead of the disobedience of Adam." The principal ground of objection—that it "excludes the Father of mercy"—would not have been made if the author had carefully read *The Blood of the Covenant* and what has since appeared in *The Sanctuary Keeper*. I have not excluded the Father and His righteousness—quite the reverse—as shown by the following extract:—

God, in His mercy . . . provided a descendant of Adam on whom to execute the penalty; and, in "the depth of" His "wisdom" (Rom. xi. 33) He devised a plan whereby submission to the penalty should constitute a part of "His righteousness," and thus enable Him to "be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus" (Rom. iii. 26).—(*The Blood of the Covenant*, p. 26).

This is equivalent to saying that Christ fulfilled or became the embodi-

ment of “the righteousness of God,” and that this was the result of the Father’s mercy. When, therefore, it is subsequently stated that “the righteousness of Christ is imputed” to believers “through their faith, Christ’s shed blood, and the water of baptism” (p. 30), the action of the Father is not excluded. It is not necessary to repeat on p. 33 what has been stated on p. 26; the second statement is obviously a sequel to the first. The Bible truth that Christ became the Righteousness of God is set forth more fully in *The Sanctuary Keeper* (Nos. 2 and 3). I have written nothing which warrants the charge that I “ascribe all to Christ and leave the love and mercy of the Father in the background;” or that imputed righteousness excludes the necessity for individual righteousness.

The author of this pamphlet admits that “the Father imputed righteousness to Abraham;” and having rightly stated that “to be justified is the same as to be made righteous,” he further admits that “the Father has recognised the blood of Jesus as a means of conveying justification from himself to the believer by faith.” This is practically the same as that to which he objects, but expressed in different words. Was not Christ justified through the shedding of His blood at the close of an obedient life? Can any one else be justified without that blood? No. Do they not then, partake of Christ’s justification by being inducted into him? And as justification is the same as righteousness, is not this another way of saying that His righteousness is conveyed, imparted, or imputed to them?

“Justification is from the Father through His Son,” says the pamphlet. True; and without the Son there would have been no justification for any member of the human race. The “righteousness of God” would have been confined to Himself if he had not provided a righteous Saviour. To say, therefore, that there is imputation of the righteousness of God, but not of the righteousness of Christ, is to write a contradiction and to divorce that which God hath indissolubly joined. The imputation of Christ’s righteousness is the imputation of the righteousness of God embodied in His Son. There is no substitution in the process because the sacrificial death which consummated that righteousness was necessary for Christ Himself, and because the believer has to be baptised into that death. By this act he “puts on Christ,” and necessarily puts on the righteousness which Christ has fulfilled.

An attempt is made to show that because the Papacy teaches the imputation of Christ’s righteousness therefore it must be false. This is plausible, but fallacious. The Papacy teaches the existence of God, and the necessity for Christ’s death to take away sin. Does this prove them to be untrue? No one having any regard to sound reasoning would answer affirmatively. On all such points the Romish Church mixes error with truth, and it is necessary to separate them. Thus, in regard to imputed righteousness it says: The merits of Christ are applied through the sacraments and priesthood of the Church, in order to deliver from eternal torments. Whereas the Inspired Word says: The righteousness of Christ is imputed to believers through baptism into His name, in order to deliver from the power of death. The wide contrast between the two is apparent.

The same remarks apply to what the pamphlet says about “original sin,” more correctly described as inherited sin, or “sin in the flesh.” With this, it is said, baptism has nothing to do, the reason given being that the plural word “sins” is always used in reference to the ceremony. This is most inconclusive. The sinful nature which each man inherits is as much his as are his “wicked works.” Christ recognized this when saying, “I kept myself from mine iniquity” (Psalm xviii. 23). It is also embraced in the expressions, “Our old man was crucified with Him” (Rom. vi. 6), and “Ye have put off the old man with his deeds” (Col. iii. 9). The “old man” is styled “the body of sin.” It required to be crucified in the person of Christ,

and it is accounted as crucified in respect to those who are baptised into His death. Only on this principle can a reason be given for the believer's "body of sin" having to go through the water. Sinful acts committed subsequently are forgiven by confession through Christ. If, therefore, the unbaptised believer only requires forgiveness of what he has done, why should not confession thereof suffice? And if baptism has nothing to do with inherited sin, how is it that the "body," as the result of this ceremony, is accounted "holy" (1 Cor. vi. 19; iii. 16)? It is impossible to satisfactorily answer these questions on the basis of the above contention. Equally impossible is it to understand the necessity for Christ having to die for himself. For if the symbol is not related to inherited sin, neither can the reality; and as Christ had no individual sins, he must, in that case, have died only for the sins of others. This is the logical conclusion to which the contention of W. Brittle leads; and if he really believes it, he is upholding substitution, while falsely attributing it to me.

The pamphlet entitled *Righteousness from God* bears three endorsements, one of the writers of which ("L. B. Welch") makes the following statement in the April *Christadelphian*:—"Why sin must be condemned by the shedding of the blood of the guilty nature is a matter that belongs to God alone." This is an admission that "guilt" pertains to the "nature," and a confession that the writer does not understand why it requires blood-shedding—a confession which would be adorned by a modesty that has not characterised the products of the same pen in this controversy. The recognition of a "guilty nature" is in direct conflict with the pamphlet which condemns it, under the name of "original sin," as part of "Rome's Cup." What the value of an endorsement from such a source can be it is difficult to see.

The accusation that what I have written on inherited sin is new has already been shown, by extracts from the writings of Dr. Thomas and others, to be false. It is what I have held and taught for many years. *The Christadelphian Shield*, No. 15, written nearly twenty years ago, and afterwards reprinted at Birmingham, contains this sentence:—

From these testimonies it is clear that there are certain "sins" which are remitted by the ordinance of baptism, sin inherited from our first parents and that committed in days of ignorance. The ceremony which effects this purification at the same time transfers the believer out of the "first man Adam," by whom came death, into the "last Adam," by whom came "the resurrection of the dead."

The fact that *Righteousness from God* was issued with *The Christadelphian* is presumptive evidence that it is endorsed also by the Editor. Whether endorsed or not he is the medium for circulating that which makes void what he has himself written in *The Blood of Christ* on the necessity for the inherited sin-nature being "sacrificially condemned"; for the author of the pamphlet declares that Christ "died for sins committed in ignorance," and that therefore baptism is related only to such.

The pamphlet also contradicts what the Editor of *The Christadelphian* has previously written on the believer being clothed with the righteousness of Christ at baptism:—

Those who think that he (the man without the wedding garment) represents the class *uninvested with the righteousness of Christ in the belief and obedience of the truth*, have only to remember that the majority of those *so invested* will be rejected at the judgment-seat of Christ for not having walked worthy of their privilege in Christ. *Christ is righteousness for a believing sinner unto his justification*; but the *believing sinner, having become a saint, has to work out his own salvation with fear and trembling* [Italics mine] (*The Christadelphian*, 1876, p. 379).

These are but further illustrations of the inconsistent attitude of the Editor. He blows hot or cold, according to circumstances. If A says Christ was born with a life free from condemnation in Adam he rightly

answers, Nothing of the kind; for He was one of the condemned stock. But if B says that condemnation involved alienation, he replies Not at all; human beings are not alienated until they commit transgression; Christ committed none, and therefore it is shocking to speak of alienation pertaining to His nature. To this C says, I am glad to hear you say that, for I never liked the idea of alienation or Divine disfavour attaching to babes; from that I see that they do not inherit "sin in the flesh." You are drawing an unwarrantable conclusion, says the Editor; the inclinations inherent in the flesh are called *sin*. But, interposes D, "sin in the flesh" is in itself an unclean thing, for Christ had to shed His blood to cleanse Himself from it. Not so, says the Editor; the Scriptures never use the word *cleanse* in that sense; bloodshedding is only spoken of in connection with actual sin. That is just my idea, says E, for I never could understand about Christ having to die for Himself. You must not talk like that, says the Editor; His death being a declaration of the righteousness of God, it would have been unrighteous to have crucified Him if it had not been necessary for His own release from death. If, says E, Christ, who committed no transgression, required a sacrificial death, it follows that Adam's other descendants require the blood of Christ not only for what they do, but for the nature they inherit. Certainly, is the response. Then, follows F, baptism, as a symbol of Christ's death, must justify from inherited sin, as well as from sinful acts. Nothing of the kind, says the Editor; to talk like that is to indulge in Papal smoke. Baptism is never set forth as a means of taking away Adam's condemnation; it is only the beginning of a process which ends, in the case of the faithful, in immortalisation. According to that, says G, Christ's sacrifice is sufficient, by baptism, to forgive sins committed in ignorance, but not to justify from "sin in the flesh." Ah, says the Editor, I see the subject is too high for you; it is one which can only be understood by minds of a higher order.

Is it any wonder that such irreconcilable utterances as these should produce perplexity in the minds of those who are not "rooted and grounded" in the teaching of the Scriptures? Does not Divine Truth, above all things, require adherence to a clearly defined principle? What would be thought of a General who first blew the trumpet for an advance, and then before the rearguard had time to join those in the front were to sound a retreat? Is this in harmony with the Apostolic method of warfare? "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?" (I. Cor. xiv. 8). "Our word toward you," says Paul, "was not yea and nay . . . but in Him (Christ) was yea" (II. Cor. i. 18, 19).

The inconsistency displayed in teaching is seen also in fellowship. The Editor of *The Christadelphian* has endorsed withdrawal from some of us, not for believing that resurrection is confined to those in Christ, but because that belief has been put into a printed form. The publication of a pamphlet, he says, has rendered accommodation impossible. Where is the Scriptural authority for such a position? Nowhere. Withdrawal from fellowship is enjoined for erroneous belief, irrespective of its being taught either in speech or in print. "I have a few things against thee, because thou hast there them that hold the doctrine," &c. (Rev. ii. 14). The weakness of the above position is illustrated in his fellowshipping within the last few months some who have held the alleged "heresy" for a longer period than many in London.

It has been said, in effect, that I want to damage the work of the Editor of the *Christadelphian*. This is refuted by the fact that I endeavoured in the first instance privately to effect agreement with him for the purpose of avoiding conflict. Only when I found this impossible, and with some reluctance, did I take an independent course; but in this step I adhered strictly to Scriptural exposition without any personal element; and I did not take up a condemnatory attitude until I found that vital truths in

reference to the Sacrifice of Christ were being corrupted. Some, who had hitherto been esteemed staunch in sound doctrine, were thereby driven from their moorings, and occasion was given for the adversary to rejoice. Much as I appreciate the work of the last thirty years in disseminating the Truth, I esteem the work which Christ has accomplished much more. And, therefore, when Christ's sacrificial work was marred, I was confronted with the question, What is to be done? If, in such circumstances, others deemed it compatible with the allegiance due to their Elder Brother to enter into a conspiracy of silence, I could not. At whatever cost, duty required me to speak. But no one would rejoice more than the writer if the necessity for antagonism were to cease. There is a very effective way of securing this. Let the false teaching of the last two years on our relationship to Adam by birth, and our relationship to Christ by baptism, be withdrawn as openly as it has been propagated. If there be regret for the injury which has been done, this course will be readily adopted. It has been required from others in the past, and in these matters we are called upon to be no respectors of persons.

J. J. ANDREW.

Things New and Old.—No. 4.

“BAPTISM BOTH ALSO NOW SAVE US.”

Surely there is a signification in these words of the Divinely-inspired Apostle. And I believe the brethren generally have been guilty of showing the signification to be less than it really is, because we have fancied them to be limited to the future in their application. It has been said by a certain writer (I forget who) that “civilisation never recedes; the law of necessity ever forces it onwards.” This is perfectly true in the main, and the increase of knowledge, with results collaterally connected, during the last 50 years, is a marvel to many. That it should be so is no surprise to the “Sons of God,” for they are acquainted with the Word which declared that “many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased” (Daniel xii. 4). The facts are patent to all the world. We cannot help but recognise them; our training in the Word is productive of a discerning mind, and what has happened and is happening in the affairs of the world—

politically, socially, and ecclesiastically—accords with the anticipations of our elder brethren. This same Word will produce an equally discerning condition of mind of what may be termed the *inner* and *higher* subjects of the faith revealed for our salvation if we will only let patience have her perfect work. These inner and higher phases of the Word have no place in the mind and heart of the world; they belong exclusively to God's “servants,” in whose minds there should be “an increase” of Divine knowledge corresponding to the world's knowledge of human things in the time of the end.

I believe there is the true disposition on the part of many to “add to their faith virtue, and to virtue knowledge,” together with the other accessory items of the Spirit's injunction. But unhappily this “increase” is too frequently resented even when the effect is only to enlarge or open out a fuller view of the Word upon important subjects of Truth.

The subject under consideration is one which has not always been associated with a present redemption. A threefold meaning is indeed presented to view by the context,—the *past*, when Noah and his family "were saved by water" from the death, which their contemporaries suffered—thus early in the world's history symbolising that which was a hidden mystery until revealed by the Apostle Peter; a *present* redemption as shown by the use of the term *now*; and the *future* redemption of the body by change to Spirit nature.

The saving by water in the Ark was one of those general laws of "type and analogy, which does not admit of precise application in the matter of either events or times"; yet in this beautiful symbol there was some connection with the "Ark of the Covenant," which belongs to the "Most Holy." Wonderful indeed are God's ways, and though unappreciated by the masses, let us be wise and discern in baptism an entrance into the Ark of Safety, whereby we are united to Christ and receive forgiveness of sins. Apart from union with Christ there could be no such forgiveness. Now this Union with Christ is the very crux of the "Now" used by the Apostle. Let us look at it a little more closely in the light of certain first principles of the Truth.

"It is one of those first principles that men are not born children of God, but children of Adam and heirs of the death that came by him (Rom. v. 12-19; Eph. ii. 3, 12). It is another, that God purposes to generate from among this death-doomed race a family for Himself whom He will glorify with salvation (Acts xv. 14; I. Peter ii. 9; I. Thess. v. 9). It is another that the mode He has chosen in the development of this family is to present the Gospel for acceptance, and to require the assumption of the name of Christ in baptism (I. Cor. i. 21; Acts x. 48; Rom. vi. 3, 4; Gal. iii. 27). It is another, that those subjects to faith in Christ Jesus are considered as having

entered the new family for the first time (II. Cor. vi. 17, 18; Gal. iii. 26; Eph. ii. 13; Peter ii. 10). Begotten by the Word brought to bear upon their mind, they have in baptism been 'born of water,' but are not yet finally incorporate in the family of God" (*Nazareth Revisited*, p. 66). The foregoing illustrations of the first principles of the Truth relating to a believer's initiation into Christ Jesus are grand and the references alluded to trite. What do they all show us? That man naturally by connection with Adam (and this before Adam's justification, which was for himself only, Christ having given us a justification by His death and resurrection) is heir to the death that came by him; and the assumption of the name of Christ in *Baptism* is described as entrance into the *new family for the first time*. Verily, if this is not a salvation, where shall we find one? Yes, brethren, it is a saving of us now; it is the bestowal of a salvation which we are enjoined to "work out with fear and trembling." We are *new* creatures by the process gone through; "old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new. And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to Himself by Jesus Christ" (II. Cor. v. 17, 18).

Why certain of the brethren will persistently speak and write as though we believed that baptism would save us from physical decay and death is incomprehensible. Both good and bad baptised believers, "members of the new family," will die if the Lord delay His coming; to believe otherwise would be sheer foolishness. Nowhere in the Word is present salvation represented as giving immunity from physical death. Justice is, however, not done either to the term or purport when salvation is restricted to being *fully* incorporate with or in the family of God.

Salvation has its initiatory stage, its development, and finality; the second and third may be neglected by those

who have been by God's grace recipients of the first. But because of this we cannot argue that they never had a union with Christ, that they never were released from the bondage of the "law of sin and death," that they never were "made righteous" or that they never came under "the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus." If salvation had not a present aspect it would be impossible for the Apostle to exhort us even *now* to take "the helmet of salvation" (Eph. vi. 17), or to say, "not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy *He saved us*, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Spirit" (Tit. iii. 5). The salvation bestowed at baptism is due solely to God's mercy, but the salvation realised after approval at the judgment seat of Christ depends upon individual righteousness. To neglect the development of a righteous character, or, in scriptural language, to fail "to work out our salvation"—the salvation already bestowed—will result in the loss of salvation in its final stage.

Can it be said that any who are "without Christ . . . having no hope, and without God in the world" (Eph. ii. 12) have ever been "saved" by the baptism which doth also now save us? No, brethren, no; and you know it. Noah and his family were placed in safety in the Ark, which rode upon the stormy waters until it safely rested on the Mount. So everyone who has partaken of "Sonship" has entered into the Ark which God has provided, to enable him to ride on "the troubled sea," which "cannot rest" (Isa. lvii. 20). Let us, therefore, strive to live lives which shall be acceptable unto God, and there will be a safe resting for us on the Mount which the Lord has chosen.

Noah and his family rested in the Ark from the trouble of the previous 120 years of strife and labour. So "we which have believed do enter into rest" (Heb. iv. 3) graciously provided by our heavenly Father as the provisional rest,

until that which remaineth is accomplished—a salvation and a glory even now, but higher in the millennial age, and superlatively grand in the age beyond. There is a fitness in the number who were "saved by water," the eight persons representing the eighth thousand year when that glorious finality of rest and consolation will fill the world, and God be all in all.

The parenthetic statement of Peter—"Not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God"—is frequently viewed as teaching that baptism has nothing to do with sinful flesh, but only with the "conscience." But this view is at variance with Scriptural teaching elsewhere; for the "body" of the believer through induction into Christ is accounted a holy "temple" (1. Cor. vi. 19). Under the Mosaic law "the blood of bulls and of goats . . . sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh" (Heb. ix. 13), and as a result it is called "holy flesh" (Jer. xi. 15), but *beyond this it could not go*. "The blood of Christ," however, can do "much more;" it can "purge your conscience from dead works" (Heb. ix. 14). It not only puts away, at baptism, "the filth of the flesh" *as a matter of justification*, but it gives "the answer of a good conscience toward God."

As "Sons of God" we are not in the habit of confounding sentiment with facts; there may be errors of judgment which some admire, others blame, but which God alone can judge. There are things, however, belonging to the first principles of the Truth, which the ordinary minds of the brethren should be able to comprehend. Do not let us degenerate to the level of the Gentile "go and come" system; such a course on our part would be an insult to God as neglecting the gospel given for our salvation. But let each be devoutly interested in the Word; attention to it will beget appreciation, and appreciation in turn will result in love for it—such love as will be a charm to the present

life because the mind, being toned by the Spirit's teaching, will be lifted out of its natural insipidity and be able to rejoice in the revealed Wisdom of God.

If then we realise that we have, like Noah, been lifted up, "saved by water," what is our course of duty to others? To show them the same "way of life." Have we examples as to how this was accomplished? Yes, many. Christ as chief, and then the Apostles. What do we find to be the principle adopted by each? A grand *constructive* one; the "vain" condition of mankind was fully understood; for to "seek and to save that which was lost" was the mission of Christ and the Apostles. It being our *privilege*, as disciples of Christ to proclaim the truth, let us be as constructive as we possibly can by inducing men to "put on Christ" in the appointed way that thus they may be "saved" from the bondage of the law of sin and death.

In the process of enlightening men the employment of type and antitype is often desirable, and sometimes necessary, ere the fulness of the subject matter can be seen in all its beauty; and it is very remarkable that in almost everything of a doctrinal and deep nature the law of figure is brought into use. The present subject is no exception. The Ark of the Covenant was placed in the Holy of holies, and the Apostle informs us in Hebrews ix. that it contained "the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the Covenant." Now the Ark itself was a type of Christ, the manna representing the bread of life, of which there is a present eating by baptised believers (Jno. vi. 51.) The rod that budded was typical of resurrection, but not necessarily to eternal life, for without partaking of the manna this cannot be. The rod and the manna represent Christ as "the resurrection and the life;" and as the symbols were distinct from each other so must be the things symbolised.

How can we be related to the resur-

rection rod and partake of the manna but by getting into the Ark, where, let us remember, they were "*hidden*." By our entrance we become related to that which it contains—God's essentials—"Thy law is the truth" (Ps. cxix. 142). Christ is the embodiment of the tables of the law, Christ's righteousness being the fulfilment thereof. What follows then? We stand related to these three things when we emerge from the baptismal water.

First.—Christ and His righteousness.

Second.—Resurrection.

Third.—The "hidden manna."

This relationship to the Ark of Safety involves the operation of the resurrection rod in the event of death, but it does not in itself necessitate eating of the "hidden manna" in its highest phase; this latter is promised *conditionally* on our overcoming the world—a conquest which always produces even present satisfaction, and will ultimately lead to the partaking of the "hidden manna."

Can we be clothed with Christ's righteousness without being in the Ark? Clearly not.

Can we have resurrection without? I think not.

Can we eat of the hidden manna without? Certainly not.

Let us praise the Lord, brethren, that in His wisdom and goodness and mercy He has appointed that which, whilst yet being so simple, grand and powerful, is counted as a weak thing by the world, even "baptism which doth also *now save us*."

"The water and the blood, O Lord,
They cleanse us from our sin,
When by the Spirit of Thy word,
We are renewed within."

"Brave the foe, proclaim the Word,
Sons and daughters of the Lord;
Work ye for the Lord of Heaven;
Give, as He hath freely given."

W. WHITEHEAD.

New Romney.

Editorial Flyleaf.

We are sending copies of this number to all subscribers to Volume I., whether they have subscribed to Volume II. or not. We do this in order that any who have forgotten to send their subscriptions may not be disappointed. If they should fail to remit before the issue of Number 6 we shall conclude that they do not desire the visits of *The Sanctuary-Keeper* to be continued.

We contemplated issuing with this number a title page and index to Vol. I., but as there is no margin for any additional weight without an increase of postage this would have reduced the reading matter by four pages—an amount of space which cannot at present be spared. Perhaps we may be better able to provide an index to Volumes I. and II. at the conclusion of the second volume.

The Christadelphian Advocate for April has an article by the Editor, entitled "Awkward Precedents," dealing with the argument based on past cases of resurrection; to which such prominence has been given during the last two years. He points out that the word "child" describes two of the raised ones (I. Kings xvii. 21; II. Kings iv. 18), and that a third is spoken of as a "little daughter" (Mark v. 23): if therefore this "proves any rule for the future at all," it "would prove infant resurrection." Bro. Williams also calls attention to the fact that "in dealing with men who denied the resurrection," Paul makes no reference (I. Cor. xv.) to any past raising of the dead; and yet if the one be proof of the other this would have been the simplest way of refuting the false teachers at Corinth. Instead

of this the Apostle bases his argument solely on the resurrection of Christ.

This is not the only awkward precedent which has been created in the advocacy of resurrection out of Christ. It has been said that the death of Christ has removed Adamic condemnation from the whole race—a statement which, in effect, admits that condemnation to be a barrier to resurrection. If, therefore, it has been removed, there can be no valid ground for keeping in the grave any who have not come under condemnation for their individual conduct; and these certainly comprise all who have died in infancy, not to mention adults who have never known of a Divine revelation. It has also been said that the judgment which "came upon all men to condemnation" for Adam's "offence" does not involve alienation from God; thus paving the way for another to say that alienation does not pertain to the condemnation at Christ's judgment-seat.

The Fraternal Visitor for February contains an article entitled "The Dual Manifestation of Divinity," which sets forth in a concise form the Scriptural teaching on Christ as a sin-bearer, in perfect harmony with our contention. The article—which bears the signature "C. Smith" (a name familiar to some of our readers)—is evidently, from a foot note, not in accord with the Editorial mind. This is inevitable; for it is quite the reverse of the position set forth in the Editorial criticism last year on *The Blood of the Covenant*. It is also at variance with an editorial note in the March number on our article entitled "Sin and its Removal, as taught by Dr. Thomas." This note admits that "some

of the writings of Dr. Thomas are in harmony with" our contention on "sin in the flesh" of Jesus, but declines to accept Dr. Thomas as an authority. It is a mistake to suppose that we appealed to the Doctor as an authority. We quoted him in refutation of the charge brought against us by some—who profess to believe the whole of his writings—that in regard to the sin-nature, &c., we were overthrowing the teaching of the last forty years. We value the Doctor's writings for the way in which they have opened up the Inspired Word, but when attempting to prove anything we appeal solely to the Scriptures, as our writings on various subjects testify.

The January number of *The Coming Nation*—a monthly paper established last year in the service of the One Faith, at Dallas, in Texas, U.S.A.—contains a short notice of *The Blood of the Covenant*. The Editor, though not agreeing with the conclusion concerning "enlightened rejectors," admits that the argument "in regard to resurrection is well sustained," and says that it is "well worth reading, even by those who differ" from its author.

During the past three months the London daily papers have contained voluminous communications from their

special correspondents describing the barbarous treatment to which the Armenians have been subjected. Some of the writers went to Armenia with a bias in favour of the Turk, and incredulous of the reported massacres. But their inquiries on the spot, from all sides, compelled them to recognise the truth of the reports, and even to admit that so far from exaggeration, the worst had not been told. Consequently they have deemed it necessary in the interests of humanity to give the fullest details, the perusal of which is enough to "make the blood run cold." The evidence collected leaves no doubt whatever that a Turkish military force, acting under Governmental authority, and aided by Kurdish bandits, committed horrible butcheries—worse than those in Bulgaria in 1876—with a view to exterminating the Armenian race. The question now of most interest is, to what will this revelation lead? What will Britain and the other powers do to Turkey? Will there be a further drying up of the Euphratean power? Will Russia be brought nearer to "the Mountains of Israel?" Will it produce a conflict between Gog and the Merchants of Tarshish? These questions—which time alone can answer—are of deep interest to every Watchman of Zion.

Things Hard to be Understood.

18.—THE DEATH INCURRED BY ADAM.

If Adam had been condemned to a violent death by Deity, he must inevitably have suffered that death, by reason of God's immutability. Knowing that Adam did not suffer this death, we have strong grounds for believing, both that he suffered the decreed penalty and that the penalty was not a violent death.

There is a distinction between the penalty with which Adam was threatened

and the condemnation pronounced against him. The penalty specified the time of death, but the condemnation did not. The time of death was "the day" of sinning, which involves a death specially inflicted; whereas the condemnation states that Adam should return to the dust of the ground, without indicating how or when. It is usual to consider the terms of the penalty and the condemnation to be identical. This is true in regard to the results, for death,

however inflicted, is a return to the dust. But, in concluding that death by physical decay is embodied in both penalty and condemnation, an important event which intervened is overlooked, viz., the promise of the seed of the woman, which in the word "bruise" predicted that the Saviour would suffer a death like that incurred by Adam. Did this mean that Adam was in no sense to die on that day? No; for he did die symbolically in the animals slain in Eden. By this means he participated in the death and resurrection of the seed of the woman, and came under the operation of "the law of the spirit of life." The death in Eden and the death on Calvary exclude the suggestion that God's immutability was set aside. On the contrary it was maintained, but with the accompaniment of mercy.

19.—ADAM'S RETURN TO THE GROUND.

Your explanation that Adam's transgression brought into operation another law, over-riding the one condemning him to a violent death, would have more force if it could be shown that in consequence of the working of that law Adam did not die as the result of his sin. Since, however, he did die, it seems obvious that the law which condemned him was not over-riden, but allowed to take its course. It appears also in collision with your own reasoning on the faithfulness of Deity.

It was not Adam's transgression, but God's mercy, which brought another law into operation. That mercy was embodied in the promise of a Saviour. If such a promise had not been made, the law of sin and death would have been allowed to take its course, and Adam would have died in his sin never to rise again. But he did not so die, and therefore he will rise. The second law did not over-ride the first in the sense of immediately destroying its power. It provided for the forgiveness of Adam and the consequent termination of the alienation caused by his transgression; but the physical consequences thereof were allowed to remain. When, however, Adam is raised, those physical consequences will be nullified, and if he should, after judgment, receive immortality, the power of the first law in all its aspects will have been completely destroyed. These two laws have each two aspects, which may be defined as mental and physical. When the second

law was introduced it over-ruled the mental aspect of the first law, but not the physical. From that time both laws have been in parallel operation. All who remain in Adam have been under the operation of the first law, both in its mental and physical aspects. But such as have been transferred into Christ, have been freed from the mental operation of the first law, and have come under the mental operation of the second law. Though still under the physical operation of the first law, their deliverance from it is assured. When the time comes for the second law in its physical aspect to operate, they will be brought out of the death-state, or transferred, if then alive, from their evil surroundings to the judgment-seat; and if sent back into the world to suffer "the second death" it will be due, not to the first law, but to their own violation of the second law.

There is no greater difficulty about Adam going into the grave after forgiveness through sacrifice than there is in regard to Christ's brethren who are now in the death-state. They, by birth, were as much under the condemnation of Gen. iii. 19 as Adam was, but by baptism into Christ they were freed from it. Why did they die? Because the Judge was not here. This is proved by the fact that those who are alive when He comes will pass to the judgment-seat without death. The same result would have ensued in the case of Adam if it had been part of the Divine plan for the seed of the woman to have been bruised, raised, and constituted a judge within the life-time of the first human pair. Although these events were not comprised during the existence of the individual Adam, they are embraced in the career of the multitudinous Adam; for his descendants are but an extension of him, and Christ, as one of them, occupied the same position. The recognition of this truth will simplify the difficulties raised by our correspondent.

20.—ADAM AND SINNERS UNDER CONDEMNATION.

Nowhere in Scripture find we any reference to the punishment of Adam being of the nature you claim. Of violent death in relation to sinners already under condemnation we see plenty, but this is another thing.

The absence of any subsequent reference in Scripture to the kind of death

incurred by Adam is no evidence that it was not a violent death. The institution of sacrifice and circumcision for inherited sin would suffice to perpetuate this fact in many generations, and doubtless some of those who practised these ceremonies understood their relationship to the death incurred by the first sinner. Compared with such we are at a disadvantage; we have had to grope our way by conflict out of the darkness of the Apostasy into the light of Divine truth. Thoughtful sons of God in ante-diluvian patriarchal and Mosaic times who slew animals to atone for their own sins must have realised that they themselves deserved such a death; and, reasoning from analogy, they would surely, when offering sacrifice for inherited sin, conclude that this was required because Adam likewise deserved to be slain.

21.—EDENIC AND MOSAIC LAWS CONTRASTED.

Your suggestion of a parallelism between violent death for transgression of Edenic law fails by reason of the perpetrators not being on the same level to commence with; in other words, Adam and a transgressor of the law of Moses do not start fair with each other. This one is already under sentence of death, and any penalty having death as the object will be no punishment at all if he be allowed to perish in the ordinary course of things. To be of efficiency as a punishment, a VIOLENT death is essential; whereas that one (Adam) is not already under condemnation, and has power by obedience to keep on living. For his transgression, then, death is a punishment, whatever form it take, and any endeavour to draw a parallel must therefore be futile.

The contrast here drawn between those under the Edenic and Mosaic laws is more in appearance than in reality. The Israelites under the Mosaic law commenced life by a justification from the condemnation under which they were born. "For circumcision verily PROPHETETH if thou keep the law" (Rom. ii. 25). How did it profit? By entitling the keeper of the law to continued life. "For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law. That the man which doeth those things SHALL LIVE BY THEM" (Rom. x. 5)—that is, in flesh-nature, for the Mosaic law could not give spirit-nature (Gal. iii. 21). When an Israelite failed to do

"those things," under what condemnation did he die? The Mosaic, which is styled "the ministration of death" (II. Cor. iii. 7). All under the law, even the most faithful, failed; hence the necessity for their Saviour to be "made a curse to redeem them" (Gal. iii. 13). If Christ had not been brought under "the curse of the law," and then cleansed from it by His own blood-shedding, not a Jew from Sinai to Calvary could have been freed from the Mosaic condemnation. In such a case their justification from Adamic condemnation, though ratified by the sacrifice of Christ, would have been of no avail. The Mosaic "ministration of death" would have been as powerful to keep them in the grave as is "the law of sin and death" to retain unjustified Gentiles.

Until Christ was hung upon the tree (Gal. iii. 13), He did not become obnoxious to the Mosaic law. Up to this point circumcision profited Him, for His obedience to the law in all things entitled Him to live in the flesh; but when "made a curse" His "circumcision" was "made uncircumcision," and nothing could then free Him from Adamic and Mosaic condemnation but the shedding of His blood. The analogy between the mode of Christ's death and the death incurred by Jews under the law being admitted, there should be no difficulty in seeing the same analogy between Christ's death and the death incurred by Adam. If, in the case of the Jew, a violent death was averted by animal sacrifice, why not in the case of Adam?

22.—ADAM'S DESCENDANTS; THEIR MODE OF DEATH.

It is no support to your position that many die by accident or violence. Abel died a violent death, yet he certainly had been legally or prospectively freed from Adamic condemnation.

The reference in *The Blood of the Covenant* to those who have died by accident or violence was made for the purpose of showing by illustration that the sentence pronounced upon Adam and his descendants, does not require death by physical decay, and that, therefore, life under condemnation may be cut short at any moment. Take, for instance, the babes destroyed by the Flood. They had not committed transgression. On what grounds then could they be deprived of life? Because they

were the descendants of sinners, the first of whom were Adam and Eve. If the condemnation of Gen. iii. 19, required death by physical decay, it would not admit of a specially inflicted death before transgression had been committed.

In regard to Abel, it must be remembered that his slaying was not a Divine act, or the result of Divine action; it was effected by one of the serpent's seed, and was the first step in the fulfilment of the prediction that the woman's seed should be bruised in the heel. Abel suffered a violent death through his belief that blood-shedding was necessary to justification from sin; but, unlike those who die in Adam, his bruise will be healed by resurrection.

23.—ANIMAL SACRIFICE; ITS SIGNIFICANCE.

The idea that Adam symbolically died in the animal's slain does not prove that those animals suffered the very penalty to which Adam was condemned. The great significance of the slaying of animals at Eden is not the showing to Adam the just penalty of his crime, but an indication of the way to atonement—a showing forth the great idea of the basis of reconciliation between Deity and fallen man, as so ably demonstrated in "Eureka" by Dr. Thomas.

There is nothing in the point to which objection is here taken that invalidates the definition given of atonement; the two are in perfect harmony. It will, we presume, be admitted, that atonement involves, or is synonymous with, justification. On what, then, is justification

based? An act, not of injustice, but justice. In view of this it is very dangerous to say that the slaying of animals in Eden was not to show Adam the just penalty of his crime. It leads to the conclusion that the death of God's Lamb does not show the just penalty due for sin; and in that case it cannot be the basis for our justification. It is true of sacrifice, both in shadow and substance, that God must be "just" before He can be "the justifier of him which believeth" (Rom. iii. 26). As soon as the animals were constituted sin-bearers they were slain; and when Christ had fulfilled what was necessary as an acceptable bearer of sin He also was slain.

God's Lamb is said to have been "slain from the foundation of the world" (Rev. xiii. 8). What does this show? That sacrifice has existed from the "foundation" of the present world or constitution of things. That "foundation" could not be the creation of Adam, because prior to his eating the forbidden fruit there was no scope for sacrifice. What, then, was the "foundation" with which sacrifice commenced? The promise concerning the seed of the woman; and, as a world must have a foundation, it is obvious that without that promise the present world would have had no existence. Adam would have been cut off from life without any descendants, in which case there would have been no slain Lamb, no priesthood, no forgiveness, no release from death, and no bestowal of immortality.

EDITOR.

Sips from "The Brook in the Way."

Psalm cx. 7 predicted that Christ should "drink of the brook in the way: therefore shall He lift up the head." He did so "drink," and, as a consequence, He was raised to spirit-nature. To be similarly exalted His brethren must do as He did. "The brook in the way" is composed of "living water" (Jno. iv. 10), the drinking of which is necessary for all who have commenced to "walk in newness of life" (Rom. vi.

4). These are in the "narrow way" (Matt. vii. 14)—"the way of the tree of life" (Gen. iii. 24)—which none can enter unless slain by the priestly "sword" of the Spirit. The "brook," being "in" this "way," is only available for those who have entered; it is given to refresh them; and unless they continuously "drink" of it they languish, becoming sooner or later dry bones from which life has fled. J. J. A.

"Wisdom hath builded her house, she hath hewn out her seven pillars" (Prov. ix. 1). "There is *one body and one spirit*, even as ye are called in *one hope* of your calling; *one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God* and Father of all, who is above all and through all, and in you all" (Eph. iv. 4-6).

What a glorious wisdom that creates a body which through His Spirit might have such a hope, and, through the Lord Jesus Christ, by faith and the obedience of baptism, may please God, and fulfil or complete His purpose and be made by Christ "a pillar in the temple of my God" (Rev. iii. 12).

W. W.

Dean Alford thus renders Heb. xiii. 20: "But the God of peace that brought up from the dead, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, the great Shepherd of the sheep, even our Lord Jesus;" and there can be no doubt that this is the Apostle's meaning. The suggestion has been thrown out, however, that it is "through the blood . . ." that we are to be made perfect; an idea which is quite untenable. The texts of Griesbach and others place the word "covenant" and before the words "make perfect," and so practically agree with the rendering given above.

The "age-lasting covenant" is, of course, that with Abraham; which by sacrifice—necessitating the shedding of blood—received a typical confirmation in his lifetime (Gen. xv.). A "perfect sacrifice," however, was required, and this was provided in the person of Christ, and hence His blood was particularly associated with the "new" or "better" covenant, for evidence of which we need only turn to Matt. xxvi. 28. "This is my blood of the new testament." "He is the mediator of the new testament." (Heb. ix. 15). The "blood of the age-lasting covenant" was shed "for the remission of sins" (Matt. xxvi. 28). What sins? Sin inherited and sin committed (Col. ii. 13).

What evidence is there that this is so? Let the following passages be considered:—"He was tempted in all points like as we are yet without sin" (Heb. iv. 15). "Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood He also himself likewise took part of the same" (Heb. ii. 14). Christ is here represented

as having the Adamic, condemned, nature, but no personal transgression. In His death, however, He was Himself benefitted, for "By His own blood He entered in once into the holy place having obtained eternal redemption" (Heb. ix. 12). In other words His death was as necessary for His own resurrection as it was for that of others; for had He not completed His obedience by submission to the death of the cross His death would have been unavailing for resurrection.

Baptism being the symbol of the crucifying of the flesh with its affections and lusts in its preliminary stage, is the only way to get "into Christ" (Gal. iii. 27)—whereupon such are no longer under "the law of sin and death," but are under "the law of the Spirit of Life" (Rom. viii. 2).

JNO. OWLER.

"ONLY A LITTLE LONGER."

Only a little longer; then the shadows will flee away,
And Creation rest in the calm delight of her Resurrection day;
Only a little longer; then the clouds in the East will break
With a rapture of sunlight, gloriously, and sleeping saints will wake.
Only a little longer; for the Saviour must soon appear;
Oh, joy to think He may even come before the next New Year!
Only a little longer; then the sorrows of earth will cease,
And the advent of Christ bring in again a universal peace.
Only a little longer; then His glory will fill the air,
And the sound of a glad hosanna ring, as Brethren meet Him there:
Only a little longer; yes, we know we can trust His word;
So we daily hope for the welcome voice of Jesus Christ Our Lord.

Selected by W. W. from Poems by
CHARLOTTE MURRAY.

Isa. lii. 14.—"His visage was so marred more than any man." Notwithstanding this passage, painters nearly always depict Christ, except when on the Cross, with a perfectly smooth and placid countenance. This is out of harmony with His experience as "a man of

sorrows and acquainted with grief." His continued conflict with the motions of the flesh, together with the grief produced by the religious corruption around Him, would be quite sufficient to produce a dejected, care-worn face, having the appearance of premature age—thus realising the prediction, "He hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see Him there is no beauty that we should desire Him" (Isa. liii. 2). The prevalent conception of Jesus Christ—which deprives His life-long temptation of its reality—accounts for the misconception as to His appearance.—J. J. A.

James i. 5.—"If any man lack wisdom let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not." This exhortation is put in such a form that, although applicable to all, only those who realise their lack of wisdom will act upon it. The proud, the conceited, the self-satisfied, not realising their deficiency, will pass it by as not for them. But the humble-minded—those who realise their own insufficiency—will readily avail themselves of the advice in confidence that wisdom "shall be given" them. The question as to how it will be imparted will not trouble those who have strong faith in the fulfilment of God's promises. There are many ways

open to Him who is infinitely wise. He may impart it by experience, through another of His sons, or in the reading of the Inspired Word. To doubt whether God will give it is to exclude its bestowal; for it is expressly said, "Let him ask in faith, nothing wavering." And "he that wavereth" is warned "not to think that he shall receive anything of the Lord."

J. J. A.

Acts xxii. 8.—"I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest." The form of this statement was well suited to the occasion. To have said "I am Jesus Christ" would have been premature; it would have declared that of which Saul then required to be convinced. He recognised the name "Jesus of Nazareth," but did not believe Him to be "the Christ." He knew, however, that "Jesus of Nazareth" had been crucified, and when the bearer of this name spoke to him in the miraculous circumstances attending His journey to Damascus it was to him infallible proof that Jesus was "the Christ."

J. J. A.

[We should like contributions from a wider area for the next number.—Ed.]

Our Letter Box.

Since the issue of the fourth number we have received many letters of a varied character, from which we will make a few extracts, accompanied by observations thereon.

CAN A CLEAN THING COME OUT OF AN UNCLEAN?

A. says that God can, and did, in the person of Jesus, bring a clean thing out of an "unclean." He adduces nothing as proof beyond the statement that Jesus was "holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners" (Heb. vii. 26)—a passage which, if applicable to the nature, would

prove that Jesus was not a member of the Adamic race, and if so, not the seed of the Woman, seed of Abraham, or seed of David. No such difficulty is involved in viewing the passage as applicable to character; and this is in harmony with the context. The next verse describes Jesus as having fulfilled the antitype of the Aaronic high-priest, who offered "sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's." He had no sin of conduct to offer for, and therefore he must have offered for sin pertaining to the nature. At the commencement of the following chapter it is said that "every high priest is ordained to offer

gifts and sacrifices; wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer" (Heb. viii. 3). A sacrifice is necessary only where there is sin in some form. Hence if Christ had had no sin of nature he would not have been required to offer a sacrifice for Himself as well as for the people. But, says the Spirit, "This He did once, when He offered up Himself," and this was due to a "necessity."

In saying that God brought a clean babe out of an unclean woman, A. makes a statement which, perhaps, goes farther than he intends. In view of Gal. iv. 4, it really means that God "made" a clean babe of an unclean "woman." The uncleanness of the babe, Jesus, is proved by the fact that his birth so defiled his mother, that she had to "offer a sacrifice" to cleanse herself (Luke ii. 24; Lev. xii.).

A. seems to think that to view Jesus as being in a "likeness" or resemblance of sin's flesh, and not "made" of it, is to honour Him. This is a mistake. We honour Christ most by recognising the position in which God placed Him, and when all the aspects of that position are taken into account, it is easily seen that God is "magnified" thereby. First, there is His relationship towards those for whom He was to act as high-priest. To qualify Him "to succour them that are tempted," He must previously have "suffered being tempted;" and for this experience "it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren, in all things" (Heb. ii. 17, 18). His brethren are tempted from within; therefore Christ must be. But unless made precisely of their nature this could not be. A nature "undefiled" by "sin in the flesh" could only be tempted from without, and therefore could not be fully "touched with the feeling of our infirmities" (Heb. iv. 15).

The next aspect of Christ's position to be taken into account is, that God was in Him from infancy, helping Him to keep within subjection the "infirmities" of "sinful flesh." By the Spirit and the Written Word the Father so circumcised the heart of His Son (Col. ii. 11), as to cut off all its evil desires. To affirm that Jesus was of "undefiled" nature is to deny that he had such evil desires, and thereby to detract from the glory of the Father in evolving a righteous character from one who was "made" of "sinful flesh."

TWO KINDS OF SINNERS.

"Man must transgress law," says A., "to become a sinner." Using the term "sinner" to represent one who disobeys a command, this is true. The Scriptures frequently so use it, but they also use it for those who never disobeyed: "By one man's offence many were made (or constituted) sinners" (Rom. v. 19). Who so constituted them? God did, by means of law. Being in Adam they are accounted as having "sinned" in him (ver. 12). This is the testimony, and it cannot be set aside by unbelief or human dislike. Its recognition is necessary to account for the death of infants. If not "made sinners" (without being transgressors) they ought not to die, for human beings only die as the result of sin in some form.

THE SECOND DEATH.

Christ's death "did not save any man from death," says A., "but it does from the second death." This is a novel, but not a true, statement. The "second death" comes, not through relationship to "the first man, Adam," but to "the second man, the Lord from heaven" (I. Cor. xv. 45, 47). It is only incurred by the unfaithful in Christ, and condemnation to it is not pronounced until the judgment-seat. Of all who are condemned to the second death it will then be said, "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still, and he which is filthy let him be filthy still" (Rev. xxii. 11). From this sentence there is no escape, no provision having been made for the deliverance of any whom the Judge may reject. True, it says, "He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death" (Rev. ii. 11). But why? Because by overcoming the world through faith they never come under condemnation to the "second death." It is reserved for those in Christ who fail to overcome (Rev. xxi. 7, 8).

WHOM WILL GOD RAISE?

B. writes under the impression that we deem this question one of "vast importance," and that *The Sanctuary-Keeper* was started for the purpose of promulgating it. This is a mistaken idea. We recognise all Bible truths as important, but not all of equal importance. The principle on which the resurrection will be carried out has its place in the Divine plan of redemption surely therefore it ought to have a corresponding position in the minds of

those who have partaken of that redemption. Should it be a matter of indifference to them as to whether they will be raised through the death of Christ or independent of it? If desirous of being "filled with the knowledge of God's will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding" (Col. i 9) can they consistently ignore the evidence presented to them? How can they fully understand what it is to be "complete in Christ" (Col. ii 10) if ignorant as to whether he has *legally* freed them from the power of death? Is it all-important to realise what is meant by Christ being "the Life," and of no importance to know why He is "the Resurrection"? It is granted that His position as "the Life" is the greater; but of what avail would this be to the dead if He were not also "the Resurrection"? Absolutely none. The gate of their prison must be opened before they can receive immortality. He became the Life-giver because of obedience unto the death of the Cross; and for the same reason He received the Keys of Hades. It is admitted that immortality will not be bestowed upon any but those who have "washed their robes . . . in the blood of the Lamb" (Rev. vii. 14). What difference is there, in principle, in confining the resurrection to those only who have been justified by that blood (Rom. v. 9)—who have "made a covenant with God by sacrifice" (Ps. l. 5)?

The arguments which have been used to oppose this truth resolve themselves into a denial of foundation principles formerly advocated; and it was for this reason that *The Sanctuary-Keeper* was commenced. As stated in the opening article of the first number, "the thinking of the flesh has taken the place of the thinking of the Spirit" in regard to "the relationship of Adam's descendants to Edenic disobedience" and "the object and the results of the offering of the body of Christ." It will surely be admitted that these are not minor matters. They lie at the very foundation of the Divine scheme of salvation. To allow false teaching concerning them to be scattered broadcast without a protest is quite at variance with the Scriptural definition of faithful stewardship. First century brethren were commended for resisting false teachers, and nineteenth century brethren may rely on approval for doing likewise.

A CHANGE IN BELIEF.

C. says that when he was examined for baptism he gave a good confession, but hesitated to proceed further because he "did not feel prepared to take such a serious step;" whereupon he was told by the Editor of *The Christadelphian*, who was present, that he "would be held responsible in God's sight for not yielding obedience." This, says C., is at least 28 years ago, and therefore sufficient evidence that there has been no change in the Editor's belief during that time. These remarks originate in the impression that our allegation of a change relates to resurrectional responsibility. This is a mistake. We have made no such charge beyond pointing out that at one time it was suggested that the punishment of "rejectors of the Word" might be "reserved till the close of the thousand years," whereas now it is contended that they will appear before the same tribunal as Christ's brethren at His return from heaven. "It does not seem reasonable," says the author of *Christendom Astray*, "that those who put away the counsel of God from themselves should be passed over without judgment, and yet, since they do not become constituents of the household of faith, their resurrection, at the time when account is taken of that household, would seem inappropriate" (Lecture V., p. 108, 1884). That which was considered "inappropriate" in 1884 was, in 1894, positively asserted.

If C. carefully reads what has appeared in our previous numbers he will see that the change to which we have called attention relates to condemnation in Adam, justification by baptism, and the object of Christ's sacrifice. When this change was realised we were filled with consternation and grief. At first we could scarcely credit it, but a careful consideration of the statements made at wide intervals plainly showed that harmony between them was impossible. Others, with a strong predilection in favour of the editor of *The Christadelphian*, have made a similar comparison and been compelled to come to the same conclusion. This must be the result in every case where the judgment is unblinded by prejudice and accompanied by a candid mind.

CIRCUMCISION IN THE WILDERNESS.

D. in objecting to our remarks on this subject in the last number (pp. 119-

120), says that the explanation is "disastrous" to our "contention that this rite warded off premature death." This is a misapprehension. The covenant of circumcision does not specify when the life of the uncircumcised should be "cut off." God kept this to Himself—doubtless that he might execute it according to His judgment in each case. This enabled Him to spare the lives of Moses and his son until such time as the ceremony was performed under pressure (Exod. iv. 24-26). And it also permitted of the lives of the male Israelites, born in the wilderness, being spared until they were circumcised by Joshua at the crossing of the Jordan. The omission of the ceremony at this time would, no doubt, have resulted in the premature death of the delinquents; for the promise concerning the "little ones" did not go beyond bringing them in to the land which their parents "despised" (Num. xiv. 31). This was fulfilled when they had reached Gilgal, on the west of the Jordan (Josh. v. 2-9), and therefore they were circumcised here to avoid being "cut off."

"Circumcision," is defined by D. to be "a type of the destruction of the flesh-nature of immortalisation," and on this ground he says, "it could not have been done when the children were born, and the type of immortalisation after judgment at Gilgal have been shown." The definition here given is defective. Circumcision is chiefly a type of the destruction of the flesh in the person of Christ on the Cross; and hence all who are baptised into His death partake of His "circumcision" (Col. ii. 11). The

destruction of the flesh by immortalisation is the sequel, but if this were the only antitype of circumcision it could not be said that all the baptised are "circumcised with . . . the circumcision of Christ" (Col. ii. 11). Viewing the nation of Israel as a whole, it was circumcised at the beginning, and also at the end, of its wilderness journey; for "all the people that came out (of Egypt) were circumcised" (Josh. v. 5). In the one we see a parallel to baptism and in the other to immortalisation.

LIGHT IN RELATION TO RESPONSIBILITY.

E., in contending that "saving light" involves resurrectional responsibility, refers to three passages. I. Cor. xiv. 23-25 states that if an unbeliever, or unlearned, be present at a meeting of "the whole Church," and hear "all speak with tongues," he will think them "mad;" "but if all prophecy" he will be "convinced" and "will worship God." II. Cor. iv. 6 refers to the fact that God has shone into the hearts of the Corinthian brethren to give them the light of the knowledge of His glory. Eph. v. 13, 14 affirms that "all things that are discovered are made manifest by the light," and on this ground the Ephesian brethren who were asleep were exhorted to awake from their slumbering condition in order to receive light from Christ.

Not a word is there in any of these passages to show that unjustified Gentiles will be raised to punishment. The idea has first to be put in them before it can be taken out.

[Others standing over for want of space.—EDITOR.]

Within the Holy Place.

LONDON (NORTH).

BARNSBURY HALL, Barnsbury Street, Islington: Sundays, 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.; Wednesdays and Fridays, 8 p.m.

I am pleased to report that obedience has been rendered to the truth by Mrs. Louisa Samuels, formerly Church of

England, and Mr. William Thomas Walker, formerly neutral, both of whom were immersed on March 31st. Also, on May 18th, Miss Flora Gibson (daughter of our Sister Gibson) was inducted into the name of Salvation.

Brethren Wilkins and Sayer, lately associated with the Harlesden meet-

have been received into our fellowship. Brother Hobbs, who has recently removed from *Aberdare to London*, is now meeting with us. Sister Burridge (wife of our Brother Burridge) originally with us when meeting at 69, Upper Street, but until recently attending the Walham Green meeting, has resumed fellowship with us. I have to mention with regret the withdrawal from our fellowship of Brother G. C. Harvey, who has thrown in his lot with those who have left us.

The attendance at our Sunday morning services has of late been very encouraging, and it is pleasing to note the spiritual tone and amity which pervade the meetings.

The quarterly business meeting was held on April 7th. On Easter Monday we held our usual Ecclesial tea meeting, when we were cheered by the presence of a number of brethren and sisters from the Camberwell Ecclesia. After tea, a profitable time was spent, the subject considered being the "Responsibilities of the brethren of Christ."

The subjects of the lectures delivered since the last report have been as follows:—March 3rd, "Bible Teaching concerning the spirit of man subversive of Spiritualism—Some difficulties examined" (R. H. Ford); 10th, "Where is the promise of Christ's coming? The awakening of Christendom from centuries of unconcern in regard to the promises of God" (J. Owler); 17th, "Who are the Christadelphians; what is their origin; in what do they differ from other religious denominations?" (J. J. Andrew); 24th, "The year of Jubilee, a season of refreshing to be realised on the Earth" (J. J. Andrew, in absence of W. Owler, through indisposition); 31st, "The World to come and Life everlasting" (R. H. Ford); April 7th, "The Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul unscriptural" (W. H. Clifford); 14th, "Christ the first fruits. Who are the after fruits?" (J. J. Andrew); 21st, "The Key of Knowledge. By whom was it taken away? How was it used by Peter?" (W. Owler); 28th, "Where will the Righteous be rewarded; in Heaven or on the Earth?" (R. H. Ford); May 5th, "Does it matter what we believe?" (J. Owler); 12th, "Some of the principal doctrines of Christendom examined, weighed in the balance of Scripture, and found wanting" (O. Balls); 19th, "The Kingdom of God a future, not a present

Institution" (R. H. Ford); 26th, "The Gospel which is God's power unto Salvation" (W. Deane).

R. OVERTON, Recording Brother.

LONDON (SOUTH).

SURREY MASONIC HALL, Camberwell New Road, S.E. Sundays, 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.

We had the pleasure on May 9th of introducing another into the Saving Name, viz., William Albert Kerby, formerly Congregationalist.

We held our tea meeting on Good Friday, when a considerable number of brethren and sisters from Islington attended, and a very profitable evening was spent. The topic dealt with was "Our Calling and Election," which furnished a series of interesting addresses from several brethren.

We are about starting a Sunday School, to be held in the morning.

The quarterly meeting was held on Sunday afternoon, April 14th.

The lectures have been as follows:—March 3rd, "The Deliverance of Israel from Egypt, and the Redemption of Man—a contrast and a parallel" (William Owler); 10th, "The Promised Land: Where is it, and who are the inheritors?" (W. F. Richards); 17th, "The Salvation of the Bible; how obtainable, and when" (W. Deane); 24th, "A Great Conflagration. The approaching fiery destruction of the (Gentile) heaven and earth" (G. F. Guest); 31st, "The Second Coming of Christ; an event unlooked for by Christendom" (Jno. Owler); April 7th, "The Gospel which is the power of God unto Salvation" (W. Deane); 14th, "The Spirit in Man; the Bible Teaching concerning it subversive of Spiritualism" (R. H. Ford); 21st, "The Name which is above every name" (J. J. Andrew); 28th, "Our Hope and its strong foundation" (W. H. Clifford); May 5th, "The Key of Knowledge; by whom was it taken away? How it was used by Peter" (William Owler); 12th, "The New Heaven and the New Earth—when will they be established, and to whom will they bring joy?" (J. J. Andrew); 19th, "The Survival of the Jews" (W. H. Clifford); 26th, "The World to Come, and Life Everlasting" (G. F. Guest).

THOS. B. CLIFFORD, Recording Brother.

NORTHAMPTON.

TEMPERANCE HALL, Nowland: Sunday, 11 a.m. and 6.30 p.m.

The brethren in fellowship with us will be pleased to hear that we have commenced public efforts. We have opened with a special course of lectures, which are so arranged as to show clearly what is involved in the "Things of the Kingdom and the name of Jesus."

The first was delivered by Brother J. J. Andrew, on Sunday, May 5th, "Christ's First Appearing: What He accomplished as a sacrifice for sin; how to obtain a present benefit from His death." The audience was not as large as we expected, but we are not discouraged by that; we are quite alive to the fact that there are "few to be saved." It being our duty to say, "Come," we are endeavouring, though so few, to do so in the best way, and leave the results to Him who "giveth the increase."

The other lectures are:—"Christ as a Life-giver: Immortality obtainable only through Him, not an inheritance from Adam" (R. H. Ford); "Christ's Return to the Earth: A certainty; His own promise; the Angelic declaration; the Apostolic predictions; the Time of its fulfilment" (W. Fowler); "Resurrection and Judgment: No future life for the dead without resurrection; all will not be raised; who will be raised? The judgment of just and unjust" (G. Handley).

Our lecturing will depend upon two home brethren and two from London each month. The evening meeting is conducted in the same order as at Cambridge; no singing. This frees us from the responsibility of encouraging those to praise who are not in the position to do so. We rejoice to report the perfect unity and fellowship which exists in our Ecclesia, such as we have not experienced before.

G. HANDLEY.

SYDNEY (NEW SOUTH WALES).

LEICHBART TOWN HALL ECCLESIA.

It is with deep gratitude to our Heavenly Father that our Ecclesia of 45 to 50 members hasten to your support in your severe fight for the preservation of "The Sanctuary." From your own recent trying experience you

are in a position to judge as to the amazement and sorrow felt by all the oldest and most staunch brethren in Sydney, and who belong to our Ecclesia—at the manner in which the truth has been assailed and overthrown by one whom all the brethren had learned to respect and love; and all to uphold the unscriptural dogma—one of the last remnants of orthodoxy—"That men in Adam, under condemnation," are to be brought from under that "condemnation" to have a SECOND sentence of condemnation passed upon them, and that *without* justification from, or remission of the former sentence!

Strong efforts have lately been made in Sydney by the other Ecclesia in fellowship with us, some of the most prominent office-holders of which are not ashamed to say that they would not have embraced the truth, but through fear of the judgment-seat. How does this embody the pattern of the WILLING SERVICE in the erection of the tabernacle? A strong attempt, I say, has been made by such to induce us to take up and adopt with them Bro. Roberts' changed position—on "justification from Adamic condemnation"—"A PROCESS," and its companion theory of amenability. The magic of Bro. Roberts' name has been imported to give an impetus to the controversy. As, in your own case, even so in ours, in our stand for the truth, calumny has been heaped upon us. The truth, dear Brother, requires none of that.

Having had the questions thus forced upon us, we after four weeks' discussion in December, adopted the following two propositions, the first being carried unanimously, and the second with one dissentient.

No. 1. Resolved—That we, as an Ecclesia of Christadelphians, do re-affirm our former position in believing "that the whole human race" (both old and young) are by nature "children of wrath," alienated from God—1st, *By the condemnation passed upon all men in Adam;* and 2nd, in the case of those of mature age—by the aggravation of the same by their own wicked works—that justification from such condemnation is not a process. But, as Jesus, as "the body prepared" for the removal of the condemnation, was born under that condemnation, and in His life and death condemned sin in the flesh and became

"justified in spirit" by transformation to the spirit-nature, so a believer at the time he obeys the "truth" is legally freed from the Adamic condemnation, and receives the remission of sins. That, in his immersion he is made to endorse, and morally participate, in the condemnation of sin in the "flesh," which Jesus underwent in His death, and in this way he is made to suffer the penalty for sin. That although the believer is thus "justified," freed from condemnation in Adam, yet the physical effects arising from the condemnation remain until mortality is swallowed up of life. Those who Christ does not approve at the judgment seat shall be delivered up to death again, because of their sins and not because of Adam.

No. 2. Resolved--That, we, as an Ecclesia, deplore the action of those within the body, who are now establishing, as a basis of fellowship, the belief that it is the revealed purpose of "The Deity" to arraign the enlightened outsider before the judgment seat of Christ.

That to force the body to believe, and adopt, as a principle of "The Truth" that the Deity will "resurrect to condemnation," men who are already under eternal condemnation in Adam, under the "Law of Sin and Death," without justification from the offence which caused such condemnation, and (as contended) will hale them to "the judgment seat of Christ," which pertains solely to "the Law of the Spirit of Life," is, we consider, to repeat an egregious error committed by some of the brethren in Sydney some twelve years ago in regard to the same matter;

And, we affirm our belief "that the Scriptures do not teach that the "unjustified alien" under condemnation in Adam will be the subject of "resurrection to condemnation," notwithstanding the knowledge he may possess in reference to "the Law of the Spirit of Life."

We hope that there are some in the other Ecclesias who will refuse to follow men, and who will retain their former position in regard to "Justification from all things," in Christ Jesus, &c., and therefore make a stand with us.

With regard to the indignation expressed in *The Christadelphian* as to your allegation that Bro. Roberts' present views are (in the main) identical with "renunciationism" as expounded to-day

by George Cornish, I am able to speak with some little authority, having had lately to meet Mr. Cornish on two occasions in semi-private debate. In our discussion, the auditors were enabled to see the superiority of the "truth" over his own vain fleshly conceit. I found that, on the main points brought out in the debate on "Resurrectional Responsibility," Bro. Roberts' position and his were identical. And had I for one moment allowed Bro. Roberts' changed position to be correct, the principal part of the issue between us would have been removed. Hence the "jubilation" in the camp of these truth-nullifiers, who are now openly declaring that Bro. Roberts has changed for the better.

It is our duty to say that the faithful brethren here admire the patient, Christ-like spirit exhibited by you and your fellow-keepers of the "Sanctuary" amid the showers of abuse and misrepresentation which has been poured out upon you from such an unexpected quarter as the pages of the periodical which has until lately so long and nobly defended the truth.

We have during the past few months had our number augmented by the immersion into Christ of two daughters of Bro. and Sister Hawkins--viz., May and Sabina, Septimus Yorke, neutral, brother in the flesh to Bro. E. Young, Mr. and Mrs. Lanham (Campbellites), Mary Myles, daughter of Sister Myles, and Mrs. Fowler (Church of England).

Our lectures are being well attended, and some are evincing interest in the truth; and this controversy, in the Father's hands, has resulted in the further enlightenment of the brethren and sisters, on that phase of the "truth," which recent events have proved to have been grossly neglected even by our most prominent opponents of the truth--viz., "God-manifestation in flesh and Spirit."

We, as an Ecclesia, have been compelled, a few months ago, to withdraw from Bro. Wm. Brown, on account of him holding the "renunciationist" doctrines as taught by the late Ed. Turney.

The lectures in the immediate past have been delivered by Brethren Hawkins, Peasley, Davies, and Wyllie, and from the present will be strengthened by the assistance of our Bro. Crane.

The Sanctuary-Keeper:

A QUARTERLY MAGAZINE FOR THE EXPOSITION AND
DEFENCE OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

"Ye (Aaron and his sons) shall keep the charge of the sanctuary, and the charge of the altar."—(Num. xviii. 5.)

"Ye (brethren of Christ) are . . . an holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices." (I. Pet. ii. 5.)

"Thou hast kept My Word and hast not denied My Name."—(Rev. iii. 8.)

No. 6.

SEPTEMBER, 1895.

VOL. II.

"Tempted of the Devil."

Immediately after being baptised in the Jordan Jesus of Nazareth was "anointed with the Holy Spirit and with power" (Acts x. 38), and heard "a voice out of the heavens, saying, This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (Matt. iii. 17). Between these events there is a close relationship. Submission to the baptism of John was a practical acknowledgment by Jesus that "no man living"—Himself included—could be "justified" in God's "sight" (Ps. cxliii. 2)—that is, without an atonement or covering sacrifice. He had been justified in shadow when eight days old, and as He had kept the law His circumcision had "profited" Him. He was, indeed, the only man under the law whom it did profit; for He lived in the flesh by virtue of His obedience, without having to offer an animal sacrifice to atone for sin. And He could have continued to so live as long as He kept the Mosaic law; but He could not, on that basis, have attained to Spirit-nature, nor have been the means of its bestowal on others. He would not have become "The Resurrection and the Life" (John xi. 25) nor have been "made quickening Spirit" (I. Cor. xv. 45). He would have been simply "a grain of wheat" abiding "alone," and bringing forth no "fruit" (John xii. 24). By submitting to baptism He practically declared that He did not desire to continue such a life of isolation, but that He was willing to "die" the death of the Cross in order to bring "much fruit" to His Father in Heaven. Hence the words of Divine commendation and the bestowal of the Holy Spirit without "measure" (John iii. 34), but "with power." Though God, by His Spirit, had dwelt in Him for the previous thirty years, this indwelling had been measured by the instruction and help which He needed to keep the law, and was without the power of working miracles for Himself or for others. But, when entering on His public career as the Prophet like unto Moses it was necessary to equip Him for the arduous task; for, said God, "I will put My words in His mouth, and He shall speak unto them all that I shall command Him. And it shall come to pass that whosoever will not hearken unto My words which He shall speak in My name, I will require it of him" (Deut. xviii. 18, 19). A commission so exalted as this and fraught

with such terrible consequences to Jewish rejectors; involved some amount of demonstration that He spoke in the name of the God of Abraham. Hence the prediction of the prophet Isaiah, quoted by Jesus at the commencement of His ministry: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He anointed Me to preach good tidings to the poor. He hath sent Me to proclaim release to the captives and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord" (Luke iv. 18, 19). The object for which Jesus was "anointed with the Holy Spirit and with power" is here defined to be the proclamation of God's purpose and its attestation by miracle for the benefit of others. Such a definition is equivalent to a limitation; it excludes the exercise of Divine "power" for individual gratification. It was, apparently, for the purpose of testing this that Jesus was "led up of the Spirit into the wilderness" (Matt. iv. 1).

The primary meaning of the word rendered "tempted" is *to make proof or trial of one*. It is so used in the statement, "By faith, Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac" (Heb. xi. 17). It was evidently for a similar trying or testing that the anointed Jesus was subjected to a special conflict with "the devil."

The source of trial—*diabolos*—was that which slanders or accuses falsely. The popular view that it was a superhuman being is out of the question; and the suggestion that it was a man representing either the Romish political power or the Jewish priesthood, is deserving of little, if any more, consideration. The devil is defined to be "him that had the power of death" (Heb. ii. 14) and it is affirmed to be an element of fallen "flesh and blood." The declaration that Jesus had to partake of this nature in order to "destroy the devil," is evidence that *diabolos* was inherited by Him through His mother. "The devil" was therefore in Him, and consequently it is needless to look elsewhere for that by which He was put to the proof. This "devil" is otherwise termed "sin in the flesh" (Rom. viii. 3), or "sin that dwelleth in me" (Rom. vii. 17). To put Jesus to the proof by an element of His nature He was taken into a place of solitude, where He would be free from the influence of any other member of the race.

The conversational form in which the temptation is recorded is considered by some to be positive proof that the tempter was a person. This argument is stronger in appearance than in reality. The experience of many who, in an isolated position, have had to select one of two courses, affords evidence of one mind conversing with itself. Of this characteristic poets have largely made use under the form of soliloquy. We find it introduced also into the Psalms:—"Why art thou cast down, O, my soul? And why art thou disquieted in me? Hope thou in God: for I shall praise Him for the help of His countenance" (Ps. xlii. 5). Christ is here represented as rousing Himself from temporary depression by words of a hopeful character; the "thou" being the feeling of the flesh, and the "I" being the mind enlightened by Divine truth. The temptation in the wilderness is the same in principle, but in a more acute form; it is a mental conflict personified.

The first temptation or trial was the result of hunger. After He had "fasted forty days and forty nights . . . the tempter came to Him" (Matt. iv. 2, 3); that is, a suggestion entered His mind. The "old man" nature of which He was made said mentally, "If Thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread." He had the power; why not use it? Because the power of the Spirit was not given to Him for any such purpose. To have made stones into bread in these circumstances would have been pure selfishness; for it would not in any way have testified to others the truth of His mission: and, furthermore, it would have exhibited want of faith in God's protecting care. In giving the law to the children of Israel Moses said by God's authority, "If thou do all His commandments . . . blessed shall be thy basket and thy store" (Deut. xxviii. 1-5);

the Lord "will put none of these diseases upon thee" (Exod. xv. 26), and "ye shall prolong your days in the land" (Deut. xxxii. 47). Was He who for thirty years had kept the Mosaic law, now to act as if He did not believe those promises? Would the Father who had hitherto helped Him to keep the desires of the flesh in subjection, now forsake Him and allow disease or death to ensue for want of food? Promptly did He repel the suggestion; "It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." He might make stones into bread and so satisfy the immediate craving for food, but of what avail would this be if effected by the unlawful use of a Divine privilege? The "word" which had "proceeded out of the mouth of God" practically forbid this course, and therefore to adopt it would bring death; and if life in flesh-nature were to be lost through disobedience, life in spirit-nature would be impossible. Far better to submit to the excruciating pangs of hunger for a short time than lose both present and future life. These considerations prevailed, and a victory over the *diabolos*-nature was achieved.

"Then the devil taketh Him up into the holy city, and setteth him on a pinnacle of the temple." On the supposition that "the devil" was a personal being this statement must be interpreted literally; and this would involve the taking of Jesus to a temple-pinnacle, either willingly or unwillingly. To be taken unwillingly would require the possession by this supposed personal tempter of greater power than that bestowed upon Jesus; and to be taken willingly would imply that Jesus went in company with one whom He knew was trying to lead Him astray. Neither of these suggestions can be entertained.

The "pinnacle," turret, peak, battlement, or wing "of the temple," was evidently the highest part, and difficult of access. Every approach to the temple was most jealously guarded; no Gentile being allowed to pass the first court, and no ordinary Jew the second, under pain of death. The priests alone were permitted to enter the third; and as Jesus was not a member of the Aaronic priesthood He would be excluded. It would have been necessary in the ordinary course to pass through these courts in order to ascend one of the wings attached to the temple; but as this would constitute a violation of the Mosaic law, it is certain that Jesus would not adopt it. The only other course open was a journey through the air by miraculous power emanating either from the supposed personal tempter, or from Jesus himself. The difficulty of such a tempter possessing the power is insuperable; moreover, Jesus, by the unmeasured "power" of the Spirit could have prevented His being so dealt with. And as to Jesus conveying Himself by Spirit-power to the highest point of the temple, that would have so closely resembled the act which He was tempted to perform, as to exclude the very suggestion. These and other entanglements do not arise out of the most simple view of the matter—that Jesus through a thought of the mind was conveyed in imagination to "a pinnacle of the temple." This view also removes the difficulty of Jesus being in the wilderness and on a high point of the temple at the same time; for "He was there in the wilderness forty days, tempted of Satan; and was with the wild beasts; and the angels ministered unto Him" (Mark i. 13). The ministrations of the angels took place in the wilderness, but not until after the temptation was complete. To have literally ascended the temple would have necessitated His leaving the wilderness and His subsequent return to it; but of such a return there is no record. A literal sojourn in the wilderness and an imaginary visit to the temple exclude literal journeying.

The first temptation was based solely on the fact that Jesus was "the Son of God." The second, though including this, contained something more: If Thou be the Son of God, cast Thyself down; for it is written, He shall give His angels charge concerning Thee; and in their hands shall

they bear Thee up, lest at any time Thou dash Thy foot against a stone." To introduce this quotation from the 91st Psalm with the words, "It is written," implies a belief on the part of the speaker in the Divine Authority of the writings containing it, and the use made of it shows that its application to Jesus was fully recognised. Where was the Roman potentate or Jewish priest of whom this could then be affirmed? Even the prophet who had been preparing the way of the Messiah, had only just identified Him by the spirit descending as a dove (Jno. i. 32-34). Jesus had not commenced His ministry, and therefore no feeling for or against Him had, as yet, been excited among the people, high or low. Who was there possessed of an adverse mind toward Jesus—only just emerged from private life—who, in this short period of forty days, had so familiarised himself with the Scriptures concerning the Messiah as to be able to select this passage from Psalm xci. as a basis for leading him astray?

The only source from which such a temptation could, in the circumstances, have emanated was the mind of Jesus himself. He had been instructed during all His previous life in the many Scriptural testimonies relating to the responsible and exalted position to which He was appointed; He knew that He was the Son of God, and believed that His Father had given a special charge to angels to protect Him in all His ways. The idea of applying to this promise a practical test by means of an extraordinary act was an instantaneous thought. But no sooner did it rise than it was repelled. His familiarity with the Scriptures came to His aid, and He said mentally, "It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord Thy God." He thus gave a practical illustration of the danger of relying on an isolated passage to the exclusion of a fundamental principle set forth in another part of the Word.

In the third temptation "the devil taketh Him up into an exceeding high mountain, and sheweth Him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them" (Matt. iv. 8) "in a moment of time" (Luke iv. 5). The difficulties about a literal interpretation, already pointed out, apply with equal force to this passage. Is it compatible with the character of Jesus, for Him to take a long walk with a person whom He knew to be endeavouring to lead Him into transgression? And where is the mountain in Canaan, or even Syria, so high that "all the kingdoms of the world," as they then existed, could be seen from it? Such a view would surely include the city which at that time possessed the greatest power, viz., Rome. If, from that distance, it could then be brought within the range of human vision, how is it that it cannot now?

The expression "in a moment of time" is very suggestive. The mind is more rapid in its action than the eye, as anyone can prove by mentally reproducing any scenes which have been scanned by the visual organs. Furthermore, the mind can see that which the eye cannot. It can see the intellectual and the moral; whereas the eye sees only the material. Does the "glory" of a kingdom consist only of its buildings and their occupants? Does it not include political power, intellectual force, commercial activity and accumulated wealth? And are they not more easily grasped by thought or language than by one of the five senses? It was comparatively easy for Jesus, while still in the wilderness, to picture himself on a great eminence taking a mental survey of all the glory of the kingdoms of men "in a moment of time;" but to leave the wilderness, and personally go to the top of a literal mountain, and literally to be shown in that brief space all that is prized by monarchs and their subjects—even to the limited extent of the kingdoms in existence—would have needed a stupendous miracle on the part of "the devil"—a miracle of which there is no record, and one quite superfluous.

When Jesus had in imagination surveyed the glory of all the kingdoms of

the world. *Dibolos* said, "All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me." The fulfilment of this promise would require the exercise of a power which only one man then possessed, and that was Jesus Christ. For, by the unmeasured power of the Spirit, the Father had "given all things into His hand" (John iii 35). But how, it will be said, could He worship Himself? "His question ignores the existence in Him of a duality, viz., the old man and the new man"; a duality to be found in all who have been incorporated into the seed of the woman. The "old man" said, "I am by birth a king (Luke i. 32); I am heir to the throne of David, and through its occupancy I can obtain the possession of all Gentile thrones: have just been endowed with the power; shall I so use it?" "No," said the new man, "to do that would be to yield to the flesh, and to act contrary to My Father's will. Get thee hence Satan; for it is written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve."

To "serve" and to "worship" are, in the proposal and the refusal, used synonymously. To be mentally in subjection to anything—material or immaterial—is a species of worship; and if this be antagonistic to God it is a violation of the command, "Him only shalt thou serve." For thirty years Jesus had been fulfilling this requirement without a flaw; by the aid of His Father the desires of the flesh—although excited by the many obligations of the Mosaic law—had been kept completely in subjection; His heart had daily undergone a circumcision or cutting off of its affections for the things of the world. Was He now about to depart from this course, and allow His inherited *dibolos* to get the upper hand? The thought was the work of but an instant; and it was, doubtless, as quickly extinguished. Had He not just declared, by submitting to the baptism of John, that He was willing to undergo a sacrificial death that He and others might attain to the Spirit-nature? Had He not, by that act, in effect, said, "I come to do Thy will, O God"? And had not the taking of this vow elicited a public declaration of His Father's approval? Would He so quickly break His vow and incur Divine disapprobation? No, said He who had been trained in wisdom's ways from infancy; the love, reverence, and obedience He had hitherto shown to the Lord God should continue. And with this "the devil leaveth Him"; that is, the temporary excitation of the desires of the flesh ceased. This absence was "for a season" (Luke iv. 13). How long it lasted is not stated, but the probability is that it continued until Jesus was in the garden of Gethsemane. It was through the desire of the flesh to escape a sacrificial death that He was led to say, "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from Me." Without any apparent interval He suppressed the desire, and said, "Nevertheless, not as I will, but as Thou wilt" (Matt. xxvi. 39). The strength of His desire is measured by the fact that He uttered this prayer a "second" and even a "third time" (vers. 42-44).

When "the devil" had "departed from Him angels came and ministered unto Him." This was apparently the first Divine help received by Jesus after being taken into the wilderness. He had, for thirty years, been Divinely helped to keep in subjection the desires of the flesh; and this, with the instruction He had received, equipped Him for the severe test to which He was subjected. Having been perfectly trained in the way He should go, He had to be tried as to whether He would continue therein. The possession of the unmeasured power of the Spirit, instead of helping to overcome, was one element in the excitation of temptation. The bestowal of that power placed Him in a position by which He could immediately realise an attractive portion of His mission. Would He grasp it, or would He subordinate self in order to honour God? This was the question presented to Him, and it was all-important that it should be answered in harmony with His Father's purpose before He was allowed to proclaim that purpose to the children of Israel. It was God's plan that the preaching of His Son should be accom-

panied by the exercise of spirit-power in order to prove its Divine character; and it was therefore very fitting that before being allowed to make a public display of that power He should be privately tested as to whether He would use it for self-gratification or not. The test was very comprehensive. It embraced, in principle, all the forms of temptation to which fallen man is liable, viz., "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life" (I. John ii. 16). "The lust of the flesh" showed itself in the desire to provide for the appetite by unlawful means. "The lust of the eye" was seen in the desire to do an exceptional thing—to act as no other man could—in order to demonstrate to all Israel His Divine origin. "The pride of life" directed itself towards the acquisition of the wealth and power of the kingdoms of men. But Jesus emerged triumphantly from this three-fold test. In refusing to satisfy His hunger by making stones into bread, He showed in a practical manner that He would exercise miraculous power solely for the good of others and the glory of God; and that, although He might not have a place to lay His head, or know each morning where His day's food was to come from, He would, in faith, rely on His Father's ministrations. In resisting the suggestion to throw Himself from "a pinnacle of the temple," He declared that He would not abuse the privileged position which He occupied, and that He would carry out God's plan of making known His Messiahship to the nation of Israel. And in dismissing the thought of immediate rulership, He avowed His intention to wait until the time appointed by God for its bestowal, and His willingness to submit to a sacrificial death that the throne He had inherited might be shared by others.

The mode in which Christ was tempted is not, as thought by some, a mere matter of theory, of little or no importance. It has a practical aspect. It shows in a most conspicuous manner the deceitfulness of fallen flesh, and the constant need for all, however much they may have been favoured by God, to be on their guard against its insidious influence. "To say that "the devil" was an outside personal being, deprives the temptation in the wilderness of this lesson; and it weakens the force of the statement that Jesus Christ "was, in all points, tempted like as we are" (Heb. iv., 15). We are tempted from within as well as from without; and therefore Christ must have been; and unless we recognise this, how can we "know" Him as we ought? To describe His temptations as emanating from within, and as real as ours, is not to degrade, but to honour Him; for this was a necessary experience to fit Him for being "a merciful and faithful high-priest in things pertaining to God." The parallel is also a source of comfort; "for in that He Himself hath suffered being tempted, He is able to succour them that are tempted" (Heb. ii. 17, 18).

Another and equally important lesson to be learnt from the above event is the source from which conquest comes, viz., the Inspired Word. "It is written," constitutes the basis on which each evil suggestion is repelled. It is not in the power of untutored flesh to resist its evil desires; tho' knowledge and practical application of the written Word are essential. "Whosoever is born of God overcometh the world; and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith" (I. John v. 4). To be "born of God" is to have "His seed" in the mind (ch. iii. 9); and this seed is the incorruptible "Word of God" (I. Pet. i. 23). By this means are we required and enabled to resist the corrupting influence of "sinful flesh." There is a power in "the Word" to be found nowhere else. When rightly applied it engenders a love, faith, and hope which nothing can overcome, and which the fear of death cannot quench. Hence it is recorded of some in the fourth century who had been "born of God" that "they overcame him (i.e., the devil of Paganism) by the blood of the Lamb and by the word of their testimony: and they loved not their lives unto the death" (Rev. xii. 11).

The Sheep and the Goats.

The twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew consists of three parables, the last of which relates to "sheep" and "goats." It is introduced by the statement that "when the Son of Man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit upon the throne of His glory" (ver. 31). This "throne"—probably synonymous with the "great white throne" of Rev. xx. 11—is not necessarily His "judgment-seat" (II. Cor. v. 10). It is doubtless the throne of the millennial age to be occupied by Christ and His brethren. The Spirit sometimes gives the consummation of a scene or epoch before narrating preceding events. Christ comes for the purpose of occupying "the throne of His glory," and as a necessary preliminary there "shall be gathered before Him all nations."

To understand the word "nations" as consisting of all the inhabitants of the earth, is in harmony with the prevalent belief in universal resurrection. But a knowledge of the Kingdom of God precludes such an interpretation; it does not admit of even one nation—in the ordinary acceptation of the word—being so "gathered." Its meaning in this connection is governed by the destinies of those to whom it is applied. One section, styled "sheep," enter the kingdom; the other section, styled "goats," are consigned to "everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels." If all the Gentile nations, or even all composing Christendom, were thus dealt with, there would be no "devil and his angels," or slanderer and his messengers—i. e., the Apostacy—with whom the "goats" could be punished. There would, in fact, be no nations on the territory of the Fourth Kingdom to suffer judgments at the hands of Christ and His immortal brethren.

The word rendered "nations" (*ethne*) means "a band, company, body of men; a race, tribe; a nation, people; a particular class of men, a caste" (Liddell and Scott's Lexicon). It is applied to the heirs of Christ's kingdom: "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation." (I. Pet. ii. 9); and it is also applied to the inheritors:—"The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." (Matt. xxi. 43). In both these passages the word is evidently used in the sense of a "band, company, body of men, particular class of men, or people." The heirs of God's kingdom comprise various classes, i. e., antediluvians, patriarchs, Jews under the law, Jews and Gentiles in the apostolic and subsequent ages—all of which will be "gathered" before Christ when He comes in His glory. The baptised Gentiles in this dispensation doubtless comprise some from all the nations of the Roman habitable; and for this reason they might elliptically be described as "all nations." The word cannot be used in its most absolute and comprehensive sense; or that would involve the summons to judgment, not only of the adult members of the nations, but also of the children. The circumstances obviously require some limitation in its application, and if this be admitted it becomes only a question of extent. The statements made by the Judge to those before Him enable us to determine that limitation.

The "sheep" are commended because, in a variety of ways, they succoured Christ's brethren, and the "goats" are condemned for neglecting them. Owing to this sin of omission the "goats" are excluded from the kingdom, a circumstance which implies that if they had acted like the "sheep" they would have been admitted. What does this prove? That they had been constituted "heirs of the kingdom," but had lost it through disobedience. They could not have been heirs of eternal life as long as they were under condemnation for sin. They must therefore have been the subjects of a justification through Christ. Of no Gentile nation can this be affirmed; but of some selected from the nations it can. These, then, must constitute the companies or classes of men gathered before Christ when He "comes in His glory."

It is thought by some that the expression "My brethren," applies to a third class distinct from both "sheep" and "goats." A little reflection will show this to be impossible. All Christ's brethren, whether Jews or Gentiles, are his "sheep" at the commencement of their probation. They become Christ's "sheep" when they enter his "fold," and this is effected by their incorporation in "the Lamb that was slain" (Rev. v. 12). At this stage they are "sheep" which "hear" His "voice"; but, such as do not continue in this hearing condition lose their sheep-like character and become goat-like. Nevertheless, in name, they are still brethren of Christ. The "sheep" are faithful brethren and the "goats" unfaithful ones.

The particular point portrayed in this parable is the treatment of that portion of Christ's brethren who need moral or material succour. The "sheep" are those who supply it and the "goats" are those who do not. The fate of the poor and sick "brethren" is not represented, because the parable deals only with one feature of the Judgment scene; others are presented elsewhere. Of these some are found in the two parables constituting the previous portion of the chapter. In the parable of the "Virgins" we have depicted the distinction between those who are careful, and those who are careless about a supply of Divine "oil for their lamps." And in the parable of the "Talents" we have a picture of the degrees of "ability" or opportunity with which Christ's stewards are endowed, and the practical use made of them.

These three parables, though so diverse, have a common basis. They are all fulfilled at a time represented by the word "cometh" or "come." The "bridegroom," the "nobleman," and "the Son of Man" are but different designations for the future occupant of the Judgment-seat; and they arise from the varied character of His position. In like manner those to whom he is specially related have diverse aspects. In view of his marriage they are "virgins"; as custodians of his truth they are "servants"; and as disciples who "hear" His "voice" and "follow" Him, they are His flock. There is a specific time when this diversified relationship commences, and it is defined, in this dispensation, by baptism into His name. All who become thus united to Christ will be tested, at His return, as to their supply of Divine "oil," their use of Divine "talents," and their treatment of Christ's needy brethren. The absence of one qualification will not be neutralised by the presence of another. The intellectual apprehension of the Word of God will not make up for its practical application; neither will the visitation of Christ's "poor" and "sick" compensate for the absence of "oil." The "wise virgins" are those who are not only "filled with the knowledge of God's will" (Col. i. 9), but also "doers" thereof" (Jas. i. 22). The "servants" who are made "rulers over many things" provide "oil" for "their lamps," and at the same time "consider the poor." And the "sheep" who enter the kingdom are not characterised solely by feeding the hungry, &c.; they also keep their "lamps" trimmed and use their "talents" profitably. The same

may be said of the other aspects relating to a probationary position and the scrutiny arising out of it. Acceptance in that day is dependent on bringing forth "the fruit of the Spirit" (Gal. v. 22); practising "holiness" (Heb. xii. 14); perfecting "faith" by "works" (Jas. ii. 22); overcoming "the world" (I. John v. 4); repudiating false "doctrine" (Rev. ii. 15); keeping "garments" of righteousness clean (Rev. iii. 4); holding fast Christ's "word" (ver. 8); and being not "defiled with women"—the teaching of the Mother of Harlots and her daughters (Rev. xiv. 4), &c. A parable might have been based on each of the conditions embodied in these expressions, in which case all the aspects of the Judgment-seat would have been pictured. But this was not necessary; the presentation of a few is sufficient to enable us to imagine the rest.

It is not without significance that all the parables of Christ relating to His "judgment-seat" deal only with two classes—faithful and unfaithful. They make no provision for a third class—out of covenant-relationship. The attempt which has been made to identify such a class with the closing statement of the parable of the nobleman will not stand the test of criticism: "But those mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me" (Luke xix. 27). One who believes the kingdom of God to be synonymous with Christ's Church might be excused for saying that Gentiles who hear the Gospel and are not baptised can be described as refusing to let Christ "reign over them"; but one who believes that God's kingdom is yet future, that Christ does not occupy the position of a King to his brethren, and that His faithful disciples will reign with Him, is precluded from such an interpretation.

It is unquestionable that the Jews are the only nation who have yet said, "We will not have this man to reign over us" (Luke xix. 14). "The chief priests and Pharisees" did more than this; they said, "This is the heir; come let us kill him, and let us seize on his inheritance" (Matt. xxi. 38, 45). These, therefore, are the "enemies" of whom Christ says, "Slay them before me." To apply this passage to Gentiles who now neglect the opportunity of becoming brethren of Christ is a palpable perversion.

The suggestion that the foolish virgins represent the Apostasy is equally untenable. To be a virgin there must be an invitation to the marriage, and an acceptance thereof. Without this no one possesses a "lamp" that will burn Divine "oil;" for both "lamps" and "oil" are provided only for those within the holy place. The Apostasy outside consists truly of "women," but of a very different kind. Instead of virgins they are "harlots" (Prov. xvii. 5). Between these two kinds of symbolic women a broad gulf must be maintained. The "virgins" who fail in this, become "defiled" with the harlot-women, and are therefore not included in the number who "follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth." (Rev. xiv. 4). On the contrary, having preferred the "harlots'" wine to the "oil" of Divine truth, they are fittingly relegated to a share of the judgments to be poured on "the great whore," which has "made drunk the inhabitants of the earth." (Rev. xvii. 1-6.)

"That no man take thy crown."

These words imply that the members of "the Church in Philadelphia" were each entitled to a crown, but that there was a possibility of losing it. The sentence, when completed, indicates how the crown might be lost. "Hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown" (Rev. iii. 11.) The thing to be held "fast" is defined in a previous portion of the Epistle: "Thou hast a little strength, and hast kept My word, and hast not denied My name" (ver. 8.) The speaker being Christ, the expressions "My word" and "My name" must relate to Him. Christ's "word" is not merely that which He spake during His ministry. It embraces all that He afterwards communicated through the Apostles; for to hear His messengers was to hear Him (Luke x. 16). It also embraces the Divine truths and predictions previously spoken by the Spirit through the prophets; for Christ, having become the embodiment thereof, is now the "Word of God" (Rev. xix. 13). Hence "the word of Christ dwells richly in all wisdom" (Col. iii. 16) in those who are "filled with the knowledge of God's will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding" (Col. i. 9); and they who believe and obey all the inspired Scriptures pertaining to the present dispensation, are keeping "the Word of Christ."

The "name" of Christ is the Name of Salvation, which was given to Him as the result of His obedience to the death of the Cross (Phil. ii. 8, 9). It, therefore, represents all that is involved in His redemptive work—the death which He "abolished," and the immortality which He "brought to light"; the way in which death came and the principle on which immortality is bestowed. To embrace error in regard to any portion of this work is, to that extent, to "deny" the "name" of Christ, and thereby to jeopardise the "crown of life" to which every believer becomes entitled when baptised into that Saving Name.

During the past two or three years a number of statements have been made which seriously affect this element of Bible truth; and, believing that they have been adopted by some of Christ's brethren without due consideration, I invite all such to pause and reflect, that they may realise their danger.

You who have become "heirs" of "eternal life" (Tit. iii. 7) have been told that your "Adamic sin has yet to be paid for by" your "literal death." (*The Christadelphian*, August, 1893, p. 301). Do you believe it? If so, you ought not to hope for Christ to come during your lifetime; you ought to long for death as a necessity for your salvation. But if you did this you would transform the "one hope" into a two-fold hope, and thus nullify one of the seven elements of perfect Wisdom (Eph. iv. 4). Nay, more, you would place your own death—by disease or accident—on a par with the sacrificial death of Christ; and you would practically affirm that the death of actual transgressors was as effective to take away sin as the death of Him who resisted all temptation. If you took up this position it is difficult to see how you could logically refrain from going a step further. For if literal death could free you from Adamic sin, could it not also free those who die out of Christ? And could it not also take away your own sins? If so, you could be saved *without* the death of Christ.

You who have been "sanctified" by "the blood of the covenant" have been told that by the same blood the whole world has been brought into the position occupied by the congregation of Israel on the annual day of atonement; and that, therefore, the barrier to the resurrection of the race is now out of the way (*The Christadelphian*, May, 1894, p. 191). Do you believe it? If so, do you not see that in applying the blood of Christ to those who have not died with Him, and not even heard of Him, you are making void the distinction between "the holy and profane" (Ezek. xlv. 23)? Do you think this a light matter? If so, you would do well to call to remembrance the numerous ways in which Israel were required to distinguish between those who were "nigh" to God and those who were "far off," and the frequent reproofs and judgments sent to them for their neglect. Do you think the God of Israel is less strict now? If the perversion of enactments based upon animal sacrifices incurred His wrath, what will be the effect of misapplying the sacrifice of His Son?

You who have died with Christ (Rom. vi. 3) have been told that by His death God condemned "sin in the abstract" (*The Christadelphian*, January, 1895, p. 24). Do you believe it? If so, are you aware that you thereby reduce the sacrifice of Christ to the level of the animal sacrifices which preceded it? Were not those sacrifices defective because—among several reasons—there was no "sin in the flesh" of the animals? Was not the absence of this feature sufficient to deprive them of permanent efficiency? Did they not require to be ratified and superseded by a sacrifice which contained "sin in the flesh," in order that sin might be put away—not in shadow or "in the abstract"—but in substance?

You who have "put on Christ" (Gal. iii. 27) have been told that "the righteousness of Christ is His own and nobody else's" (*The Christadelphian*, June, 1894, p. 242). Do you believe it? If so, do you know what this involves? Was not the death of Christ the consummation of His righteousness? Was it not also a declaration of God's righteousness? And have you not by baptism into Christ's death been clothed with the righteousness of God as embodied in His Son? Are you not aware that without such investiture you could not have become "servants of righteousness"? Do you not know that as members of a "holy priesthood" (1 Pet. ii. 5) you are necessarily covered with holy priestly garments? And by whom were these provided but your priestly Head who, "through the eternal Spirit, offered Himself without spot to God"? (Heb. ix. 14). Will you repudiate a gift secured at such a cost? Will you dare to tell your Elder Brother at the Judgment-Seat that His righteousness is His own and nobody else's? If so you will, in effect, declare that you have never received a garment of righteousness which could be defiled (1 Cor. iii. 17) and then be "washed" and "made white in the blood of the Lamb" (Rev. vii. 14). To admit this would be to pronounce yourself "naked," and, as a consequence, unfit to enter the kingdom.

You who have been "bought from "the law of sin and death" by the "blood" of God's beloved Son (1 Cor. vi. 20; Rom. viii. 2; Acts xx. 28) have been told that your baptism has not freed you from Adam's sentence, but that your "patient continuance in well-doing" is necessary to the "process" (*The Christadelphian*, September, 1894, v. 347, and February, 1894, v. 71). Do you believe it? If so, are you aware that you are claiming in probationary faithfulness an efficacy which it does not possess? that you are substituting your own works, which are "unprofitable" (Luke xvii. 10) to take away sin, for that which is "precious," viz., "the blood of Christ" (1 Pet. i. 19)? Have you considered that even the life-long obedience of Christ could not deliver Him from the power of sin and death without His being offered as a sacrifice? Can you obtain by your imperfect "well-doing" that which it was not "possible" (Matt. xxvi. 32, for Christ, by a

perfect life, to secure? If you say No, you cannot but admit that your freedom from the Adamic sentence is—as was Christ's—dependent on the death of the Cross, and that if you were not so freed when baptised into His death you never can be.

Do you not see that, in denying your freedom from the death decreed for Adam's sin, you are supporting those who say that Christ was not under the Adamic sentence, or that the death of the Cross was not necessary to take it away? You may perhaps repudiate their contention, but only at the expense of self-contradiction. If you admit that Christ was born under Adamic condemnation, and that he was freed from it by his sacrificial death, you ought, if consistent, to recognise that baptism into his death frees the believer from the same condemnation. If you do not, you destroy the parallel between that death and its symbolic counterpart. You disclaim a benefit obtainable by no other means. This is a matter of paramount importance, as you may easily see on reflection. What would you say to anyone who denied the need of Christ's blood to cleanse from probationary sins? or, of one who denied that baptism into Christ would give remission of all previous wicked works? Would you admit the possibility of forgiveness in either of these cases? I trow not.

Then what is your position if you deny that you have been already justified from condemnation in Adam? To assist you in realising it, allow me to present an illustration.

Speaking parabolically, two men walking along the shore, between the sea and some very high, perpendicular cliffs, were unexpectedly hemmed in by the tide, with no prospect of escape. A very powerful man on the top of the cliffs, seeing their helpless condition, let down a rope for each, with instructions that they were to hold it tightly with both hands. One complied, and was landed in safety; but the second, thinking one hand would suffice, and that the other could be utilised in taking hold of the projecting pieces of rock, was unable to retain his grasp, and fell to the bottom.

The man who let go one hand resembles those who say that they were, by baptism into Christ, forgiven their previous "wicked works," but not justified from Adamic condemnation. They are not holding fast to that which is their only means of deliverance from the condition under which they were born, and they are substituting their own probationary "well-doing"—a flesh-pleasing idea—for the justification provided in the death of Christ.

Do you not see the erroneousness of this teaching? And will you endanger your crown by endorsing it? Will you allow anyone to rob you of "the liberty wherewith Christ hath made you free" (Gal. v. 1)? Having been made "complete" in Christ (Col. ii. 10), will you now contend that the position in which you were placed by entering His name was defective? Will you dare to "count the blood of the covenant" as superfluous in respect to inherited sin, and therefore to that extent "an unholy thing?" (Heb. x. 29). If you do, will you be allowed to sing the "new song," in which the faithful will say to the Lamb of God, "Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation" (Rev. v. 9)?

The fallacy of the foregoing quotations will be further seen by noting their mutually destructive character. If Adamic condemnation has, by the death of Christ, been taken from the race, it does not require a faithful probation or the death of the baptised believer to remove it; and if it ceases with literal death, all Christ's brethren who are in the grave—whether faithful or unfaithful—have been freed from it. If, on the other hand, it requires a faithful probation to take it away, it has not been removed from the race, and the death of the believer is powerless to nullify it.

The mutual antagonism of these several contentions does not prevent their authors working together. The reason is not difficult to see. Though at opposite poles on such a fundamental point, they are of one mind in their desire to get rid of a Bible truth. These mutually destructive statements have indeed been made public through one channel, in which even the same writer sometimes contradicts himself. Of this, an illustration is to be found in the June number. "As soon as he believes and obeys the gospel by baptism into Christ (says Dr. Welch) *the righteousness of Christ covers him as a robe*, and God looks at him through the righteousness of Christ." "When baptised into the name of Christ, our faith is counted unto us for righteousness, but if we do not from thence bring forth the fruit of a personal righteousness, *the righteousness imputed to us* by faith at the time of obedience in baptism, will avail us nothing" (p. 220).

This is very good, but what does the same writer say immediately afterwards?

"There is a *great blunder* made by some at this point in our probation, by some *who teach that Christ's righteousness is imputed to us at baptism*" (p. 220).

If "righteousness be imputed to us" at baptism, it can only be "the righteousness of Christ," which then "covers us as a robe," and consequently there can be no "blunder" in saying that "Christ's righteousness is" then "imputed to us."

What is the cause of the unscriptural statements to which attention has been called?

The repugnance of the natural mind to the humiliating truth that by being "born of the flesh," we have been "made sinners," through "the offence of one," apart from anything we may do ourselves; that for this reason there is a breach between God and men which can only be healed by sacrifice; that when the healing takes place by baptism into Christ, the condemnation for this first sin, as well as for individual sins, is removed; and that without the imputation of Christ's righteousness, acceptable personal righteousness is impossible.

"The name of the Lord" is described as "a strong tower," into which the righteous run for safety (Prov. xviii. 10); and it is typified by the cities of refuge, which provided a shelter to anyone who had killed a "person unawares" (Num. xxxv. 15), or without criminal intent. But the protection required a continued dwelling in the city during the life-time of the high priest; to leave it was to run the risk of being slain by "the avenger of blood" (vers. 26, 27). The lesson this teaches us is obvious. Having "sinned" in Adam (Rom. v. 12), but *without his moral guilt*, we were in danger of losing our life; but when we became Christ's we entered a refuge of safety, and there we are required to abide as long as He acts as our High Priest. To deny the protecting character of the Name in respect to anything for which we were once under the power of death, is analogous to the Israelite, who, after fleeing to a city of refuge, incautiously or deliberately left it? Will you adopt such a foolish course as this? If at all inclined to it, I beseech you to pause. For if you deny that from the day of entering the Name of Salvation you were protected from the power of death for your previous sins and the sin of one man, you may have your probation cut short before there is time to retrace your steps. Do not for one moment suppose that you will be able to shelter yourself behind any brother—however able, energetic, zealous, or sincere—who may have led you into a Christ-dishonouring path. Your living Head has warned you not to allow any man to induce you to deny any portion of His Name; and He has plainly told you that in so doing you jeopardise the incorruptible crown of which you have been made an heir.

Editorial Flyleaf.

We tender our thanks to all who have subscribed for the second volume of THE SANCTUARY KEEPER, and for the words of encouragement which accompanied some of the remittances. A few who recognise the importance of the work in existing circumstances have subscribed for others as well as themselves, in the hope that the unwarrantable prejudice which has been excited by misrepresentation may be removed. As an illustration of this prejudice one brother, in sending his remittance, remarks that some brethren have been threatened with disfellowship if they become subscribers. Last year some copies of *The Blood of the Covenant* were consigned by the purchasers to the flames. These are old methods of attempting to stem the progress of truth, but their success has always been but temporary. *Elpis Israel*, when first published, was, by some, put into the fire; but what is its position now? We pray that all who have opposed us may yet see the error of their way.

We have received a pamphlet entitled, "The only Blood that maketh Atonement for the Soul. An answer to J. J. Andrew's pamphlet entitled, *The Blood of the Covenant*; and a reply to an article in *The Nineteenth Century* entitled 'True and False Conceptions of the Atonement,' by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone." The author is described as "Thos. W. Good, D.D.," and it is published by John Snow and Co., 2, Ivy Lane, E.C., at sixpence. The criticism in reference to Mr. Gladstone's article is very meagre; the animadversions relating chiefly to *The Blood of the Covenant*. Though described as "a

cleverly arranged and written pamphlet," its teaching is pronounced "blasphemous." This is easily understood when it is known that the author upholds the Renunciationist contention, as shown by the following extracts:— "The life that Jesus possessed He obtained direct from God, and therefore He was not subject to the common fate of the human race. Jesus is born free. He is not under condemnation. Men die because it is the common lot of the animal creation to die. Death existed in the world long before the first man made his appearance. Adam's descendants . . . cannot rightly be said to be condemned, for they never had any law given them, and never any trial. The sin which is the transgression of some known law of God is the kind of sin atoned for by the death of Jesus. The doctrine that the death of Christ in any way atoned for the sinful flesh possessed by Himself and others is unscriptural. It is a mistake to connect the death of Jesus with the Adamic penalty at all."

Some of these statements, it will be observed, are in harmony with arguments recently used by certain Christadelphians. We do not purpose to reply to them because their substance has been already dealt with in this and previous numbers of THE SANCTUARY KEEPER. There is a little mystery about the title "D.D." appended to our critic's name. It is very unusual to find Doctors of Divinity believing in the return of Jesus to establish a kingdom on the earth as a necessary fulfilment of the promise made to Abraham, and condemning "the doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul as the great SATAN to the human race." If anyone, who

obtained this theological degree were afterwards to come to a knowledge of the Truth—even in a defective form—he would surely be glad to drop such a defiling rag of the Apostasy, that he might not even appear to be sailing under false colours. Perhaps this bearer of the title is identical with a leading member of the small Renunciationist community in South London. If so, it will account for the familiar way in which he speaks of “the controversy between Turney and Roberts.”

The recent change of government in Britain is remarkable for its suddenness; for its proximate cause—the supply of smokeless powder; and for its overwhelming confirmation by an appeal to the electorate. A majority of 162 has not been enjoyed by any party in power for the last half-century. In view of the foreign problems looming in the near future this is a notable sign of the times. A strong government at this juncture befits the isolated position which Britain is destined to occupy in the conflict pertaining to the re-establishment of the throne of David. Turkey is evidently ripe for a further reduction of territory, if not for a complete collapse; and France is doing its best to secure the co-operation of Russia to put an end to the British occupation of Egypt. The East may soon be aflame with events calling forth the military and naval resources of modern Tarshish to maintain her highway to India and aid the persecuted Jew to obtain possession of his own land. A government unhampered by pledges on domestic matters, and giving Imperial interests a first place, is better able than any other to cope with such difficulties.

The Christadelphian Advocate for August devotes several pages to mat-

ters relating to the recent controversy. Under the heading, “In Adam and in Christ,” the editor replies to some of the contradictory statements recently made in *The Christadelphian*, and very justly complains of the way in which, by implication, his and our belief is perverted. In another article, entitled “Is Christ Divided?” Bro. Williams points out the danger of using the names of brethren, however gifted and respected, in support of any belief, for its tendency is to reproduce that condition of the Corinthian ecclesia represented by the words, “I am of Paul, and I am of Apollos, and I of Cephas.” Whatever be the subject under discussion, “let the law and the testimony,” he concludes, “be our authority, free from the influence of any man.” In a third article the Editor points out that the author of *Twelve Lectures* once believed that “no one became responsible to a resurrection of condemnation in pre-Noahic times,” and that, in *Christendom Astray*, this was altered into “few.” “But,” he adds, “as the author declares that he has not changed a hair’s breadth, we may conclude that the meaning is the same, whether we read *no one* or *few*.” A brother at New Orleans writes to Bro. Williams, under date May 19th, to say that heretofore he has “always believed that enlightenment would bring all to a resurrection to judgment, whether they obeyed the commandments or no;” but that, having read and re-read all that has appeared in print on the late controversy, he has to admit that the author of *The Blood of the Covenant* “has been misrepresented and not treated fairly,” and he is “almost fully convinced” that the conclusion presented in that pamphlet “is right.” Would that many others, for their own sakes, were to give the subject the same impartial consideration.

Things New and Old.—No. 5.

"WHATSOEVER" AND "IF."

The Apostle Paul, in that beautiful letter imparting sound doctrinal wisdom, combined with loving exhortation to his brethren at Philippi, sums up his injunctions in the 8th ver. of ch. iv: "Finally, brethren, *whatsoever* things are true, *whatsoever* things are honest, (margin venerable), *whatsoever* things are just, *whatsoever* things are pure, *whatsoever* things are lovely, *whatsoever* things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things."

Verily, brethren, here is expressed a rich profundity of thought for reflection, and if we so engage the mind we cannot fail in its adornment and consequent greater holiness of life—which must be pleasing to the Father and to Christ.

"Whatsoever things are true." Now we know that God is *true*, for we believe the record which His servant Jeremiah gave concerning Him:—"But the Lord is the *True God*, He is the living God, and an everlasting King" (Jer. x. 10). Likewise, Jesus says, "This is life, eternal to know Thee, the *only true God*," &c. (Jno. xvii. 3). The supremacy of God is one of the most prominent features of the Bible, acknowledged by each and all His servants, and so grandly expressed always by the Son, who was not only the Father's "polished shaft" but a *veritable manifestation* of the Father in our nature—"Emanuel," or God with us. How exhilarating, therefore, to realise that the "*Root and Offspring of David*" is shadowed forth by these true words:—"And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots. And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom

and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord" (Isa. xi. 1, 2). Herein is expressed a true descent—God, the primary Root, taking hold of a branch of David; "Concerning his Son Jesus Christ, *our Lord*, which was made out of (of) the Seed of David according to the flesh;" . . . (Rom. i. 3; Gal. iv. 4). It is interesting to note that Ruth, the mother of Obed, the father of Jesse, the father of David, was a Moabitess—thus precluding the flesh from having any superiority in the case of Christ. It is *true* that "God hath chosen the foolish things of the world, to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world, to confound the things which are mighty; . . . that no *flesh* should glory in his presence" (1 Cor. i. 27-29). And saith the Apostle, "Yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we Him no more" (II. Cor. x. 16). No, for this self-same Son had then passed the time of his flesh spotless in character, had passed the anointing and had become "the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of Holiness, by the resurrection from the dead" (Rom. i. 4). And so the Apostle in this beautiful Epistle to his brethren at Philippi pointing to the consolation in Christ did say, "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus; Who being in the form of God thought it not robbery (or did not covet) 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 (or habit) and being found in fashion as a man, He *humbled* Himself and became

obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name" (Phil. ii. 5-9). That name will be seen by those who will have "overcome," and it will appear both on His vesture and on His thigh written in glorious characters, "KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS" (Rev. xix. 16). To behold such, will be to "see the King in His beauty" (Isa. xxxiii. 17). Thus there will be many Sons all of One, that is God, by and through their relationship to the One Well-beloved Son in Whom the Father was well pleased, and a rich song will be heard in that day by them proceeding from the mouths of the elders saying, "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power: for Thou hast created all things, and for Thy pleasure they are and were created" (Rev. iv. 11). God is true, then, dear brethren, and everything which comes from Him must be true. It is true that He has made bare His arm; that arm was His Son Jesus Christ, in and through Whom He manifested Himself for our salvation. We have been *drawn* by "the true sayings of God" (Rev. xix. 9) to enter "the true tabernacle" (Heb. viii. 2), and eat "the true bread" (Jno. vi. 32). We have been united to "the true vine" (Jno. xv. 1), and are "in Him that is true" (1. J. o. v. 20). We have been created "*new creatures*" in Christ; and we shall be created immortal creatures or "*fashioned like unto His glorious body*, according to the working whereby He is able even to subdue all things unto Himself" (Phil. iii. 21), if we mortify the members of our body and overcome and add to our faith those seven excellent "*things*" enumerated by the Apostle (11. Pet. i. 5-7). For true indeed is the promise associated therewith, viz., "for if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . for if ye do these things,

ye shall never fall: for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" (8-11 verses). God's Word is true, and I shall later on, in writing on "*Whatsoever things are pure*," enter more fully into it; I will, therefore, content myself with here quoting the latter part of the 2nd verse of the 138th Ps.: "For thou hast magnified Thy word above all Thy Name!" Brethren, if God reveals His mind to us as to the estimation He has of His word, both now and when it is fully magnified—as it will be in the day to which reference has been made—should it not be our delight in this, our day of probation, to know that word more and more? Should we not "*think*" more and more about it, seeing that it is the source of our "*knowledge*," and our pathway to "*virtue*" and "*Godliness*"? Yes, brethren, to do this would be to carry out the exhortation of "*Whatsoever things are honest (or venerable)*," for truly the Word of God is worthy of our highest veneration or reverence, and of our honour and respect; sacred as coming from Himself; spoken "*at sundry times and in divers manners unto the fathers by the prophets, and in the last days (of the Jewish commonwealth) by His Son.*" (Heb. i. 1, 2).

"*Whatsoever things are just.*" Back to God and Jesus Christ must our minds recur when we would go to the root of all that is just. Faith, which is the assent of our mind to the truths revealed by God, leads us to realise that "now the righteousness of God without the law (Mosaic) is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets, even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all (the Jews), and upon all (the Gentiles) that believe; for there is no difference, for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God, being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith

in His blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time His righteousness (exhibited in and by Christ) that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." (Rom. iii. 21-26). Thus we see a perfect blending of God's justice and righteousness in Jesus Christ. Think of and be grateful for the extended forbearance of God, whereby, through faith, we have become justified ones, we who were "without strength," "enemies to God," have become reconciled to God by the death of His Son. Yea, saith the Apostle, "much more, being reconciled we shall be saved by His life; and not only so, but we joy in God, through Our Lord Jesus Christ, by Whom we have now received the atonement." (Rom. v. 10, 11). To God be the glory and praise for His justness and righteousness, and to Jesus Christ for His love, suffering, and righteousness, even unto the death of the Cross, whereby we might be saved and clothed with His righteousness.

"*Whatever things are pure.*" It is written in the 12th Psalm, 6th ver.,

The words of the Lord are pure words; as silver tried in a furnace of earth purified seven times." It is no wonder, brethren, that we should be asked to think on God's Word when such a comparison is made as to its purity. Silver seven times thus treated would contain no dross, neither "do the words of the Lord"; moreover, God has, according to his promise, kept them from (or by) "this generation (of Jews) for ever." (7th ver.). Had He not done so there would have been no purity in the world; the world owes what purity it possesses to "the words of the Lord." The true servants of the Lord love it, and have always done so. Psalm cxix. 140: "Thy Word is very pure; therefore thy servant loveth it." It is by the Word that, "of His own will begat He us" (Jas. i. 18); and our bodies have been washed with pure water (Heb. x.

22)—a peculiar expression; but when its relationship to the Word and Commandment of God is considered we behold its force and beauty. Wisdom has been listened to by "her children," she hath not cried in vain; we have understood the words "Unto you, O men, I call; and my voice is to the sons of men. O ye simple, understand wisdom, and ye fools, be ye of an understanding heart. Hear, for I will speak of excellent things, and the opening of my lips shall be right things. For my mouth shall speak truth, and wickedness is an abomination to my lips. 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" (Prov. viii. 4-9). By the grace of God is this caused; and we learned that "to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams," and also that there was no approach unto God except by sacrifice and priesthood. Christ has become both for us, and He is the word made flesh; He is pure and holy. Let us consider Him more, brethren.

"*Whatever things are lovely.*" Here character in the matter of deed more than expression is enjoined as a matter for our thoughts. There are not wanting in the Scriptures notable examples of a line of conduct which is lovely to behold; look at that beautiful and touching incident in the lives of David and Jonathan, as narrated in 1. Samuel xx.; and this even when the loss of a kingdom was involved to one of the twain. That bond of love and fidelity might with advantage to many of us be emulated. Coming down to the time of Jesus, we cannot read that shortest of all verses in the Word, "Jesus wept," without being filled with the deep sense of the loveliness of Christ's character. That all Israel have not been so is fully shown us by these words: "Also thou Son of Man, the children of Thy people still are talking against Thee by the walls and in

the doors of the houses, and speak one to another, everyone to his brother, saying, Come, I pray you, hear what is the word that cometh forth of the Lord; and they come unto thee as the people cometh, and they sit before thee as my people, and they hear thy words, but they will not do them: for with their mouth they show much love, but their hearts goeth after their covetousness. And, lo, thou art unto them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice . . . for they hear thy words but they do them not. And when this cometh to pass (lo! it will come) then shall they know that a prophet hath been among them" (Ezk. xxxiii. 30-33). Brethren let us hear and do, so that we may be classed with Him that "walketh uprightly" remembering that such "shall be saved" (Prov. xxviii. 18).

"Whatsoever things are of good report."

There are those who find time for many things of an unprofitable nature, but who devote little time to the application of the mind to those abounding "good reports" which the Truth furnishes. In this they are not wise. "Who hath believed our report?" says Isaiah, "and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed?" (Isa. liii. 1). It was a "good report" which was made to the Serpent: "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." The Serpent had expressly contradicted what God had told Adam as to the effect of his eating of the forbidden tree. God said Adam would die; the Serpent said, "Ye shall not surely die." The lie was believed, and has prevailed. Nevertheless God made provision for a conquering power which should prevail in a "mighty" sense; that power referred to was Christ; the "good report in Eden" was the foundation upon which God's love and purpose should be made effectual in delivering from the dead condition all who should be connected with God in relation thereto.

In an admirable "good report" of the words of Jesus Christ, "Let the dead bury their dead," Bro. Roberts, in *Nazareth Revisited*, p. 94, says: "It will not seem unfeeling to those who have learnt to estimate things as Jesus estimated them—and that is according to the standard of eternal truth. The whole race of man without God are "the dead" in a sense easy to understand when the supposition of "human immortality is dismissed, and the Bible doctrine of the reign of death by sin accepted. The whole race is under sentence of death. Death is only a question of time . . . Now, where men have no connection with God it is impossible that the death-state can be changed. Continuing in alienation from Him, they are "the dead," in contrast to that section of them who have the "promise of life which is in Christ Jesus" (II. Tim. i. 1). Their burial is, therefore, from Christ's point of view, a very insignificant affair, and not to be allowed to come at all into collision with "affairs connected with the great and stirring hope and work of life which he, and he alone, has in hand." That believers pass from the death-state when they enter into Christ at their Baptism is a "good report" which cannot be gainsaid:—"And you hath He quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins" (Eph. ii. 1). "At that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world, but now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ"—(verses 12, 13). Again, "if any man be in Christ he is a new creature, old things are passed away; behold all things are become new" (II. Cor. v. 17).

It was a "good report" that was made to Abraham concerning the land. It was "a good report" that was made to David concerning the Throne. It was a "good report" that was made to Daniel (amongst others):—"But go thou

thy way till the end be, for thou shalt rest and stand in thy lot at the end of the days" (Dan. xii. 13). Finally, it is a "good report" which saith, "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last." "Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gate into the city." These are illustrations of the "good report" that "maketh the bones fat" (Prov. xv. 30); and such as have believed are said to have obtained a "good report" (Heb. xi. 2, 39).

"If there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things." It was not that the Apostle did not recognise that both virtue and praise existed, for probably there was no man that had received such striking evidence of the virtue of a changed relationship to Christ than he, and none more willing to render praise; but, I think, the little *ifs* are here put to arouse in Christ's brethren an attitude of reflection. There will be found much virtue in patiently and thoughtfully considering the words of the Apostle, not only in the Epistle referred to, but in all the epistles, as he was preëminently the Apostle to the Gentiles—not that any portion of the Word is to be neglected; by no means. But as he tells us, "For I speak unto you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office" (Rom. xi. 13). The Jews were all along the line more or less acquainted with the "virtue" of the various washings enjoined under the law; which washings no doubt shadowed forth the "Baptism" of which we have been made partners. We have no record that either John the Baptist or Peter the Apostle entered so minutely as the Apostle Paul, who left no doubt as to the virtue of an act, unwisely, in these later days, referred to

as a "mechanical justification," even by brethren. Considering the Divinely-inspired language by which it is described:—"Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death; THAT like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been PLANTED together in the likeness of his death we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." (Rom. vi. 3-5.) It would be just as unwise to speak of "mechanical" resurrection as it is to apply such an irreverent term to a beautiful ordinance of God, and one so full of virtue to the man who responds to the same in a believing and childlike manner. This "planting" and "burying" is worthy of our highest appreciation, brethren; "think on these things." When we do so, our "praise" will be of God. Let us ever be ready to offer praise. Yea, as the Apostle says, "By him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually—that is, the fruit of our lips giving thanks to His Name" (Heb. xiii. 15).

"Fountain of Being! Source of Good!
Immutable dost thou remain;
Nor can the shadow of a change
Obscure the glories of Thy reign.

"Jesus lives! henceforth is death;
But a Sleep with glorious waking;
This shall calm our trembling breath
In the hour of last leave-taking."

"Praise the Lord, O my soul; while I live I will praise the Lord. Yea, as long as I have any being will I sing praise unto my God" (Ps. cxlvi. 1, 2).

W. WHITEHEAD.

New Romney.

Passing Shots.

The first of these is from "P. R.," and consists of an article in the July *Christadelphian* (p. 259), entitled "A Reply to Sin and its Removal." The quotations it gives are chiefly from writings on the Scriptures, not from the Scriptures themselves; and, therefore, although a "reply" it lacks the very foundation for refutation. He adduces a few quotations from Dr. Thomas for the purpose of showing that I am not in harmony with the doctor on condemnation for sin; but in this he fails. One quotation states that infants have not "committed sin" and are "not responsible for Adam's sin." I have not affirmed that they are. What I have said is that they sinned in Adam in a federal or constitutional sense, as Levi paid tithes in Abraham; and this is what Dr. Thomas taught, as the quotations I have given from his writings abundantly show. I have also said that Christ by His death suffered the disfavour due to His nature; and so Dr. Thomas taught.

"P. R." ignores the fact to which I pointed, that Renunciationism, like the Romish Church, attributed moral guilt to infants, and that this has to be taken into account in considering some of the statements made in the controversy of 1873-4.

"P. R." quotes a definition of sin in the flesh written by me in 1874, and says that if I still adhere to it he is at one with me on this point. Certainly, I adhere to it; I have written nothing the last three years at variance with it. I will, however, put it into a more concise form:—Sin in the flesh is the lust or evil desire which resulted from Adam's eating the forbidden tree.

A quotation is given from *Elpis Israel* (p. 115) condemning as "foolishness" the teaching of some that baptismal regeneration "neutralises" sin in the flesh. This has no application to me; for I have not endorsed such teaching. What I have said is, that sin in the flesh, by baptism into Christ, is the subject of a justification; i.e., that it

undergoes a change of relationship, the disfavour previously resting upon it being then taken away.

"P. R." takes no notice of Dr. Thomas's statements—to which I have called attention—that at baptism a believer "passes from under the sentence of death, and . . . comes under the sentence of life;" and that "the writing of death against the saints" (just and unjust) has, by Christ's death, "been crossed or blotted out." What is this but the removal of a condemnation resulting from Adam's sin?

"P. R." calls attention to an inadvertence—for which I apologise—in quoting one passage from the December *Christadelphian*, 1894, which is in itself a quotation from 1873. He then gives a partial quotation of my statement about Bro. Roberts, during the Renunciation controversy, making an admission which constituted the "surrender of a citadel to the enemy." And on this he bases an accusation of misrepresentation. To this I plead not guilty. The expression "surrendering a citadel" had reference to Bro. Roberts yielding a part of his own contention. He had from the beginning of the controversy shown that Christ's death was an act of Divine justice; and on one occasion he set it forth in large capital letters (1873, p. 398). This contention clearly involved the necessity of Christ dying the death of the Cross, and this was, in effect, embodied in certain statements that Christ required to be cleansed by bloodshedding (1873, pages 466, 468). This was the "position" which Bro. Roberts (as well as others) then took up. When, therefore, he admitted that an ordinary death might have sufficed for Christ except as the Saviour for others, he was clearly weakening his own position; and it was to this inconsistency I called attention.

"P. R." writes as if I had said that the shedding of blood for Christ Himself was the sole point involved in the Renunciation controversy. I have not done so, and if he had quoted what

wrote this would have been seen. I was dealing with "Bro. Roberts' contention in the debate that Adam's descendants do not come under condemnation until they individually commit sin." I then said, "If this had been the belief of Christadelphians in 1873 there would have been no Renunciationist controversy."

In referring to an article of mine in *The Christadelphian* for 1876, "P. R." says that I then denied that the expression "sinners" as applied to Adam's descendants implied guilt without introducing any legal saving clause (p. 62). Why? Because the circumstances did not need it. For the argument antagonised was that Adam's descendants shared his moral guilt. This is shown by the previous part of the article, in which I said, "Though Adam committed an unrighteous act, deserving of moral reprobation, it is not necessary that his descendants be charged on that account with moral guilt. They were in Adam's loins when he sinned, as Levi was in the loins of Abraham when paying tithes. Adam's sin defined their position in the sight of God; it did not attribute to them his moral guilt; otherwise they would all be called to account as he was, at the bar of God, for partaking of the forbidden fruit" (p. 58). This statement, which "P. R." ignores, obviously governs what follows, and it is in perfect harmony with what I have written during the last three years.

In discussing the question as to whether Christ, by reason of his birth, required a justification by blood-shedding, "P. R." asks the question, "Why was it necessary for sin to be condemned in sinful flesh innocent of transgression?" To say that it was because "God willed it" is one answer; but it is possible to go deeper. Why did God will it? Because he had given a law, and that law had been broken; because sin in the flesh was the result of that broken law; and because God's word must be vindicated by the infliction of the penalty incurred by breaking His law.

In concluding, "P. R." sets forth five propositions, one of which is as follows: "Christ required redemption from Adamic nature equally with his brethren, and the mode of redemption which God had ordained was a perfect obedience, culminating in a sacrificial death." This is true; it embodies the substance of my contention. If redemption from

the Adamic nature required a sacrificial death for Christ, it must be equally necessary for other sons of Adam; and if that sacrifice takes away the wrath incurred by actual transgression, it must have a similar effect in respect to the sin nature. And as that effect is produced in the one case by a burial with Christ, it must be also in the other. This reasoning is invulnerable, and it is amply supported by Scriptural testimony. Indeed, to teach otherwise is to detract from the efficacy of baptism, and of the death which it symbolises.

"P. R." appears to have constituted himself the champion of editorial consistency, but the principal result of his labour thus far is to bring into prominence the inconsistencies of twenty years ago. To fulfil his self-appointed task in a workmanlike manner, he must deal with the subject much more comprehensively. Let him show that the Editor's statements in the Responsibility Debate, to which I have more than once called attention, are in harmony with his contention twenty years ago that the death Christ underwent was necessitated by justice; that they agree with the numerous quotations I have given from Dr. Thomas's writings; that they are in accord with his own pamphlet entitled *The Blood of Christ*, and with mine entitled *The Doctrine of the Atonement*, which he endorsed. Let "P. R." then reconcile the many conflicting statements by the Editor and his contributors in *The Christadelphian* for 1893-5. And, lastly, let him explain how it is that recent editorial utterances have been applauded by those who have adopted Renunciationist views in whole or in part. Until he has accomplished all this, his well-meant, but mistaken advocacy, must be pronounced a failure.

The second passing shot is from Bro. Lake, who says that "Man needs justification by the sacrifice of Christ because he is a sinner, and not because God has imputed to him the 'legal' liability of the sin of Adam." (*July Christadelphian*, p. 274). If by this he means that men only need sacrifice for what they have done, he is teaching that Christ did not need a sacrifice for what he inherited from Adam. He deems it "awful to say that the wrath of God abides upon every child of the flesh because of that" legal liability. So also does that section of the religious world which rejects

Christ's death as a sacrifice for sin; to deny the need of blood-shedding for Adam's "offence" is one step towards denying it for the offences of his descendants. "The matter is made worse," says Bro. Lake, "by the declaration that men 'have no moral guilt' as to the offence of Adam, only a 'legal' one." On what ground? Because there is no testimony that all men "sinned" in Adam as Levi paid tithes in Abraham (Rom. v. 12; Heb. vii. 9)? Not at all. The reason given is this:—"It suggests that God's wrath abode upon Christ because of this 'legal' or imaginary guilt, and could be assuaged only by his agonising death!" The objection to God's wrath being in any way on infants, including Mary's babe, is an illustration of the ease with which some men are frightened by a word. They appear to forget that the word "wrath," like the word "favour," has different degrees. Both, are, in some things, confined to this side the grave, but in others they extend beyond resurrection. The wrath of God at the destruction of Jerusalem is not the same as the wrath under which all men are born. The wrath on a rebellious people, when it had once commenced, could not be averted; not so with the wrath arising out of Adam's offence. It was for the purpose of providing the means to remove it that God took one who was in the same relationship to Adam as the rest of the race, and developed in Him a righteousness which justly admitted the favour of eternal life being exchanged for the wrath of endless death. Where the righteousness of Christ does not operate, the result is obvious—death for ever. This could not be if there were no sin. It matters not who committed the sin; the death arising from it is a punishment. And how could there be punishment without Divine wrath or disfavour? To admit condemnation for Adam's offence, and to deny that it involves wrath is to ignore the elementary meaning of the words.

"There is no such thing in the Scriptures (says our critic) as 'expiation' for sin." The word "expiation" does not occur in the English version, but "propitiation" does; probably, therefore, the latter word is meant. It occurs in two passages, viz., Rom. iii. 25 and 1 Jno. ii. 2; and its Greek original is defined as follows:—"Propitiatory, an expiatory sacrifice" (Liddell and

Scott's Lexicon). It is rendered "Mercy-seat" in Heb. ix. 5, and it doubtless has the same meaning in Paul's and John's Epistles. But does this prove that the Mosaic Mercy-seat did not involve the idea of expiation or propitiation? If so, why was it not the means of substituting favour for wrath without blood-shedding (Lev. xvi. 14)? The offering of sacrifice is called "an atonement" (vers. 11, 34)—a word used in connection with the Mosaic law upwards of forty times—and its effect is defined as forgiveness of sin (Lev. iv. 13-20). If it be admitted that sin produces Divine wrath, it cannot be denied that forgiveness involves the removal of that wrath; and if it be further admitted that death is the punishment due for sin, it must be obvious that the forgiveness which results from a sacrificial death is due to an expiation of the sin. And yet we are told by Bro. Lake that "God does not, and never has, desired that His wrath should be averted by suffering." If by this he means "suffering" apart from anything else he is fighting a shadow; no one has affirmed it. But if he mean that wrath for sin can be averted without suffering, he is, in effect, eliminating from the Scriptures all the expressions, "Lamb slain," "shedding of blood," "sacrifice for sin," and their synonyms, such as "Christ suffered for us" (1 Pet. ii. 21), "Christ hath once suffered for sins" (ch. iii. 18), "Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh" (ch. iv. 1), "He must suffer many things" (Matt. xvi. 21), "We see Jesus who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death" (Heb. ii. 9), "Thus it behoved Christ to suffer" (Luke xxiv. 46), "Christ must needs have suffered" (Acts xvii. 3). The words "must," "behoved," and "must needs" prove that the object effected by the suffering—the taking away of the wrath and punishment arising from sin—could not have been achieved without it. My opponent's contention implies that it could. In contrast to what he condemns, he says "God does not desire the death of a sinner, but rather that he may turn from his wickedness and live." If these words are quoted to prove that no wrath rests upon Adam's descendants because of their sin-nature, they go further, and prove that there is no wrath for their individual "wickedness."

Echoing the language of another, Bro. Lake describes justification from Adam's

sin by means of baptism into Christ as a "mechanical justification." The fellowship test in the Inspiration controversy was described as a "mechanical" one, and now some of those who took a leading part in it are not ashamed to apply the same term to Bible teaching on baptism. But such an epithet—the mere expression of irreverence—is no refutation. It was very "mechanical" for Noah to make an ark, and then walk into it; and yet it saved his life. It was very "mechanical" for the Israelites in Egypt to "take of the blood and strike it on the two side-posts and the upper door-post of the house;" and yet it saved the lives of their first-born. It was very "mechanical" for Aaron to "take a censer, and put fire therein from off the altar, and put on incense, and go quickly into the congregation;" and yet it stopped the plague which the "wrath" of God had inflicted for sin. (Num. xvi. 46-48). It was very "mechanical" for Israelites to look at a brazen serpent; and yet it stopped the deadly effects of real serpents. It was very "mechanical" for Naaman to "wash in Jordan seven times;" and yet it cured him of his leprosy. It will doubtless be said that all these things required something more than "mechanical" action. Quite true; and so does baptism. It embraces the repudiation of the fables of the Apostasy, the intelligent belief of the things concerning Christ's Kingdom and name, a personal identification with the sacrifice

of Christ, a voluntary death to sin and birth to righteousness—a putting off of "the old man and his deeds," and a putting on of the new man. And yet a ceremony involving all this is described as a "mechanical justification." If "mechanical" for sin inherited from Adam it must be "mechanical" for individual "wicked works." Students of natural history tell us that "no bird fouls its own nest;" but some of Christ's sheep do not hesitate to impugn the security of the door by which they entered his fold.

Bro. Lake says, "It is a mistake to suppose that in London the division was caused by the doctrine of non-responsibility." Then why was this doctrine specified as the reason for withdrawal in his original letter of indictment, and in the resolutions and circulars issued both in North and South London? Why were we constantly accused of denying the basis of fellowship on this point? And why was non-resurrection out of Christ denounced as a "heresy," the belief of which would bring condemnation at the judgment-seat? In the face of these facts the above disclaimer is virtually an admission of having said one thing and meant another. If some who withdrew from us are beginning to be ashamed of their action, their best course is to say so; but let them not cover it by statements which, if true, would involve discreditable conduct.

J. J. A.

Things Hard to be Understood.

3.—SINS GOING BEFORE TO JUDGMENT.

1 Tim. v. 24. *What does this verse mean?*—P.

In the Revised Version it reads as follows:—"Some men's sins are evident, going before unto judgment; and some men also they follow after." That is, some men sin openly, so that their condemnation is foreseen by others. Such is the case with a brother who becomes a drunkard, or one who neglects the Truth in order to make money. Whereas the sins of some are hidden from the eye

of man, though seen by God. Thus a brother may harbour "envy" or "hatred" without showing it openly; or he may practise deceit. In such cases the "sins" are not "evident" to the brotherhood, and may therefore be said to "follow after" those who commit them. The succeeding verse, which deals with the opposite class, has a parallel meaning: "In like manner, also, there are good works that are evident; and such as are otherwise cannot be hid." The "good works" of some brethren are conspicuous to these

around, but the "good works" of some are "otherwise"—that is, hidden from sight, though done in secret—on the principle of not letting the left hand know what the right hand doeth—they cannot permanently be "hid;" "for there is nothing covered that shall not be revealed; and hid that shall not be "known" in the day when the Lord "will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and make manifest the counsels of the hearts" (Matt. x. 26; 1 Cor. iv. 5).

24.—THE WICKED RESERVED FOR RETRIBUTION.

Job xxi. 30. To whom does this verse refer?—P.

The "wicked" who are "reserved to the day of destruction" to "be brought forth to the day of wrath," are those wicked who are responsible to the future judgment-seat. Who these are the passage does not say; this must be ascertained from the Scriptural testimony dealing with resurrection to judgment. The verse has been adduced to support resurrection of "enlightened rejectors," but it is no more proof of this than of universal resurrection. All men out of Christ are wicked in the sight of God; in the Scriptures the word is not always used in this comprehensive sense. It sometimes refers to the unfaithful in covenant with God:—"The wicked that forsake Thy law" (Ps. cxix. 53); "The wicked bend their bow . . . that they may privily shoot at the upright in heart" (Ps. xi. 2); "A wicked generation seeketh after a sign" (Matt. xvi. 4); "Thou wicked servant" (Matt. xviii. 32); "By wicked hands have ye slain him" (Acts ii. 23); "Put away that wicked person" (1 Cor. v. 13). There were wicked ones of this class in the days of Job; his Satan, or adversary, was one of them. By means of the sacrifices then offered (Job. i. 5), Job and others were reconciled to God; and such as did not continue faithful were "wicked."

25.—GOD'S REVEALED WRATH.

Is the Wrath of God revealed against men because Adam sinned?

The purport of this question depends on what is meant by "the wrath of God revealed." As used in Rom. i. 18, it relates to judgments in this life for the wickedness of Adam's descendants; of

which the Deluge, the burning of Sodom and Gomorrah, &c., are illustrations. But there is wrath of another kind—the result of Adam's sin. The cursing of the ground (Gen. iii. 17), is an expression of this wrath; it is also exhibited in the droughts, storms, malevolent animalculæ, and unpropitious seasons, which mar man's labours. When the curse on the ground is removed, and all families of the earth are blessed, these evils will cease. They are the result of sin, and therefore inflicted in wrath. But there are also, for the wickedness of men, wars, pestilences, commercial dislocations, political upheavals, &c. In this way "God judgeth them that are without."

26.—THE LIFE TO WHICH THE LAW WAS ORDAINED.

Was the law ordained to life eternal? If not, what did Paul mean when he said he found it unto death?

The law was not ordained unto eternal life: "For if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law" (Gal. iii. 21). The "life" unto which it was "ordained" (Rom. vii. 10), was life in the flesh, in the land of promise. Paul "found" the law to be "unto death" because he could not keep it. All under the law, except Christ, committed sin; and they could not be made "perfect"—that is, freed from the power of sin—by animal "sacrifices" (Heb. x. 1, 4). This required "the offering of the body of Jesus Christ" (ver. 10). But, as he kept the law perfectly, could he not have obtained eternal life without this "offering"? No; because he inherited a "body of sin" (Rom. vi. 6), which required the atonement of a perfect sacrifice.

27.—THE LIFE PROMISED TO THE LAWYER.

If Christ, when He said, "This do and thou shalt live" (Luke x. 28), did not mean live for ever, did He not evade the lawyer's question?

Christ did "mean live for ever"; but He did not say that this would result from the lawyer henceforth keeping perfectly the Mosaic law. He said, "What is written in the law? how readest thou?" And the lawyer, in reply, quoted from Deut. vi. 5:—"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy

heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself." This is a comprehensive statement, and it is necessary to consider what it embodies. Could it be fulfilled by merely obeying the law without regard to the Abrahamic covenant? Clearly not; for conformity to that covenant is a necessary part of whole-hearted love for God: indeed without the faith of Abraham the Mosaic law could not be kept perfectly. Could a Jew, after the manifestation of Christ to Israel, love the God of Abraham with all his heart, soul, strength, and mind, without believing the Son of God? Obviously not; for this was, in effect, to reject him whom God had constituted the seed of Abraham and David. Moreover, "every one that loveth Him that begat (i.e. God), loveth Him also that is begotten (i.e. Jesus, the Christ) of Him" (I. Jno. v. 1). Hence, "Who-soever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God" (I. Jno. iv. 15). He, who did not thus confess, did not love God perfectly.

In a similar incident recorded by Matthew Jesus made express mention of this requirement. After enumerating some of the commands of the Mosaic law, which the young man said he had "kept from" his "youth up," Jesus further said, "If thou wilt be perfect, go sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven, and come and follow Me." To this the young man was not equal, "for he had great possessions" (Matt. xix. 16-22). He was not prepared to love God to the extent of obeying and following His Son; therefore it was not a love which would enable him to "have eternal life."

28.—THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF THE LAW AND THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

If the only benefit obtainable by Christ through the righteousness of the law, was continued life in the flesh, how is it that he was raised from the dead and immortalised through that righteousness (Heb. i. 9), which it is stated, comprised "the death of the Cross" ? (Phil. ii. 8-10).

This question is based on a misapprehension. The righteousness of the Mosaic law did not embrace "the death of the Cross." This may easily be tested by asking for the production of a command through Moses requiring such a

death. Where is it? Nowhere. On the contrary, the law said, "He that is hanged is accursed of God" (Deut. xxi. 23), or as Apostolically expressed, "Cursed is everyone that hanged on a tree." (Gal. iii. 13.) As soon as Christ was nailed to the cross He was under "the curse of the law," and He was only cleansed from it by his subsequent blood-shedding. The "commandment" thus to "lay down" His "life" was one which Jesus "received of" His "Father" (Jno. x. 17, 18) above and outside the Mosaic law. It "fulfilled" the law (Matt. v. 18) in antitype, or in substance, but it was not essential to the keeping of the law. If it were, it would have been obligatory not on Jesus only, but on every other Jew under the law.

The Apostolic writings make a clear distinction between "the righteousness which is of the law" and "the righteousness which is of faith" (Rom. x. 3-6). The "righteousness of the law" simply gave long life in the land of Canaan: "The man which doeth these things shall live by them" (Rom. x. 5), or "shall live in them" (Lev. xviii. 5): that is, he shall live in the flesh-nature, not in the spirit-nature. It is thus expressed in Deut. xxx. 16: "That thou mayest live and multiply: and the Lord thy God shall bless thee in the land whither thou goest to possess it." The Jews made the mistake of believing that obedience to the law, and even the offering of animal sacrifices for violations of the law, would give them eternal life without a more perfect sacrifice; hence their rejection of "Christ crucified." Their mistaken belief was the subject of constant Apostolic reproof (Gal. iii. 21); and when preaching to Jews the Apostles made a clear distinction between justification through the Mosaic law and justification through Christ: "By Him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses" (Acts xiii. 39). If "the death of the Cross" had been a part of the Mosaic law, this contrast would have been impossible. The Apostles would in that case have told the Jews that, in rejecting "Christ crucified" they were repudiating an essential element of the righteousness of the law. But this they never did.

The keeping of the law was a necessary part of Christ's righteousness, but of itself it could not give him life in spirit-nature. This is shown by his

submission to the baptism of John, which was clearly an addition to the Mosaic law. And what did He say when insisting on baptism by John? "Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness" (Matt. iii. 15)? The then future death which this ceremony symbolised was obviously in the same position as the symbol; it was an addition to the Mosaic law, and yet a part of Christ's righteousness.

QUESTIONS WAITING TO BE ANSWERED.

One of our correspondents suggests that questions for this section be printed, to afford an opportunity to the readers to answer them, as he does not believe any one brother being able to solve all difficulties. Neither do we; and in writing this section we disclaimed the power to "explain all the hard things that may be submitted" (No. 1, p. 23).

We readily, therefore, adopt the suggestion. The following have been received, and as yet not answered:—

Luke xi. 30-32. What is the meaning of this passage in conjunction with Jonah?

II. Peter ii. 4. Who are the "angels" here mentioned, and what was their sin?

Jude vers. 6 and 7. What "angels" are these, and what is the "eternal fire" visited on Sodom and Gomorrah?

Rom. ii. 8, 9. Who are the Jews and Gentiles who "obey not the truth," and are to suffer "tribulation and anguish"?

John i. 14. What is "the Word" that was made flesh?

Any of our readers who can explain these passages are requested to send their answers as early as possible.

EDITOR.

Sips from "The Brook in the Way."

THE TEMPTATION OF THE WOMAN AND HER SEED.

We must always bear in mind the unique position of Adam and Eve in the garden; none of their descendants have had the same experience. God made man "upright" (Eccles. vii. 29); or, as defined in Genesis, "very good" (i. 31). Man was made in the image of the Elohim (Gen. i. 27). Does not this imply more than physical likeness? Elohim do not sin; neither could those in their image unless prompted from without. Hence the necessity, in this unique position, for an outside agent to prove man—a necessity not existing in the temptation of Jesus; for he partook of our fallen nature and experienced human passion like the rest of mankind. But the first Adam—untried and without the passions which, in a state of activity, impelled Paul to do things that he "would not"—required to be put to the proof from without. Rebellion did not originate in the pure minds of the first two children of God, but in the mind of their tempter. Is not this taught by Paul in 1. Tim. ii. 14? "Adam was not beguiled, but Eve being beguiled hath fallen into transgression." The woman

was "beguiled" by that which was "more subtle than any beast of the field," viz., "the Serpent." From that time the Serpent became the symbol of sin. Hence we read in Rev. xx. of the binding and destruction of "that old serpent, which is the devil and Satan." We easily perceive this to be a symbolic representation of a future literal and complete fulfilment of the Edenic promise. As it is impossible to understand a symbol without its literal counterpart, there must have been in the first instance a particular serpent animal identified with the origin of sin, upon which subsequent allusions are based; just as an antitype necessitates a literal type. Sin is not only compared to a serpent; it is said to be one. Therefore a literal serpent had to do with the first sin. To this some raise objection on the ground that in Gen. iii. 15 the serpent is the subject of prophetic symbol. There is, however, no real difficulty in this. To the 14th verse we have a literal narrative. Then in the 15th and 16th verses we have a profound and gradually unfolding prediction, comprising a comprehensive symbol, and admirably expressed in a

few lines—upon which prophets and apostles have extensively written—beautifully portraying the undoing by the woman's seed of the mischief wrought by the Serpent, and although involving a temporary check by a bruise in the heel, yet ending in a complete triumph in the destruction of that which has the power of death.—R. H. F.

"Ye mountains of Gilboa, let there be no dew, neither let there be rain upon you, nor fields of offerings; for there the shield of the mighty is vilely cast away, the

shield of Saul, as though he had not been anointed with oil" (II, Sam. i. 21). Looking upon that mountain—bleak, and white, and barren, without tree, or shrub, or blade of grass—I could scarcely help thinking that the widely plaintive words of David's lamentation were prophetic.—From *The Giant Cities of Bashan* per E. H.

[We should like the contributions to this section to be, as much as possible, the reflections of the senders on portions of the Inspired Word. It is intended to encourage individual thinking.—E.]

Our Letter Box.

"WHAT IS SIN"?

F. says that we have yet to learn definitely what sin is, and that our phrase "sin in the flesh" is at variance with Dr. Thomas's definition that the *flesh or human beings are sin; if sin be in the flesh, he adds, sin must be as distinct from the flesh as the water in the pot is distinct from the pot.*

The phrase "sin in the flesh" is not ours but the Spirits' (Rom. viii. 3), and it is used by the Spirit as synonymous with "sinful flesh" or flesh of sin. In the Scriptures the flesh, since the Fall, is always spoken of as bad:—"The thinking of the flesh is death" (Rom. viii. 6) "If ye love after the flesh ye shall die" (ver. 13); "In me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing" (Rom. vii. 18); "Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts" (Matt. xv. 19); "I was shapen in iniquity" (Ps. li. 5). The flesh was not made bad in the first instance, but "very good" (Gen. i. 31). How came it to be changed from good to bad? By yielding to the enticement of the Serpent. The thinking of the Serpent, which was fallacious, was transferred to human flesh, and caused it to disobey. Previous to partaking of the forbidden tree it had no knowledge of good and evil (Gen. iii. 5, 22); and as it could not desire that of which it was ignorant it was devoid of evil desire. But after partaking of that knowledge evil desire became an element of its constitution, and has been transmitted to all subsequent generations. Every babe exhibits its evil desire in proportion to the development of its mental faculties. It

is called "sin" because a result of the first man's disobedience; and it is the cause of all the "wicked works" of which the race has been guilty since the Fall. "Every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death" (Jas. i. 14, 15). Of whom is the Apostle here speaking? Not of Adam in Eden; he was not "tempted of his own lust," but from an outside source. A subtle serpent was provided as a means of testing our first parents, because they were created without evil desire. Since then, a tempter outside human nature has been unnecessary, because every man under law to God who has sinned has done so through being "drawn away of his own lust." A man who is ignorant of Divine law does not know that he has any evil desire, because there is nothing to conflict with it. One object of the Mosaic law was to make those under it realize by experience the evil nature of which they were made—that they were "shapen in iniquity" (Ps. li. 5), and that their "heart was deceitful above all things" (Jer. xvii. 9). "I had not known sin, but by the law; for I had not known lust (or evil desire), except the law had said, 'Thou shalt not covet'" (Rom. vii. 7). The expressions "known sin" and "known lust" are here used synonymously; hence "lust" is "sin in the flesh," but not transgression. "Without the law sin was dead" (ver. 8); that is, sin in the flesh was quiescent. "But when the commandment" interdicting the indulgence of evil desire "came, sin

revived"; it became active, exhibited its antagonism to the law by violating it, and as a consequence the transgressor "died" (ver. 9). "Sin," says the Apostle, "deceived me, and by it slew me" (ver. 11). What was it that deceived him? Not the act of transgression; for that was the result of the deception. The "sin" which "deceived" was something which preceded and indeed caused, both the deception and the transgression. What could this be but the inherited evil desire? "The law," though "holy, and just, and good," was given that "sin might appear sin" — that is, that "sin in the flesh" might be exhibited in its true colours; or, in the Spirit's language, "that sin . . . might become exceedingly sinful," i.e., a great sinner (ver. 13). To speak of a transgression becoming a transgressor would be without meaning, but to say that "sin in the flesh," or evil desire, became a transgressor is quite intelligible. In the face of this testimony it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that the word "sin" in the Scriptures is used in two senses, one for fallen flesh and the other for acts of disobedience.

The illustration of F. that if there be "sin in the flesh" it must be as distinct from the flesh as is the water from the pot, is a defective parallel. It is true that the flesh once existed without "sin," but this "sin" has now become such an integral part of the flesh that it cannot be eliminated. It can be kept under control by divine help, as in the case of Christ, but it cannot be got rid of without the destruction of the flesh. Hence the need of its crucifixion in the person of One who never yielded to it. "Our old man was crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be DESTROYED" (Rom. vi. 6). The "old man" is fallen Adamic flesh, and this is styled "the body of sin." If Christ had not possessed such a "body" it could not have been "crucified" when he was nailed to the tree. And if we had not a "body of sin" it could not be "crucified with Him" by "baptism into His death" (Rom. vi. 3, 4). As "the old man" is distinct from His "deeds" (Col. iii. 9), so "the body of sin" is distinct from the transgressions committed by it. There is no "folly," as F. affirms, in this twofold aspect of sin. Its recognition is necessary in order to understand how Jesus, though sinless in character, was nevertheless "made sin" (II. Cor. v. 21),

and "put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself" (Heb. ix. 26).

The Scriptures give more correct illustrations of "sin in the flesh" than any that can be evolved from the human mind. One of these is a leprosy-infected garment of woollen or linen. If pronounced by the priest "a fretting leprosy" it was to be "burnt in the fire" (Lev. xiii. 52); and if it showed no signs of spreading, the infected part was to be cut "out of the garment" (ver. 56). Whatever portion of the warp or the woof partook of this plague must be destroyed, because the leprosy could not be expelled. Thus is it with "sin in the flesh." The flesh was made "very good," but through yielding to the enticement of the Serpent it became infected with evil desire, which can only be got rid of by the flesh, or "the devil," being destroyed.

THE PHYSICAL ASPECT OF SIN.

G. ("H. W. Hudson"), from whose criticism a quotation was made on page 87 of No. 3 SANCTUARY-KEEPER, writes in self-defence of his condemnation of "physical sin." He says that sins "do not weigh anything." In the sense of transgressions this is true, but not in regard to fleshly nature. "The flesh" is a substance, and "the flesh" is styled "sin"; therefore sin in one form is a substance. "The flesh" thinks—that is brain-flesh—and its "thinking is death" (Rom. viii. 6). It is only sin which causes death; therefore brain-flesh, which is a substance or material, is sin. Brain-flesh controls all the rest of the body—causing its various members to do that which is wicked. Hence the expression, "lying tongue" (Prov. xii. 19), "evil eye" (Mark vii. 22), "wicked hands" (Acts ii. 23), "feet" that "run to evil" (Prov. i. 16), &c. Every muscle and nerve affecting conduct is under the control of the brain. When, therefore, the time arrives to put an end to the wicked "deeds" of "the old man" all that is necessary is to "bruise" its "head."

It is inconsistent to contend with believers in immortal souls or immaterial spirits, that matter in the form of brain-flesh thinks, and then, when we find that flesh spoken of as sin, to deny that sin has a material or physical form.

It cannot be denied that the term "body of sin" describes that which is physical, for in the person of Christ it was "crucified." It, therefore, there

can be sin in a physical form in one who committed no transgression, there can be also in those who do "wicked works." G. quotes the Apostolic expression, "the body of the sins of the flesh" (Col. ii. 11), and uses the phrase "sinning bodies"; but he misapprehends what is meant by those bodies being the subject of a present justification. "Baptism," he says, "cannot cure the sinning nature; nothing can cure that but spirit; for the final cure all depends on moral action in this life of probation. Nothing can cure sinning bodies but spirit life from heaven." Quite true; no one has said anything to the contrary. What has been said is that the body of the believer is, by baptism, no longer accounted unholy by reason of inherited sin; and that it continues holy until defiled by some act of transgression (1. Cor. iii. 17). By birth it is unjust, and by baptism it becomes in God's sight just, so that he can henceforth dwell in it (ver. 16). Without this change of relationship death has a hold on the body by reason of its inherited sin; but, after this change, death cannot hold it permanently in its grasp. G. refers to 1. Pet. iii. 21, to show that "baptism is the answer of a good conscience toward God, not in any way affecting these vile bodies." The article by Bro. Whitehead on this passage in the last number renders it unnecessary to say anything here.

CIRCUMCISION: ITS SANCTIFYING EFFICACY.

H., in referring to the statement in THE SANCTUARY KEEPER, No. 5, p. 3, that Jesus was subjected when eight days old (Luke ii. 21), made him a fit dwelling place for Jehovah, says that if this were so, all Jewish boys were in the same position. This is true, provided the parents were walking uprightly; but the purpose of God did not require that He should dwell in them. The human temple which God was to occupy must be the seed of the woman, not the seed of man and woman; He must be "made of a woman," but by Divine begetting. This did not alter the nature or place him in a different position from the rest of the race as regards the power of sin and death. God did not reveal His power through this weak flesh by making it different from other flesh, but by dwelling in it, and to this

is due the victory over sin which is seen in Jesus Christ.

RESURRECTION: ITS LIMITATION.

J. can hardly conceive that only baptised ones during the Christian dispensation are amenable to resurrection from among dead ones. He considers that John xii. 48 is equally applicable to every generation downwards. The difficulty of believing that resurrection is confined to baptised ones has its root in the universal resurrection doctrine of the apostasy. In this we have all been more or less nurtured, and hence it gives a colouring to our reading of the Scriptures. Having got rid of the immortality of the soul, we can see the necessity of resurrection; but we think this such a small matter for Him who is the Creator and Sustainer of all things, that we conclude it can have no limitation. As an exercise of power the raising of dead ones is comparatively nothing to God, but we are apt to forget that when God has made and revealed laws, He regulates His action by those laws. We should think it very strange, in view of the condemnation passed upon all men, if some—without any mode of deliverance—were not to die. Why? We should say that it was contrary to "the law of sin and death." If, then, death be regulated by law why not resurrection? The one is the antithesis of the other. If death come by law, how can death be terminated, if that law be not abrogated or overruled by another law? Death is not terminated, you will perhaps say, in the case of those who are raised to punishment. Think again. Seeing that the punishment after resurrection is death, what reality can there be in it if the previous condemnation to death is still in force? Do you not see that in such a case the second condemnation is superfluous? Perhaps you will say that the second condemnation includes tribulation. True; but it is not complete without death. Whatever conscious suffering there may be the punishment for sin must end in death. Hence the necessity for all condemned to "the second death" to be previously freed from the power of the first death.

In regard to John xii. 48 it is necessary to consider the context. When Jesus says "I am come a light into the world" (ver. 46), He clearly means the Jewish world; and when He follows this

by the statement, "If any man hear My words and believe not" (ver. 47), it is equally obvious that the "any man" is confined to those who compose that "world." This is confirmed by the remainder of the verse: "I judge him not; for I come not to judge the world, but to save the world." The next verse is but an elaboration of this: "He that rejecteth Me, and receiveth not My Words, hath one that judgeth him; the Word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day" (ver. 48). The expression "rejecteth Me" is synonymous with "believe not" in ver. 47. To the Jews addressed by Christ, the words were prominently applicable; or they professed belief in the writings of Moses and the prophets, but rejected Him of whom those writings spoke—although He demonstrated His claims by infallible proofs. To apply the passage to Gentiles who hear our explications of the Bible, is to ignore widely different circumstances and relationships. It would involve the resurrection to life of those who be-

lieve and abstain from baptism, but of all hearers who "believe not"—including even infidels and atheists!

J. further thinks that the Psalmist's expression, "The entrance of Thy words giveth light" (Ps. cxix. 130) favours the resurrection of enlightened rejectors. This is a passage of a totally different character. It relates to those who receive the light; for the second half of the verse reads, "It giveth understanding to the simple." The word "understanding" in the Scriptures has a deeper meaning than mere theoretical apprehension. Thus Moses says to Israel, "I have taught you statutes and judgments . . . Keep, therefore, and do them; for this is your wisdom and understanding in the sight of the nations" (Deut. iv. 5, 6). The "understanding" in this case clearly comprises the doing of God's commands. So, likewise, in the Psalmist's statement; the "simple," who are credited with "understanding," are those who act upon the "words" of Divine "light" which obtain an "entrance" to the mind.

Within the Holy Place.

LONDON (NORTH).

BARNSBURY HALL, Barnsbury Street, Islington: Sundays, 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.; Wednesdays and Fridays, 8 p.m.

Since the last report we have assisted to unite with Christ by baptism, on June 3rd, Mrs. Rosa Ann Shorter (wife of our Brother Shorter, late of Hitchin). Brother and Sister Shorter have recently removed to London, and will in future meet with us.

On June 14th, Mrs. Henrietta Frost, who resides in Bedfordshire (mother of our Sister Neyle), formerly Baptist, was immersed into the saving name. It should have been mentioned in the last report that Miss Annie Matthews, formerly Church of England, was immersed on March 6th last.

Sister Alice King, of London, and Brother George Hobbs, late of Aberdare, were united in marriage on June 3rd.

On Whit Monday our usual tea meeting was held, when we were cheered and encouraged by the presence of

several Brethren and Sisters from the Gamberwell and Northampton Ecclesias.

The annual business meeting of the Ecclesia was held on July 7th, when it was reported that the brethren and sisters on the Register numbered 102.

The lectures delivered from June 2nd to August 25th, have been on the following subjects:—"Saints and Sinners" (C. Bore); "Christ in the Earth again. Facts and figures which point to His speedy advent" (R. H. Ford); "The decay of Turkey—a matter of Prophecy and its bearing on the restoration of the Jews" (J.owler); "The Nations getting ready. The attitude of the Great Powers in the East, and its bearing on the present situation" (W.owler); "Immortality a Gift—conditional and prospective" (C. Balle); "The future of the Earth as revealed in the Scriptures" (W. H. Clifford); "Christ as the Lion of the tribe of Judah" (J.owler); "The Lord our God is one Lord" (R. H. Ford); "The kingdom of the World and the approaching change of Government" (C.

Bore); "The unsettled state of the Nations. The outlook in Europe and the East" (W. Owler); "It is Life Eternal to know the only true God" (C. Balls); "Popular notions on the Devil and Satan at variance with Bible Theology" (J. Owler); "The manifestation of the Sons of God—when does it take place, and what does it involve?" (J. J. Andrew).

B. OVERTON, Recording Brother.

LONDON (SOUTH).

SURREY MASONIC HALL, Camberwell New Road: Sundays 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.

In accordance with the intimation in our last report a Sunday School was started on May 26th, and we trust that this important branch of our work in the Truth will be the means of the children being instructed in the Scriptures in their youth. We have already over 20 names on the register.

A Mutual Improvement Class has also been formed, which is held on the last Sunday in each month from 5.30 to 6.30 p.m.

We regret to report the removal of our newly-immersed brother, W. A. Kerby, to Cowes, Isle of Wight.

It is a source of encouragement to us to witness the constant attendance of a few interested strangers at our Sunday evening lectures, which from June 2nd to August 25th have been as follows:—"The Kingdom of God not now in existence" (R. H. Ford); "The desire of all Nations" (Jno. Owler); "New Testament mode of union with Christ" (W. Deane); "The end of the Age" (G. F. Guest); "Old Testament evidence that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah" (J. J. Andrew); "Saints and Sinners" (C. F. Bore); "The doctrine of Eternal Torments unscriptural" (W. H. Clifford); "The Valley of Dry Bones" (J. J. Andrew); "Do the Dead return?" (G. F. Guest); "The Day of Vengeance of our God" (T. B. Clifford); "The Nations Angry" (W. Owler); "Christ in the Earth again" (R. H. Ford); "The prophet Daniel" (G. F. Guest).

THOS. B. CLIFFORD, Recording Brother

NORTHAMPTON.

TEMPERANCE HALL, Newland: Sunday, 11 a.m. and 6.30 p.m.

With pleasure and gratitude to our Heavenly Father, we report the "taking out from among the Gentiles" another "for His name."

Our new brother, Henry White (age

30), who was formerly of the Church in England, passed out of Adam into Christ on Aug. 9th. We pray that he may keep the garment provided by God in the "Righteousness of Christ" without "spot or blemish" until he comes. Bro. White had attended the lectures for about eighteen months before the division, and has attended our meetings ever since we commenced our public effort. He is in perfect harmony with us on "our condemnation in Adam," "our justification in Christ," and the "responsibility question"; and so has obeyed the truth from love, and not fear.

There is a little improvement in the attendance at our lectures the last few weeks. Subjects for July have been as follow:—"In the Regeneration" (T. E. Boddington); "Christ in the Earth again—Political signs and Bible figures which point to His speedy advent" (R. H. Ford, London); "The rich man and Lazarus" (G. Handley); "The Unsettled State of the Nations—the 'Peace and Safety' policy of Germany and Austria—the agitation in Armenia, Italy, Spain, Bulgaria, and Macedonia—what will be the upshot? Hear what the Lord hath spoken" (W. Owler, of London). G. HANDLEY.

NEW ROMNEY.—It is with great pleasure that I report our unity of mind with you, on the question of resurrectional responsibility and the nature and sacrifice of Christ, and also the fact that Bro. Albert Holland, of Lydd, who was immersed by the Gresham Hall (Brixton) brethren, after careful investigation of the Word on the phases of the Truth named, declared himself with us, and now regularly meets with us at the breaking of bread.

We have been much refreshed and strengthened in the Word by the sojourn in our midst for a fortnight of Bro. and Sister J. J. Andrew, Bro. Andrew giving us two lectures—one on "The cleansing efficacy of the Blood of Christ" and the other on "Adam and Christ, a parallel and a contrast." Both lectures were well-attended and we pray that fruit will be borne to the honour and glory of God and His Son, Jesus Christ.

The lectures on Sunday evening were taken in the absence of a visiting brother by the undersigned, who rejoiced in the privilege, and his joy is great at having brethren and sisters around him waiting for Christ, and who love His appearing. WM. WHITEHEAD.

The Sanctuary-Keeper:

A QUARTERLY MAGAZINE FOR THE EXPOSITION AND
DEFENCE OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

... (Aaron and his sons) shall keep the charge of the sanctuary, and the charge of the
... (Num. xviii. 5.)
... "Ye (brethren of Christ) are an holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices."
I. Pet. ii. 5.)
"Thou hast kept My Word and hast not denied My Name."—(Rev. iii. 8.)

No. 7.

DECEMBER, 1895.

VOL. II.

Bible Secrets.

"The secret things belong unto the Lord our God," says Moses, "but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law" (Deut. xxix. 29). All that is contained in the Bible was once a secret, as implied by the word "revealed." But, as we well know, the act of revealing did not take place all at once: the process has been a gradual one. At first it was confined to the promised seed of the woman, without any reference to the time of fulfilment or to the many events leading to it. And not until the perversion of this revealed secret had brought universal retribution on the race was a further secret revealed to Abraham. For something like four hundred years after this the giving of the Mosaic law was quite unknown. And a like period elapsed before another secret was communicated to David. For about fifteen centuries the way of salvation was confined to one nation, without any clear indication of the privilege being extended to others. The length of time for Jewish rejection and Gentile favour, constituting the present dispensation, was hidden until the Apostle John received visions which threw light on Daniel and other Old Testament prophets. The "hidden period" of Jewish exaltation and Gentile blessedness was at the same time defined to be one thousand years.

DIVINE CONCEALING; HUMAN SEARCHING.

The Divine method of revealing secrets partakes of Divine wisdom; it is not complete when put into words. In addition to the free use of symbol there is a conciseness and depth in many words and phrases which require reflection and research to fathom their meaning. "It is the glory of God to conceal a thing, but the honour of kings"—the heirs of God's kingdom—"to search out a matter" (Prov. xxv. 2). That which enters the mind without any effort makes but a faint impression, and is soon forgotten; but that which is obtained at the cost of much thought is highly valued and long retained. If the Bible had been written after the manner of human composition it would not have possessed that perennial interest which has

made it valuable in all circumstances and every age. Many of its beauties, not being on the surface, have to be dug for as hidden treasure; and some of its statements require circumstances or experience to explain them. The prophets—who wrote many things which they did not understand—"searched diligently . . . what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow" (I. Pet. i. 10, 11). Daniel "heard, but understood not" certain "words" which were spoken to him in vision and he was plainly told that they were "closed up and sealed till the time of the end" (Dan. xii. 8, 9). The development of human affairs has been necessary to show the full meaning of some of the prophecies; and how many are there yet to be fulfilled which are more or less enigmatical?

Some parts of the Inspired Word cannot be understood without the fear of God; for "The secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him" (Ps. xxv. 14). Part of their "fear" is to pray for Divine "wisdom" (Jas. i. 5):—"Give me understanding that I may learn Thy commandments." "Open Thou mine eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of Thy law" (Ps. cxix. 73, 18). To "know the only true God" is impossible for any but an obedient Son, and to "know Jesus Christ" (Jno. xvii. 3) as He ought to be known requires an experience similar to his. Hence the expressed wish of an Apostle to "know Him and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings" (Phil. iii. 10). Without this "fellowship" the "Man of Sorrows" must necessarily be more or less an enigma.

The word for "Secret" in the Old Testament is likewise rendered "counsel" (Jer. xxiii. 18, 22); and in the Revised Version "friendship" is inserted in the margin as an alternative rendering. There is much beauty in this meaning. A secret is always confined to those who are friends—either real or supposed; it is never communicated to known enemies. All Adam's descendants are, by birth and conduct, at enmity with God (Eph. ii. 2, 3, 12), and therefore not in a position to have the hidden wisdom of His Word communicated to them. They must be "reconciled" before they can penetrate the innermost recesses of the Divine oracles; and if they are to continue there their reconciliation, friendship, or fellowship, must be maintained. For if they receive "the truth" without "the love" of it they are liable to be visited by a "strong delusion that they should believe a lie" (II. Thess. ii. 11). So precious is the Inspired Word that it must be rightly used if even its present privileges are to be retained; God's "secret (or friendship) is with the righteous" (Prov. x. 32), not the unrighteous.

THE SECRET OF APOSTOLIC PREACHING.

The use in the New Testament of the word "mystery"—which occurs about twelve times—conveys to some minds the idea of the impenetrable or incomprehensible; but the word *secret* would be a more suitable rendering. It refers to that which at one time, or under certain circumstances, is hidden. Though the Apostles are styled "stewards of the mysteries of God" (I. Cor. iv. 1), it is also said that God had "made known unto" them "the mystery of His will" (Eph. i. 9), "which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest, and by the Scriptures of the prophets . . . made known to all nations for the obedience of faith" (Rom. xvi. 25, 26). They were not "stewards" of that which they did not understand, or were not allowed to communicate; quite the reverse. "By revelation," says Paul, "was made known unto me the mystery, as I wrote afore in few words, whereby when ye read, ye can perceive my understanding in the mystery of Christ; which in other generations was not made known unto the sons of men, as it hath now been revealed unto his *holy apostles and prophets* in the Spirit; that the Gentiles are fellow-heirs, and fellow-members of the body, and fellow-partakers of the

promise in Christ Jesus through the Gospel" (Eph. iii. 3-6). The dispensation extending from the day of Pentecost to the Second Appearing of Christ was hidden during Old Testament times; and therefore the individual crafting into Christ of Jews and Gentiles by baptism was not then known. To the Apostle Peter was delegated the use of the "keys" by which to unlock this secret; and he exercised the power for the benefit of the Jews on the day of Pentecost, and, for the benefit of Gentiles, when sent to Cornelius. Then was "the mystery which hath been hid from all ages and generations . . . manifested," because "God was pleased to make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles" (Col. i. 26, 27).

THE SECRET OF LAWLESSNESS.

A secret of an opposite character is styled "the mystery of iniquity" (or lawlessness), which, says Paul, "doth already work, only there is one that restraineth now until he be taken out of the way. And then shall be revealed the lawless one, whom the Lord Jesus shall slay with the breath of his mouth and bring to nought by the manifestation of his coming" (II. Thess. ii. 7, 8). The "iniquity" then hidden was the leaven of corruption which had entered the apostolic ecclesias. It is well styled "lawlessness," because it perverts "the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus" (Rom. viii. 2) in all its aspects. That which hindered or restrained its full development was Paganism. When this was taken out of the way, "the lawless one" was fully "revealed." He took possession of the throne of the Roman Empire, making a corrupt Christianity the State religion and giving expression to his joy by saying, "Now is come the salvation, and the power, and the kingdom of our God, and the authority of His Christ" (Rev. xii. 10). "The lawless one," when fully developed into "Mystery, Babylon the Great" (Rev. xvii. 5), did not hesitate "to change the times and the law" (Dan. vii. 25), with the result that wherever "the harlots and the abominations of the earth" have sway, the law of God in all its aspects is perverted. Thus will it continue until He who is the supreme embodiment of Divine law—now hidden behind the veil—is manifested. Then will ensue a severe conflict, in which the Lawful One will "bring to nought" the Lawless One.

The perversion of Divine law has characterised the seed of the serpent from the commencement. It began with Cain, who attempted to substitute the fruit of the ground for blood shedding as the basis for justification from sin. It continued throughout the antediluvian world until it culminated in the complete corruption of God's "way" (Gen. vi. 12). It characterised the whole course of Israel during the existence of the Mosaic covenant. "The law of the Lord" was "forgotten" by some (Hos. iv. 6), "despised" by others (Amos ii. 4), and "violated by the priests" (Ezek. xxii. 26). Scarcely had the Apostolic churches become established before the truths committed to them were mixed with Judaism and Grecian philosophy. The Judaizing teaching denied that the law of Moses had been nailed to the Cross of Christ and thereby "abolished" (Col. ii. 14; Eph. ii. 15); and it asserted that those who had been "married" to Christ (Rom. vii. 4) were still under obligation to this abrogated law. The Platonic philosophy, by introducing immortality of the soul—with its consequent doctrines of the consciousness of the dead, eternal torments, and entrance on reward or retribution at death—has made void "the law of sin and death," and "the law of the spirit of life." The doctrine of the Trinity has likewise perverted these two laws, together with the law of Moses, in their application to the Son of God. "The law of sin" in the flesh (Rom. vii. 23; viii. 3) has, by the doctrine of the immaculate conception, been set aside in regard to two members of the human race—Jesus and His mother. The Divine "law of faith" (Rom. iii. 27) has been replaced by the human law of salvation by works. The law of marriage (Heb. xiii. 4) has been interfered with by the

inculcation of celibacy (I. Tim. iv. 3). The law of love to enemies (Matt. v. 44) has been superseded by the practice of warfare—with ecclesiastical approval—between even members of the same church. "The law of liberty" (Jas. i. 25) has been transformed into a law of license for the gratification of the flesh (Gal. v. 13; Phil. iii. 19). The law of divine forgiveness (Acts. ii. 38) has, by the repudiation of baptism, or the substitution of sprinkling, been trodden under foot. And the laws of condemnation through Adam, and of justification through Christ (Rom. v. 18), have been ignored by the doctrine of *universal* resurrection to judgment.

THE SECRET OF GODLIKENESS.

These instances of "lawlessness"—of which many more might be given—*are* all supported by highly moral reasoning, the fallacy of which can only be discerned by such as are instructed in the Word. They are due to the antipathy of the human mind to "bring into captivity *every thought*" to the wisdom of God. Herein lies the distinction between the Lawless One and Him who "fulfilled" every "jot and tittle" of the law of God (Matt. v. 18). These two opposite developments were both, up to a certain stage, comparatively hidden. Hence there is not only "the mystery (or secret) of lawlessness," but also "the mystery (or secret) of godliness." The latter is referred to by the Apostle Paul as follows:—"Without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness; He who was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached among the nations, believed on in the world, received up in glory" (I. Tim. iii. 16; R.V.). The interpretation usually given of this passage is—That God was manifest in the flesh when the Virgin Mary became a mother; that the Father in the person of His son, was justified in spirit when Jesus Christ was immortalised; that He was seen of angels from Heaven at His birth or His resurrection; that He was preached to the Gentiles by the Apostles, especially Paul; that their preaching was believed by many in the Roman world; and that Jesus, forty days after his resurrection, was received up into Heaven. If this be correct, is it not strange that the events should be placed in such irregular order? This is not the course usually adopted by the Spirit in a concise narrative. Even the simple expression "Strangers and pilgrims" (I. Peter ii. 11) is given in the order of development; for a man must become a "stranger" to the world before he can become a "pilgrim" in it. Should not this consideration—apart from others—suggest a doubt as to whether the above interpretation is correct? If so, may we not go a step farther, and look for a solution in the consecutive order of the *various* sentences, and the events which they describe? Let us see.

1. "*Great is the mystery of godliness.*" Our readers are familiar with the way in which this is treated by Trinitarians. "Godliness" is supposed to describe the "Godhead," and, as the union of three in one and one in three can neither be comprehended nor explained, it is accepted as an impenetrable "mystery." And by some who are far removed from Trinitarianism the expression "mystery of godliness" is viewed as a fitting description of a supposed mysterious union between the nature of God and the nature of man—or the incorporation of Divine life in Adamic flesh and blood—in the production of the babe born in Bethlehem. The initial defect in both views is an incorrect application of "godliness." The Greek word (*εὐσεβείας*) means "Reverence (usually towards the gods), piety, religion" (Liddell & Scott). It denotes, therefore, that which is outside God—a state of mind directed towards him—not God Himself; a man of godly mind, or God-likeness. This being the key-note to the Apostolic statement, necessarily governs what follows.

2. "*He who was manifested in the flesh.*" There has been much controversy as to whether this should read "God was manifested," or "who

was manifested;" for some manuscripts have "God" and some "who." The translators of the Revised Version have, however, no difficulty as to which is the more reliable, for in justification of the rendering selected they insert this marginal note:—"The word *God*, in place of *He who*, rests on no sufficient ancient evidence. Some ancient authorities read *which*." With his decision before us it becomes a duty to inquire what person is denoted by the *He who*? Obviously the one embodied in the phrase, "Mystery of Godliness," or secret of God-likeness. That which was once "secret" is the same as that which was subsequently "manifested"; it was a likeness of God in the one case, and therefore a likeness of God in the other. This God-likeness did not exist before Jesus was born. His birth was indeed a preliminary to its development. The process occupied thirty years, during which time He was known only as the son of a carpenter, living an upright life. Not until He had submitted to the baptism of John did the Spirit openly declare Him to be the Son in whom God, his Father, was well pleased. Speaking of the time preceding this event, John said, "I knew Him not, but that *He should be made manifest to Israel* . . . He that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on Him, the same is He which baptizeth with the Holy Spirit" (John i. 31-33). The "He made manifest" of John the Baptizer is identical with the "He who was manifested" of Paul the Apostle. The latter says, "manifested in the flesh," an expression which implies a previous hidden life in the flesh. The character of that life is defined in the Divine expression of approval, "well pleased"—an equivalent to God-likeness. He who had, since His birth, been hidden in "the shadow" of His Father's hand (Isa. xlix. 2), now "came forth from the Father" (Jno. xvi. 28), and was "made manifest to Israel" as "The Lamb of God" to take "away the sin of the world" (Jno. i. 31, 29).

3. "*Justified in the Spirit*." The word (*ev*) rendered "in" is frequently used in the New Testament, and in a great variety of ways. It can be applied to *place*, to the *instrument* or *means*, and to *time*. It is most frequently rendered *in*, *within*; *among*, *with*: *on*, *at*, or *by*: the context generally guiding the selection. In the verse under consideration it occurs five times—being rendered once "into," once "unto," and thrice "in." The only reason apparently for saying "*in* the Spirit," is the preceding expression, "*in* the flesh." The two phrases are evidently viewed as an antithesis, and as the flesh-nature is introduced in the one, it is concluded that the Spirit-nature is expressed in the other. But this view overlooks the great difference in the two phrases.

The expression "manifested in the flesh" could not, to harmonise with its construction, be translated in any other way. Neither would the facts admit of any other rendering; for "godliness" having, as a seal, been secretly impressed on "the flesh," it necessarily follows that, when this godliness is "manifested," it must be "in the flesh." Not so with the other expression; the "flesh" could not be the instrument or means, but the "Spirit" could. Though impossible to say that Godliness was manifested *by* flesh, it is quite permissible to say that Godliness was justified *by* Spirit. The word (*ev*) is rendered "*by*" upwards of 100 times, some of which relate to the Spirit: "By one Spirit are we all baptised" (I. Cor. xii. 13); "We both have access *by* one Spirit unto the Father" (Eph. ii. 18); "He came *by* the Spirit into the temple" (Luke ii. 27); "No man speaking *by* the Spirit of God" (I. Cor. xii. 3). It is evident, therefore, that there is good reason for translating the phrase, "Justified *by* the Spirit."

The question now arises, What is the meaning of godliness being justified by the Spirit? Acting on the principle that this is the second item in the Apostolic statement, in order of time, the obvious conclusion is that it follows or is associated with the manifestation in flesh. The Spirit,

it is well-known, was very conspicuous in connection with the baptism of Jesus. After going up out of the water "the heavens were opened unto Him, and He saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting on Him; and lo a voice from Heaven saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (Matt. iii. 16, 17). The descent of the Spirit was the signal to John that Jesus was the Messiah (Jno. i. 33), and the expression of approval declared his godliness, or "justified" Him in word. The basis for this approval was the baptism which Jesus had just undergone. By that act he had practically said, "I come to do Thy will, O God" (Heb. x. 6) that is, 'I submit to a symbolic death in token of my willingness to die the death of the Cross, which I recognise to be the penalty due to the sin-nature of which I am made.' He conformed to the Divine principle of justification for sin, and therefore the Father approved or "justified" him.

4. "*Seen of Angels.*" We are so accustomed to associate the word "angels" with the Spirit-beings dwelling in heaven that it is difficult to associate it with any others. But when we learn that the word simply means *Messenger* and that it does not relate to nature, we should carefully scrutinise every place where it occurs to see whether the messengers in question are inhabitants of the earth or of heaven. John the Baptist styled a "messenger," or angel (Matt. xi. 10), and the "disciples" whom he sent to Jesus are called "messengers" or angels (Luke vii. 24). Likewise Jesus sent "messengers (or angels) before His face . . . into a village of the Samaritans" (Luke ix. 52). The "twelve" whom Jesus chose "He named apostles" (Luke vi. 13) because they were "sent forth" (Matt. x 5) or constituted messengers; for the word "apostle" simply means a messenger, or one sent. Paul styles Titus and certain other "brethren" "the messengers (or apostles) of the churches" (I. Cor. viii. 23). Jesus when communicating through John with "the seven churches which are in Asia" (Rev. i. 4), calls the brethren at their head, "the angels of the seven churches" (ver. 20).

There is in these passages abundant evidence to show that the word "angels" can be applied to members of the human race. Who the "angels" were by whom "the mystery of godliness" was "seen," after being "manifested in the flesh" and justified by the Spirit, it is not difficult to determine. The Apostle John makes special mention of having "seen" with his "eyes," "looked upon," and "handled" with his "hand" "the Word of life"—"the eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested (he says) unto us" (I. John i. 1, 2); that is, in the person of Him who was "the Way, the Truth, and the Life" (John xiv. 6). The place of Judashad to be filled by one which had "compared with us (said Peter) all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us" (Acts i. 21). Of all the messengers relating to Christ's first appearing, John the Baptist and the twelve Apostles stand pre-eminent; and they are as fully entitled to the term "angels" as the chief brethren of "the seven churches." There is therefore no need to go outside their circle to identify the "angels" by whom the Secret of God-likeness was "seen" after being "manifested" and "justified."

5. "*Preached among the nations.*" In the original of this sentence there is no article; it should, therefore, read, *preached among nations*. The word rendered "nations" is frequently used for the Gentiles, but in those cases it is generally preceded by the definite article *the*. Its absence in this sentence suggests the possibility of some other application. The word translated "Gentiles" and "nations" (*εθνη*) means "a band, company, body of men; a race, tribe; a nation, people, a particular class of men, a caste (Liddell and Scott's Lexicon). The heirs of Christ's Kingdom are called "a holy nation" (I. Pet. 2, 9), and the inheritors, "a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof" (Matt. xxi. 43). The Jewish people were composed

different bands, companies, or classes of men, such as the Scribes, Pharisees, lawyers, Sadducees, Herodians, publicans, &c., and among these was the Secret of God-likeness preached. It was proclaimed when Christ said, "I am the bread of life" (Jno. vi. 48), "I am the Light of the world" (Jno. viii. 12), "I am the door of the sheep" (Jno. x. 7), "I am the Resurrection and the Life" (Jno. xi. 25), "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life" (Jno. xiv. 6), "I and My Father are one" (Jno. x. 30), "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father" (Jno. xiv. 9), "I do always those things that please Him" (Jno. viii. 29), "Which of you convicteth Me of sin?" (ver. 46). His frequent declarations that God was His Father, that He spake the words of God, and did the works of God, involved the secret of God-likeness, because this feature was a necessary basis for the position he then occupied. And it was this claim which excited the greatest antagonism from the Jews, who "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" (Jno. v. 18). "For a good work we stone Thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that Thou, being a man, makest Thyself God!" (Jno. x. 33).

6. "*Believed on in the world.*" The word rendered "world" simply means *order, arrangement, a set form, or an ornament*; and it is used for the human race, or for different sections of men, because of the order or arrangement pertaining to them. The Bible applies it sometimes to the Jewish nation and sometimes to the nations in general. In this case there is no need to go beyond the Jewish world; for although Christ's preaching did not have great success, there were some who "believed on" Him. The number is sometimes limited to the "hundred and twenty" who met in "an upper room" after Christ's ascent from Mount Olivet (Acts i. 15); but this was not all, for after His resurrection "He was seen of above five hundred brethren at once" (I. Cor. xv. 6). How many more there were we know not. This number is, however, sufficient to fulfil the statement that He was "believed on in the world," or more correctly "a world"; for there is no word to represent "the" in this sentence.

7. "*Received up in glory.*" To no event can this apply but that which is concisely reported in Acts i. 9: "While they (the Apostles) beheld He (Jesus) was taken up; and a cloud received Him out of their sight." He was "received" into "Heaven" (Acts iii. 21) to sit "by the right hand of God exalted" (Acts ii. 33). As a result, He "received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit," which he "shed forth on the disciples" (Acts ii. 33); the absence of this outpouring was evidence before the Crucifixion that "Jesus was not yet glorified" (John vii. 39).

THE SECRET OF THE LORD; HOW REVEALED.

The foregoing exposition is in perfect harmony with other parts of Scripture, and does no violence to the order of the events narrated. Beginning with Christ's baptism, it brings before us his ministry and its results and concludes with his departure from the earth. The God-likeness, which is the burden of the passage, though "manifested in the flesh" to Israel and since proclaimed in the Inspired Word, is still impenetrable to the understanding of all but an insignificant few. The reason for this is obvious: a comprehensive acquaintance with the Scriptures is necessary to the full revelation of this secret. A man must believe that the human race is devoid of immortality, and that it is under the power of sin and death by reason of disobedience in Eden; that the flesh which was created good became bad by eating of the forbidden fruit; that Jesus Christ was made of this bad flesh, and that His existence commenced when He was born of the Virgin Mary; that the Mosaic law under which He was born, was contrary to all the desires of the fallen flesh, and that it could not be kept perfectly by the flesh left to itself; that Jesus Christ was begotten

by the Spirit, and that the Father by the same Spirit helped him to keep in subjection, or "cut off," his inherited evil desires; and, finally, this comprehensive belief must be accompanied by action in harmony therewith. That is: A man must by doing the "will" of the Father (Jno. vii. 17) practically realise the strength of sinful flesh, and the difficulty of overcoming its influence. All this involves walking in the fear of God, and induces a desire for Divine guidance and assistance in "perfecting holiness" (II. Cor. vii. 1). It is with such that "the secret of the Lord" dwells; an enlightenment which embraces "the secret of Godlikeness" embodied in Christ Jesus. As in the case of their head, Godliness is developed in them in secret. The world "knoweth not" that they are "Sons of God," even as "it knew Him not" (I. Jno. iii. 1). It cannot, therefore, see the moulding process by which the Almighty Potter shapes them into vessels of honour "meet for the Master's use" (Rom. ix. 21; II. Tim. ii. 21). This process is, as a rule, unseen even by the members of the household. The subjects of it may not, in the early stages, realise its meaning, because not yet "humbled under the mighty hand of God" (I. Pet. v. 6). But if their minds are rightly "exercised" (Heb. xii. 11) they will gradually perceive that it is for their own good, and accordingly "yield" themselves "unto God" (Rom. vi. 13), that "by the renewing of their mind" they "may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God" (Rom. xii. 2). Being fully satisfied that "godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come" (I. Tim. iv. 8), they persevere in their effort to "mortify (or kill) through the spirit the deeds of the body" (Rom. viii. 13), in hope of being included in "the manifestation of the Sons of God" (ver. 19); for as the Head of the New Creation was "manifested," so must there be a "manifestation" of his faithful brethren.

THE SECRET OF THE NEW NAME.

When speaking of "Christ and the Church," the Apostle Paul says, "We are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones." This, he says, "is a great mystery," or secret (Eph. v. 30, 32). The relationship between Christ and His brethren is, indeed a secret which those who are still in Adam cannot penetrate; and its intimate character is fully realised by a portion only of those who have entered into it. The head of a human body is so closely united to its various members as to control all their actions, and they are powerless without it. Christ and "the members of his body" are in the same position. "Without me ye can do nothing" (Jno. xv. 5); "I can do all things," says Paul, "through Christ, which strengtheneth me" (Phil. iv. 13). Though Christ be of spirit-nature, and the "members of His body" are still mortal-nature, they have entered into a spirit-relationship described as "not in the flesh, but in the spirit" (Rom. viii. 9); and such as realise this, strive to "walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit" (ver. 4); they study the "mind" of Christ (Phil. ii. 5), and endeavour to be "followers" of Him in character (I. Cor. xi. 1) that they may become "like Him" in nature (I. Jno. iii. 2). To those who succeed, a further "secret" will be revealed, already made known as a matter of words: "Behold I show you a mystery (or secret); we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump" (I. Cor. xv. 51, 52). But, in the highest sense, it will only be made known to those who undergo the change. They will receive "a white pebble" containing "a new name written, which no man knoweth saying ho that receiveth it" (Rev. ii. 17). That name will be "the Name of God" (Rev. iii. 12) in its highest phase, and will be equivalent to the bestowal of a "house from heaven" (II. Cor. v. 2). Thus will He "show His covenant" and reveal His greatest "secret" to "those who have feared Him," (Ps. xxv. 14). EDITOR.

The Salvation of Jesus Christ.

The character of Jesus Christ as a Saviour occupies such a prominent position in the Bible that the need for His own salvation is in great danger of being overlooked. Indeed, by some even of His brethren it is absolutely denied. And yet the direct evidence in Old and New Testaments—apart from the indirect—is by no means scanty. The Epistle to the Hebrews contains at least ten or twelve proofs, and in the Psalms they are equally numerous; it is intended, on this occasion, only to call attention to a few in the hope that they will serve as a clue to the elucidation of others.

Commencing with Hebrews, we find it recorded that Jesus Christ, "in the days of His flesh . . . offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save Him from death, and was heard in that He feared" (Heb. v. 7). To need saving from death He must have been under its power. From what cause? Death results only from sin, and He committed none. Yes, but as "the Son of Man" and "Seed" of "the woman" He was descended from the first pair that sinned. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin" (Rom. v. 12). Jesus Christ was one of the "all men" on whom "death passed" for "one man's offence" (ver. 17); and from this death He could not be saved without the removal of the sin which caused it. For this an acceptable sacrifice was requisite. In the immediate prospect of His offering the prepared body (Heb. x. 5, 10) He prayed, "if it be possible" (Matt. xxvi. 39), that "this cup" might "pass from" Him; but it was not granted, and therefore it was not "possible." Knowing this, He subordinated His own "will" to His Father's. Did He offer no other prayer? He must have done, for He "was heard." He was "saved from death," not by exclusion from the grave, but by release from it. The substance of this prayer is given in Ps. xxx. 8, 9:—"I cried to Thee, O Lord; and to the Lord I made supplication. What profit is there in My blood, when I go down to the pit? Shall the dust praise Thee? Shall it declare Thy truth?" A sacrificial death without resurrection would have been no "profit" to Christ or any other member of the race. And yet, without such a death His resurrection would have been impossible; for it was "through the blood of the everlasting covenant" that He was "brought again from the dead" (Heb. xiii. 20). His prayer "was heard" because He had yielded to all that the law of sin and death demanded of Him. When this had been done, "it was not possible that He should be holden of death" (Acts ii. 24).

The "cup" from which Jesus Christ shrank is referred to when he said, "I will take the cup of salvation, and call upon the name of the Lord. I will pay my vows unto the Lord now in the presence of all His people" (Ps. cxvi. 13, 14). His baptism by John constituted his "vow"; for he then, in effect, said: "I come to do Thy will, O God" (Heb. x. 9); and His obedience to "the death of the Cross" was its fulfilment. As the result of paying this vow he was afterwards able to say; "I am Thy Servant, and the Son of Thine handmaid; Thou hast loosed my bonds" (Ps. cxvi. 16). The same truth is expressed in these words: "The Lord hath chastened Me sore, but he hath not given Me over unto death" (Ps. cxviii. 18). To be "given over unto death" is not to go into the grave, but to be allowed to remain there; and to be brought out is to be "loosed" from its "bonds." "My bonds," says Jesus: an expression which shows His personal relationship to the bondage or "dominion" of death (Rom. vi. 9).

The need for His own salvation was a frequent thought in the mind of Christ. He addresses His Father as the "Lord God of my salvation" (Ps. lxxviii. 1), and says, "From Him cometh my salvation" (Ps. lxii. 1). Recognising His inability to save Himself He prayed to the Father to save him: "Save me, O God" (Ps. lxxix. 1); "Save me from the lion's mouth" (Ps. xxii. 21); "Save the Son of Thine handmaid" (Ps. lxxxvi. 16); "I will call upon God, and the Lord shall save me" (Ps. lv. 16). And in prospect of His prayer being answered He speaks of His deliverance as Jehovah's "salvation": "My soul shall rejoice in His salvation" (Ps. xxxv. 9); "I will rejoice in Thy salvation" (Ps. ix. 14); "Let Thy salvation, O God, set me up on high" (Ps. lxxix. 29). Jehovah, in the language of prediction, likewise says: "With long life will I satisfy him and shew him My salvation" (Ps. xci. 16); "He shall cry unto Me, Thou art My Father, my God, and the rock of my salvation. I also will make Him my first-born; the highest of the kings of the earth" (Ps. lxxxix. 26, 27, R.V.); "In Thy salvation, how greatly shall He rejoice" (Ps. xxi. 1). After realising this joyful deliverance the Son of God's handmaid is represented as saying: "Thou hast answered Me and become my salvation" (Ps. cxviii. 21).

The Psalms set forth, not only the need for the Son's salvation, but the basis for it: "Save me, O Lord, by Thy name" (Ps. liv. 1); "Quicken me, O Lord, for Thy name's sake; for Thy righteousness' sake bring my soul out of trouble" (Ps. cxliii. 11); "Because he hath set his love upon Me, therefore will I deliver him; I will set him on high, because he hath known My name" (Ps. xci. 14). The Name of the Lord is the expression of His mercy and His righteousness. To pray to be saved, by that Name, or for that Name's sake, is to recognise the mercy which God has shown to fallen man in providing a covering for sin, together with the righteousness of God in inflicting the penalty of His broken law as the basis for justification. When, therefore, God's Son thus prays, He declares that He is dependent on His Father's mercy and righteousness. When he says "for Thy name's sake," He puts Himself in the same position as His brethren now do when they, in praying to God, say "for Christ's sake" (Eph. iv. 32).

It is impossible to evade the force of these testimonies. The Psalms from which they are taken describe not only "the sufferings of Christ," but also "the glory that should follow" (I. Pet. i. 11). Some of them—such as the 21st, the 22nd, the 69th, the 86th, and the 91st—are, through internal evidence or quotation in the New Testament, generally recognised as applying to Jesus Christ. In the use of the words "seed" and "salvation," they clearly show that the Seed of the woman was, by birth, in the same lost condition as the rest of woman born; for such expressions could not be applied to Him if in the position of Adam before sinning, or free from the condemnation pronounced upon Adam and his descendants. There is a widespread belief that it is derogatory to Christ to speak thus of Him. This is a mistake; as will be seen by a consideration of two or three leading points.

I. IT RECOGNISES THE ABSOLUTE JUSTICE OR RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD. It shows that when once "condemnation" had passed upon "all men" for "the offence of one" (Rom. v. 18), no exception could be made. "Sin," having "entered into the world," necessarily "reigned unto death," over all the descendants of the "one man," by whom "came death" (Rom. v. 12, 21; I. Cor. xv. 21). "The sting of death is sin" (I. Cor. xv. 56); and it is equally true of the spiritual, as it is of the natural, that to save from death, the mortal sting must be neutralised or destroyed. There is only one way to destroy sin, and that is "through death" (Heb. ii. 14). If it be asked, what kind of death? the answer is, not any kind; only that which Christ underwent, viz., a sacrificial death. Why sacrificial? Because it is the judicial infliction of the penalty due for sin. Would the judicial infliction of this penalty on anyone be a sacrifice for sin? No; its infliction for the sufferer's own act of

transgression would exclude his resurrection; and in that case death would not be conquered, but would reign. To neutralise sin the penalty due to it must be judicially inflicted on an obedient one. In Jesus Christ we see these conditions; and therefore, in His death we see a sacrifice for His own deliverance as well as for that of others. God showed "grace" or "mercy" in providing all that was necessary for the accomplishment of this; but His favour was bounded by His own decree. He could not be faithful to His own word without inflicting the penalty which He had threatened for disobedience (Gen. ii. 17). God must "be just" before being "the Justifier of" any under the power of death (Rom. iii. 26). Justice, by inflicting the penalty for sin, gives all that "the law of sin and death" can demand; but love goes beyond; it offers and afterwards bestows—when the conditions are kept—life in Spirit-nature, which Adam never had. Justice removes the barrier to immortality, and then love bestows what it had promised. There was, therefore, both justice and love in the death of Christ.

To say that the passages which speak of Christ dying "for our sins" (1. Cor. xv. 3) exclude dying for Himself, is to draw a conclusion not warranted by the words, and to do violence to other testimonies. It is explicitly stated that "through His own blood" He "entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption" (Heb. ix. 12). The words "for us," being in italics in the A.V., should, as in the R.V., be omitted. Indeed, correctly rendered, the sentence should read: "Having obtained eternal redemption for Himself"; for the Greek verb is in the middle voice, which means that a person does something to or for himself.

2. IT EXHIBITS THE NEED FOR DIVINE INDWELLING IN A LIFE-LONG CONFLICT WITH SIN. The flesh of which Jesus was "made" was not identical with the flesh of Adam before sinning. Adam was created without any "knowledge of good and evil," and therefore without any desire for evil; but by yielding to the enticement of his wife, who was beguiled by the serpent, evil desire became an element of his nature, and has been transmitted to all his posterity. This evil desire is in itself obnoxious to God, because of its origin and its consequences. It was due to the first transgression, and has been the author of all subsequent wickedness. All its varied phases were met by the enactments of the Mosaic law, and, owing to its great strength, that law was kept in perfection by none but Jesus Christ. How did He succeed where all others failed? Not by a nature different from theirs, for if His flesh had been free from evil desire He would not have felt the force of the many commands and interdicts given through Moses. The law "was weak through the flesh" (Rom. viii. 3) of all who failed to keep it and as Christ's flesh was "the same" (Heb. ii. 14), the law could not in His case be strong "through the flesh." Whence, then, was the power by which He obeyed perfectly? It came from God. "What the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God" did in the person of "His Son Jesus Christ" (Rom. viii. 3). How? By dwelling in His Son through the Holy Spirit, conjoined with instruction in the Inspired Word. If the obedience of Jesus had been due to the nature of which He was made, the flesh would have been able to glory in the victory, and a fundamental Divine principle would thereby have been nullified; for it is written, that "God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty . . . that no flesh should glory in his presence" (1. Cor. i. 27, 29).

One reason given for Christ being "made in all things like unto His brethren" is, "that He might be a merciful and faithful high priest"; "for in that He Himself hath suffered being tempted, He is able to succour them that are tempted" (Heb. ii. 17, 18). On the same principle, the experience which He has Himself had of the need of salvation, must enable Him more fully to realise the position of those whom He "seeks to save" (Luke

xii. 10) to save one member of the lost race, and then, through Him, save

others, is the simple yet profound plan which has been devised and thus far carried out by the Only Wise God.

3. IT IS NECESSARY IN ORDER TO SHOW THE FULL EXTENT OF THE FALL AND THE FULL BENEFIT DERIVED FROM BAPTISM INTO CHRIST. When it is seen that the only obedient Son of Adam was in need of salvation, it must be obvious that every other son of Adam—whatever be his conduct—must need salvation from the same thing; and as there is only one way of salvation the means necessary for the Obedient One must be equally so for the disobedient. This does not detract from the fact that the disobedient once need the means of salvation for something more, viz., their own evil deeds. The need for forgiveness of individual acts has very properly been placed in a prominent position; for if a man does not see that his past course of life has been wrong he cannot change it—that is, “repent”—and as a consequence cannot obtain forgiveness. But this feature should not be allowed to hide the effect of the first transgression. The testimony on the point is presented in such varied form as to leave no room for doubt or denial. All men have been “made (or constituted) sinners,” all are under “condemnation,” and all are accounted “dead” (Rom. v. 19, 18, 15); they are all “shapen in iniquity” (Ps. li. 5), they all possess a “body of sin” (Rom. vi. 6), and they are all under “the law of sin and death” (Rom. viii. 2). The flesh of which they are all made contains “no good thing” (Rom. vii. 18) for it is the dwelling-place of “sin,” “lust” (Rom. vii. 7, 20), or “the devil.” It must have been this evil in Christ’s nature which led him to disclaim the title “Good” when applied to Him by a well-meaning Jew: “Why callest thou Me good? There is none good but one, that is, God” (Matt. xix. 17). Although, by the indwelling of His Father, He had resisted the evil desires of His flesh, He nevertheless felt “the law of sin” in His “members” (Rom. vii. 23) to be loathsome; and this has been the feeling, more or less, of all in whom the law of God has taken root. If so viewed by godly men how must it be viewed by God Himself? His estimate of it is vividly portrayed in His denominating it “the devil,” and in His requiring His righteous Son to die sacrificially in order to “destroy” it. And it is further shown by His decree that all who would be saved must be “baptised” into His Son’s “death” (Rom. vi. 3). It is in harmony with the character of God that in preparing a “Lamb” to “take away the sin of the world” (Joa. i. 29) He should embrace sin in all its forms. To provide a sacrifice which could only cleanse from the evil deeds of Adam’s sons would be insufficient; it would leave them in a state of bondage from which they could not possibly get free. To take away sin it is necessary to deal with the root as well as the fruit. The root is two-fold—“sin in the flesh” and the first act of transgression—and Christ’s sacrifice covers the root in its entirety. If it had not been an atonement for “the offence” of the first man, Adam, could not have had a second probation, and the condemnation of his descendants on account of that offence could not in any case have been cancelled. In like manner, if baptism into Christ had not been a covering for all sin to which a believer is then related, it would have placed him in a defective position. No such flaw is to be found in the Divine arrangement. By baptism into Christ a believer is “made (or constituted) righteous” (Rom. v. 19), and he commences a new life free from “condemnation” (Rom. viii. 1); he becomes “a new creature” (II. Cor. v. 17); and an heir “of eternal life” (Tit. iii. 7); and he cannot lose salvation in its final stage, or have his name blotted “out of the book of life” (I. Rev. iii. 5), unless his conduct be unworthy of the privilege bestowed upon him.

Editorial Flyleaf.

The *Coming Nation* for July, which did not come to hand until our last number had been printed, contains an article entitled "Was Christ a Child of Wrath?" To this an affirmative answer is given, and the answer explained. It does "not mean that He was an evil character, but that He was born outside of the Garden of Eden, and consequently cut off from the tree of life . . . In the sense that he inherited the alienated condition of Adam, who had created a barrier to eternal life in failing to obey. . . . Christ was a child of wrath, and no amount of sentimentality will remove the fact." "This is sound speech, which cannot be gainsaid, and it is supplemented by the following equally pertinent remarks:—"The institution of sacrifice in the Garden of Eden and its continuation after banishment pointed to the fact that those for whom the sacrifice was made deserved the death inflicted upon the animal; but that God, in His mercy, had provided Himself a Lamb that would satisfy the law and yet make it possible to fill the earth with a righteous, obedient people. This Lamb was Jesus, the faithful, obedient, lowly Nazarene, who, though richly endowed with power without measure, by which He could have exalted Himself to the highest pinnacle of earthly grandeur—become universal monarch and commanded the wealth of the world—like His great type, Moses, abstained from the exertion of His limited power in His own behalf, that He might become the redeemer of His brethren, preferring to suffer hardships to enjoying the pleasures of this life for a season and dying like the beasts that perish."

During the past three months the

most conspicuous position in foreign affairs has been occupied by Turkey. The Tory Cabinet having adopted the policy of its predecessor, Lord Salisbury has been actively engaged, in conjunction with Russia and France, in pressing upon the Sultan the necessity for reforms; but thus far these efforts have only resulted in promises. The slaughter of Armenians has revived, and, in some districts, has been as extensive as ever. The Sultan, it is said, has a mania for religious persecution; and, having roused the spirit of fanaticism among his Mohammedan subjects, it cannot easily be quenched. This is easily understood when we remember that the slaying of "infidels" will, according to their belief, increase their reward in Paradise. Hatred of the Armenians has manifested itself in the butchery of some hundreds in Constantinople itself, and this has been followed by a financial crisis. Throughout Asia Minor and other parts of Turkey anarchy reigns supreme. Disaffection exists also among a portion of the Mohammedan population. There is in Constantinople a "Young Turkey" party which, it is said, in default of improved administration, is aiming at the deposition of the Sultan. Public opinion in Britain would have supported the Tory Cabinet if it had taken more energetic measures. But, Lord Salisbury has evidently been fettered by the reluctance of Russia and France; and he has also had to take into account the fact that the Queen has more Mohammedans under her rulership than the Sultan. It is for this reason, as he recently explained, that he has endeavoured to secure reforms for all classes in Turkey, irrespective of religious differences. And he has publicly announced that the six

leading powers of Europe—Russia, France, Germany, Austria, Italy, and Britain—are of one mind, thus far, in reference to their demands on the Sultan. It has since been reported that, at the instigation of Austria, negotiations are proceeding with a view to these Powers taking no action without previous consultation and agreement. All this points to the probability of a partition of Turkey—a mode of settling the question already advocated in the Press. It also receives countenance from an expression in the Prophetic Word. In announcing that the Lord, "will gather all nations . . . unto the valley of Jehoshaphat," to "plead with them there for" His "people," Joel adds, "Whom they have scattered among the nations, and parted my land" (Joel iii. 2). This looks as if the Holy Land were to be "parted" or divided by the "nations," which unite in its invasion. If so, it must be after the collapse of Turkish rule; and if they divide one portion of the Sultan's dominion, will they not divide all? There may also be a partial scattering of Israel in connection with that invasion; some of the Jews inhabiting "unwalled villages" (Ezek. xxxviii. 11), being not unlikely to flee at the advance of such a formidable host. Whatever may be the Divine plan for the final drying-up of the symbolic Euphrates (Rev. xvi. 12), it is evident that this long-looked-for consummation is not far distant. It, therefore, behoves the children of light to be on the watch for their Elder Brother.

In giving Egypt to Britain in 1882-3 for the "ransom" (Isa. xliiii. 3) of Israel from Gentile bondage, God took a definite step towards the restoration of His chosen people. It is since then that the Jewish population of Palestine has so largely increased; the one event

being obviously the consequence of the other. To do anything, after payment of the "ransom," to the injury of the land and people, is much more serious than it would have been before. It resembles the treading down by the Apostasy of God's "saints"—the people whom He has "purchased" or ransomed by the blood of His Son. To divide, as the result of Turkey's collapse, "the land of promise" and scatter the first instalment of its restored people, is, in effect, an attempt to frustrate God's purpose. Hence the outpouring of "the fire of God's wrath" (Ezek. xxxviii. 19) on the "nations" to be gathered into "valley of Jehoshaphat."

The altered position in the Far East resulting from the conflict between China and Japan, is of a more momentous character than at first appeared. In demonstrating the complete demoralization of China and the unrealised vitality of Japan, it has swept away the theory on which British policy in that part of the globe has so long been based. The action of Russia and France in guaranteeing a loan for China is a master-stroke of policy; the control of the purse-strings, giving to these Powers a preponderating influence where British action has hitherto been in the ascendant. What effect this may have on the relations between Russia and Britain it is impossible at present to say; but it is obviously an addition to the existing points of contact where their interests clash. Japan, mortified at having to surrender some of the spoils of her victory, is preparing for a further conflict; and when this takes place it will not unlikely enlist on opposite sides some of the European Powers. Both the Far East and the Near East are at the same time giving cause for trouble among the Kingdoms of Men.

Things New and Old.—No. 6.

“A PERFUME, A CONFECTION, PURE AND HOLY.”

For the purpose of making these Moses was commanded to take unto himself principal spices “of pure myrrh five hundred shekels, and of sweet cinnamon half so much, even two hundred and fifty shekels, and of sweet calamus two hundred and fifty shekels, and of cassia five hundred shekels, after the shekel of the Sanctuary, and of oil olive an hin” (Ex. xxx. 23-24). This was to be the composition of “an oil of holy ointment” which was to be “an holy anointing oil” (ver. 25). Then there was to be taken of sweet spices, “*stacte* and *onycha*, and *gambanum*; these sweet spices with pure *frankincense*: of each shall there be a like weight” (ver. 34). This was to be a perfume “tempered together, pure and holy” (ver. 35).

The number of the ingredients, it will be observed, are nine; this I think in no wise accidental. In the allwise purpose of the Deity the number, as well as the spices themselves, represent certain things which He afterwards caused both the Apostle to the Jews and the Apostle to the Gentiles to make known for the benefit of those who in His sight are considered “holy,” like the priests of the “Sanctuary,” who were anointed with the “holy anointing oil,” and who put some of the “confection” before the testimony in the tabernacle of the congregation where the Deity met with them and accepted them in the days of Moses. First, let us consider the beautiful specialities of the ingredients:—

1. MYRRH is the produce of a valuable Oriental balsamic tree, and is obtained by making an incision in the tree; thus its effect would be of a stimulating and yet soft, unctuous, and mitigating character.

2. SWEET CINNAMON.—This, in its flower, has no smell, but the nut that

follows is rich in oil, which throws off a delightful fragrance.

3. SWEET CALAMUS is a cane (sugar cane) not used particularly for its sweetness, but for its refreshing odour. The process was to dry the canes and then, when required for use, to soak them in water. The intense heat to which they were subjected rapidly evaporated the moisture, and drew off a most refreshing odour, which filled the place where they were so treated.

4. CASSIA has a stronger and coarser perfume and flavour than Cinnamon, and is more common in the East.

5. OLIVE OIL.—This oil, which is supposed to be the best preservative of odours, formed the body of all sweet perfumes. We are aware of the frequent use of the term “olive” and “olive oil,” and we remember also “the two sons of oil standing before the Lord of all the earth” (Zech. iv. 14).

6. STACTE consists of rain-like drops of gum obtained from the Storax, a native tree of Syria, whose leaves are like poplar; it has snow-white flowers; the gum exudes from the trunk and is highly fragrant and contains beniforio and citraemic acids.

7. ONYCHA is of a gum-resinous nature and valued for its agreeable odour.

8. GALBANUM is the gum of a plant, which enhances the efficacy of a fragrant substance.

9. FRANKINCENSE.—The resin of a tree which grows very high; it has a balsamic smell and when lighted burns with a bright flame and fragrant odour. The word *frank* or *free* is supposed to represent the liberal or ready distribution of its odours.

Now as there was a marvellous and grand compactness, mechanical in its fitness, of the first tabernacle so there

was a grand significance in the component parts of the "holy" confection and perfume with which the tabernacle of the congregation and Aaron and his sons were anointed. Fragrance illustrated that which was pleasing to the Deity, and the things pertaining to the tabernacle—the show bread and other various utensils for use therein—were designed no doubt to show the "holy flesh," what was acceptable to Him, who was their Father and their God. The prayer incense of the Priests was a fragrance unto Him, and they were permitted and privileged to be anointed with "holy" perfume and ointment.

Had the children of Israel regarded their high calling and not feared the people, but feared their God they would have continued as a fragrance unto Him, but they sought other ways, and so it is written, "But thou hast cast off and abhorred, thou hast been *woth*, with Thine anointed" (Ps. lxxxix. 38); again, "Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for: but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded" (Rom. xi. 7). That the election are His anointed ones cannot be gainsaid. Let us look at it. The federal head of our anointing is Christ Jesus our Lord; and this beautiful statement is preserved to us of Him, "Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows."

That it is God's pleasure to make all His anointed ones participate in the joy of Christ is, or ought to be, known by the brethren. To this end are we anointed in Christ: "Now he which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God" (II. Cor. i. 21); and the disciple John in writing to his brethren says, "But the anointing which ye have received of Him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you, but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it

hath taught you, ye shall abide in Him" (I. Jno. ii. 27).

That we were constituted anointed ones at our baptism into Christ, when we were made "complete" in Him, is sufficiently clear from the Word; and like the Father's anointed of old, a grave responsibility rests upon us, brethren, which will require prayerful and earnest watchfulness to maintain a right course. The various ingredients of the holy perfume and confection were mainly representative of a fragrant odour; so they shadowed forth by antitype that which was left for the Apostles Peter and Paul to describe as the acting ingredients which in our lives should be a fragrant odour unto our Father and to Christ. Thus Peter in reminding the brethren of the precious promises of God and the resultant effects thereof through "having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust" (or evil desire) asks them to give "all (1) diligence, add to your (2) faith (3) virtue and to virtue (4) knowledge, and to knowledge (5) temperance; and to temperance (6) patience; and to patience (7) godliness; and to godliness (8) brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness (9) charity" (II. Peter i. 5-7).

Paul tells us by his letter to the anointed ones in Galatia, that "the fruit of the Spirit is (1) love, (2) joy, (3) peace, (4) long suffering, (5) gentleness, (6) goodness, (7) faith, (8) meekness, (9) temperance; against such there is no law" (Gal. v. 22, 23).

It will be observed that there is a division into two parts, "ointment" and "perfume"; this probably, as in the case of the two "wave loaves" points to Jew and Gentile accepted ones, to whom were sent two specially appointed Apostles in the persons of Peter and Paul by One Spirit. The same Spirit has chosen the number Nine to illustrate His glorious teaching and purpose in many ways which it is our pleasure to discern. Nine in number were the ingredients of the ointment and perfume;

and nine were also the number of the things mentioned by both Peter and Paul as the special characteristics of those who are living in the Truth. Likewise nine was the number of manifestations of the Spirit given to every man (in Apostolic days) to profit withal:—“For to one is given by the Spirit, the word of (1) wisdom; to another the word of (2) knowledge, by the same Spirit; to another (3) faith, by the same Spirit; to another the (4) gifts of healing, by the same Spirit; to another the (5) working of miracles; to another (6) prophecy; to another (7) discerning of spirits; to another (8) divers kinds of tongues; to another the (9) interpretation of tongues; but all these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will” (1. Cor. xii. 7 to 11). Then there were the five pillars and the four pillars in connection with door hangings and the veil; writing about which Bro. Roberts, in *The Christadelphian* for September, 1895, in his article on the “Law of Moses,” says:—“If pillars represent men, what men in this connection? If the four pillars stand for “the four evangelists” as the witnesses to the world in all generations of the sufferings and resurrection of Jesus, what five men are distinguished in connection with the work of preaching this risen Jesus as the door of entrance into sainthood, reconciliation, and hope? This phase of the testimony of Christ is represented peculiarly by the epistles which are the outgrowth of the Apostolic work after Christ’s departure from the earth. Now it is a fact that these epistles have five authors, and only five, Paul, James, Peter, Jude, and John.” Surely in all these things there is a spiritual significance which goes far beyond mere ingenuity. The very remarkable combinations as to stimulus and fragrance of the ointment and perfume foreshadowed that which would be pleasing to God in the characters of His Saints, and they perfectly answer to the results produced by following the Spirit’s

exhortation. This is effected by daily anointing ourselves with the Spirit-word and so becoming acceptable to Him who has called and exalted us to this high position in Christ Jesus. Besides the fragrant characteristics of the ingredients of the holy ointment and perfume their adhesive nature will be observed; thus foreshadowing the *unitedness* which will positively result if we pay heed to the nine characteristics (II. Pet. i. 5-7 and Gal. v. 22-23). How grand is the harmonious blending, and what perfect agreement between the whole so contrary to the “Old Man,” and so in accord with Christ Jesus the New Man!

It will have been noticed that whilst all the ingredients of the “holy” ointment and perfume have more or less a fragrant odour, some are finer, some coarser than others, some a softening, some a stimulating character, some yielding their odour under intense heat, and some of an adhesive nature. How beautifully do all these symbolise the varied natures of the brethren! All “holy” ones are a fragrance; some are of a refined nature, delightful to meet with, others more coarse or more rough and ready, but who are fitted for the more arduous work of the vineyard. Strength is often needed to break the clods. How Dr. Thomas answered to this we can judge by the vast amount of breaking up of the ground he did. Others show their true devotion to Christ by their courage and patience under great trial, which may be likened unto intense heat, even the trial of their faith. Another class are more of a loving or adhesive nature, at their happiest when in association with those who are of the Truth. Thus the whole body gets moulded together into a compound which is “holy” and acceptable to the Lord.

However much diversity of mind there may be, if all be under the influence of the Spirit’s teaching, there is unity of thought and purpose, and when that is so it can be said, “How good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell to-

gether in unity" (Ps. cxxxiii. 1). A community of united brethren under the Spirit's influence is compared to one man, from whose head "the precious ointment" goes "down to the skirts of his garments" (ver. 2). In its highest aspect this illustration will be fulfilled in the immortal state; but it should be realised, in a lesser degree, even now. And it will be, where all parts of the Word predominate. Disunion is due to the thoughts of the flesh being mixed with the thoughts of the Spirit.

Of the result in the Apostle Paul's life he gives us a glimpse in writing to Timothy: "All Scripture given by (1) *inspiration of God*, is (2) *profitable* for (3) *doctrine*, for (4) *reproof*, for (5) *correction*, for (6) *instruction* in righteousness, that the man of God may be (7) *perfect*, (8) *thoroughly furnished* unto all (9) *good works*." (11. Tim. iii. 16-17.) Again, "But thou hast fully known my (1) *doctrine*, (2) *manner of life*, (3) *purpose*, (4) *faith*, (5) *long suffering*, (6) *charity*, (7) *patience*, (8) *persecutions* . . . what persecutions I (9) *endured*." (11. Tim. iii. 10, 11). In both these it will be seen that there are nine states or

principles which lead to the endurance acceptable. Brethren let us go on to perfection, anointing our eyes daily that we may see what it is that is good and acceptable unto Christ, so that if the Lord comes not before we die, we may be with those that shall "Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead." (Isaiah xxvi. 19). If so we shall be drawn up by the Sun of Righteousness to be made glorious in Nature as we have been holy in character during our probation.

"Behold how good a thing it is,
And how becoming well.
Together such as brethren are
In unity to dwell.

"Like precious ointment on the head
That down the beard did flow,
E'en Aaron's beard, and to the skirts
Did of his garments go.

"As Hermon's dew, the dew that doth
On Sion's hill descend;
For there the blessing God commands
Life that shall never end."

W. WHITEHEAD.

New Romney.

Sips from "The Brook in the Way."

THE COLLECTING BOX.

This indispensable and familiar adjunct to ecclesial organisation has a history. It seems to have been invented by one of Judah's model high-priests. Jehoiada, we are told in II. Kings xii. 9, "took a chest, and bored a hole in the lid of it, and set it beside the altar on the right side, as one cometh into the house of the Lord; and the priests that kept the door put therein all the money that was brought into the house of the Lord."

The necessity that led to the adoption of this novel arrangement was that "the sons of Athaliah, that wicked woman, had broken up the house of God" (II.

Chron. xxiv. 7). Joash had commanded the Levites to "gather money" for the restoration of the Temple, but "the Levites hastened it not."

Josephus states that they concluded "that no one would willingly pay the tax and so Jehoiada used this stratagem to obtain the money." This probably does not fully explain why Jehoiada should be thus negligent in the performance of the king's wishes. The Law did not provide for such a thing. A tax was exacted half a shekel of every one above the age of twenty when the nation was numbered. The rich might not give more, or the poor less. This taught them that they needed redemption for their lives; and

the money realised was used for the service of the tent of meeting (Ex. xxx. 11-16).

The only other tax was in the matter of tithes. All were to render a tenth of their income, whether derived from the land or the flock; it was holy to the Lord. These taxes were obligatory. But faithful service required more than this from the "Israel of God." It was, however, to be rendered "not of constraint, but willingly."

This principle governs the giving of offerings both under this and past dispensations. Hence in the making of the Tabernacle the invitation to contribute was "to every man whose heart maketh him willing."

David declared that he would not offer to the Lord of that which cost him nothing. The Lord Jesus himself, in laying the foundation for the "house not made with hands" declares "no man taketh my life, but I lay it down of myself;" "So I come to do Thy will, O God."

Jehoiada, faithful to the spirit of the law, avoided the taxing, but by this device of a collecting box obtained from willing donors sufficient to repair the breaches in the Temple.

We who are not under the law, but under grace, are expected to do our part in monetary offerings for the service of the truth. It is not incumbent upon us to devote a tenth of our income as it was with Israel. It is evident that a brother earning £1 a week with responsibilities of various kinds would find very often that two shillings was a grievous tax. On the other hand one in receipt of £20 a week would find little self-denial in devoting £2 by way of tithe. If we regard our offerings as a tax they lose their virtue.

Israel had many advantages while faithful which we cannot have. We have burdens also which were unknown to them, such as Imperial taxes and poor rates. Nevertheless the law which relates to our time is very plain; much depends upon a right interpretation of it. It is just, it is merciful, and it is kind. It is contained in Paul's letters and elsewhere. In II. Cor. viii. 12 for example, after exhorting to action in giving, he says: "If the readiness is there, it is acceptable according as a man hath, not according as he hath not." Observe, the same principle of willingness or readiness is required, and

that a little given out of a small purse is equally acceptable with God as largesse from the abundant supply of the more favoured contributors.

An example of one who fell short of this virtue of willingness is furnished in Mat. xix. 16. A young man, blameless as regards the law—and whom Jesus, looking upon, loved—desired to know what good thing he should do to obtain an entrance into the Kingdom. Jesus perceived his failing. He had great possessions, and although diligent in doing all that Moses had enjoined, through avarice, kept a firm clutch upon wealth which he might have distributed to the poor and needy. Wealth is not a sin, money is good; it is the "love of it" that is "a root of all kinds of evil" (I. Tim. vi. 10 n.v.) It was necessary for him if he would be perfect to put this, his one weakness, entirely away, and—like the Master whom he desired to serve—"although rich yet he became poor" for the Truth's sake. He went away sorrowful, unequal to the task Jesus imposed. If He could lose the right to eat of the tree of life, so may we, if, though otherwise blameless and sound in the doctrine, we allow the worship of mammon a place in our belief and neglect or grudgingly bestow our mite in the service of the Truth and its poor.

Should we give to strangers? Some think not, under the impression that being incorporate with Israel our duties begin and end with its commonwealth. Yet the Law and Christ both enjoin consideration for the poor, even the stranger from the covenants of promise. Doth not even nature itself teach us? Does not God cause his sun to shine and his rain to descend upon the evil and unthankful, filling their hearts with joy and gladness?

Jesus, although sent "only to the house of Israel," bestowed a "crumb" upon the Syro-Phœnician woman. True His mission was not of the merely philanthropic kind of popular Christianity; true He as a rule bestowed His favours upon those who had faith in His power; but blended with this rule there was the element of compassion and loving kindness which gives grace and beauty to every gift. How often do we read of "Jesus being moved with compassion," as the impelling cause of some of the good works he accomplished.

The law inculcated regard for the

stranger; some "crumbs" were to be reserved for him from the harvest (Lev. xxiii. 22). To entertain them hospitably formed part of Abraham's duty. James exhorts us to the same mind. Despise not an Edomite; he is thy brother; abhor not an Egyptian, but remember thyself was once a bondman in Egypt.

R. H. FORD.

Psalm lxxviii. 25, 26. The life of Jesus recorded in the four Gospels, clearly reveal the intensity of his love and zeal for everything pertaining to God and His ways; and is proof of the fulfilment of the words of the Psalm, to which He gave expression. "Whom have I in Heaven but Thee? and there is none upon earth that I desire beside Thee." With Him the Father was ever in the

foreground; and never did He at any time rely upon His own feeble strength. "I am poor and needy" (Ps. lxxvi. 1), he would say; "I can of mine own self do nothing" (Jho. v. 30), but "the Lord is the strength of my life" (Ps. xxvii. 1). With us brethren let God be first in all things. Flesh and heart may fail at times. But the knowledge of the fact that God is our strength, will help us to overcome all obstacles, and we shall be able to say with our elder brother—"Whom have I in Heaven but Thee? and there is none upon earth that I desire beside Thee. My flesh and my heart faileth, but God is the strength of my heart, and my portion for ever."

E. HEMINGWAY.

Things Hard to be Understood.

29.—THE LIVING CREATURES AND THE ELDERS.

In view of the reading of Rev. v. 9, 10 in the Revision, and other revised versions, notably Alford's (see his foot notes), can it be possible that the "Four living creatures," and the "Four and Twenty Elders," should not be identified as, or with, the Saints? The analogy of the symbols with the Moabite encampment and priestly courses may not of itself be sufficient proof. There is always the difficulty, if the Saints be referred to, of beholding them crowned, enthroned, and glorified BEFORE the opening of the Seal's. Then the 144,000 redeemed sing their song of redemption BEFORE the "living creatures and the elders"; and again at the sounding of the seventh angel they give thanks that the time of the dead to be judged and rewarded has come. In fact, in all the references they appear to be extraneous, separate, and different from the Saints themselves. If the reading in the common version can be substantiated, well and good.—C. H. EVANS.

The Revised Version of Rev. v. 9, 10, reads as follows: "Worthy art thou to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and didst

purchase unto God with thy blood men of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation, and madest them to be unto our God a kingdom of priests; and they reign upon the earth!" Alford's version is substantially the same. The omission of "us" in ver. 9 is, he says, in accordance with the Alexandrine MS.; and the substitution in ver. 10 of "made them" instead of "made us" is, he explains, in accordance with all the MSS. except one of the fourteenth century. In regard to the words, "they reign," he affirms they are found in the Alexandrine, Sinaitic, later Vatican, and many other MSS.; hardly any giving "we shall reign," as in the Authorised Version.

The effect of these alterations, it will be observed, is not to alter the meaning of the "new song," but as altered it is not necessarily sung by the saints. At the same time the use of the third person "they" instead of the first person "we" or "us," does not prevent its being sung by the saints; for it is permissible for persons in one character to describe themselves in another. To take the song out of the mouths of the saints would involve us in many difficulties. It is sung by "the four living creatures

and the four and twenty elders." If these are not the saints who are they? They originate in the four-square encampment of Israel and the twenty-four orders into which David divided the priests. Do not these, as part of "the patterns of things in the heavens" (Heb. ix. 23), symbolise Christ multitudinously? If so, how can any but Christ's immortalised brethren be represented by them?

The "living creatures and the elders" must be one of three classes: 1. Flesh and blood beings; 2. Spirit beings outside the human race; or, 3. Human beings immortalised. They cannot be the first because they possess "crowns," or coronal wreaths (ch. iv. 4, 10)—the reward for overcoming (ch. ii. 10). It is difficult to see how they can be the second class, because the symbols do not relate to any outside the Adamic race. In ch. v. 11 and vii. 11 "angels" are introduced, but they are described as standing "round about the throne, and the elders and the four living creatures"; which implies that the "angels" are distinct from the "elders" and "living creatures." There is left only the third class, viz., human beings who have been immortalised. The difficulty of identifying these as "the elders and the living creatures" is small in comparison with the difficulty of finding any others to whom the symbols apply.

It does at first seem strange, as stated by our brother, that the saints should be pictured as "crowned, &c., before the opening of the seals"; but when we find that the Spirit sometimes—in the prophetic books—describes a consummation before narrating the events which lead to it, our surprise is considerably lessened. In the present case it is not without propriety that the epistles to the seven churches in chapters ii. and iii. should be immediately followed, in chapters iv. and v. by a dramatic scene embodying, in substance, the reward promised in those epistles. It is, of course, understood that this dramatic scene does not describe anything which actually took place. That all the redeemed during six thousand years should be gathered together to witness the opening of the seven-sealed scroll at the commencement of the fifth thousand, is obviously an impossibility. That such a scene was portrayed by the Spirit to John is unquestionably true, but the object

appears to have been the exhibition of certain features relating to Christ and His brethren, especially the fact that no one but Christ was worthy to open the sealed scroll. And if some explanation had not been given of the principle on which the Lamb received the scroll with power to unseal it, the statements in chapter vi. 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 12 and in chapter viii., 1, that He opened the Seven Seals, would have been less pregnant with meaning. We should have taken it that Christ opened them as a matter of course, without realising that it was a result of His having "prevailed" (ch. v. 5) over "the law of sin and death." It has been suggested that this law is symbolised by the "strong angel" who proclaimed "with a loud voice, Who is worthy to open the book, and to loose the seals thereof?" (ch. v. 2); and there is some force in the suggestion in view of the statement that "the strength of sin is the law" (1. Cor. xv. 56). But it is also possible that it refers to one of the angels of spirit-nature, for they are Mighty Ones, whose strength is derived from the Source of all power. If it does, it shows very forcibly that only a member of the human race who, "through death" had destroyed "him that had the power of death" (Heb. ii. 14), was worthy to exercise the unsealing power—that, in accordance with God's laws or regulations, this honour could not be bestowed on any of the angels in heaven who do God's will perfectly (Matt. vi. 10).

30.—GOD KNOWN IN JUDAH; WHEN?

Ps. lxxvi. 1. "In Judah is God known: His name is great in Israel." Is this verse poetry or not? Is its fulfilment past or future? If past, how was God known? If future, when will it be fulfilled? Is Judah synonymous with Israel? or are they referred to separately?

Like all the Psalms, this is poetry; and judging by the second verse, which uses "Zion" and "Salem" synonymously, the two sentences are a parallelism: the expression "God known" means the same as "His name is great," and "Judah" is identical with "Israel." To "know" God is not simply to know that He exists and that He has given a revelation; it is to understand and appreciate the truth that He "exercises loving-kindness, judgment, and righteousness in the earth" (Jer. ix. 24). To

"know" God and Jesus Christ in relation to these characteristics is a necessary qualification for the bestowal of "life eternal" (Jno. xvii. 3). Did the nation of Israel know God to this extent? Clearly not; He was so known but by few. "The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib: but Israel doth not know, My people doth not consider" (Jsa. i. 3). Jehovah was not "known," and "His name" was not "great" in Israel during the operation of the Mosaic law, and it certainly has not been since their last dispersion. But it will be when they are restored. God will "write" His law in "their hearts," so that they shall no longer say "know the Lord: for they shall all know Me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them" (Jer. xxxi. 34). The subsequent part of Psalm lxxvi. shows that the first verse relates to the future; for the third verse records as an event then past the breaking of "the arrow, the shield, and the sword" in Salem, that is, Jerusalem. The fifth verse refers to "the stout-hearted" having been "spoiled," and the sixth to "the chariot and horse" having been "cast into a dead sleep." This is evidently the overthrow of Gog and his hosts, described prophetically in Ezek. xxxviii. 21, 22.

In response to the request in our last number, we have received the two following answers from a brother of long standing who is, we believe, in agreement with us in the sacrifice of Christ in relation to condemnation, justification, and resurrection; but not, we regret to say, on fellowship obligations.

31.—OBEYING NOT THE TRUTH.

Rom. ii. 8, 9. *Who are the Jews, and Gentiles who "obey not the truth," and are to suffer tribulation and anguish?*

Paul was writing to the saints in Rome, who are troubled with brethren among them who thought it necessary that the Gentile converts should be circumcised. Those brethren were in some measure resting upon the law for their salvation. In so far as they taught circumcision to be necessary, they had fallen from grace, and were not obeying the truth. It is clear from the reasoning of Paul, that there were many such persons, who were contentious and sticklers about forms and ceremonies—not having the spirit of the

truth although they had put on the name. They had "the form of knowledge, and of the truth in the law," and their trust was in the form more than in the truth itself. Such men, while professing great zeal for the truth, were really the "enemies of the Cross of Christ." Paul says that there were many such, of whom he had told the Philippians often; many brethren whose god was *themselves*, who gloried in their shame, whose mind was set on earthly things. If such things existed under the eyes of the Apostles, can we expect to be free from them now?

The doing evil is in, or under, the law of Christ; outside of Him men are only under the compensating law of their animal life. Paul was only writing to Jews and Gentiles, who were under law to Christ, or in the bonds of the new covenant, through faith; and so the blessing, and the curse of the covenant apply only to them. A mistake is often made of supposing him to be writing to all men, and hence the misapplication of his reasoning. CHAS. SMITH, Edinburgh.

32.—THE WORD MADE FLESH.

John i. 14. *What is "the word," that was made flesh?*

Even the same word, which is mentioned in the first verse of the chapter. The word that was in the beginning, the word that was with God, even the word that was God.

God the Father, who is the source of all things, is the invisible God, whom no man hath seen, nor can see. He hath created man with the capability of receiving, and, in measure, understanding His mind, will, or purpose. His mind, which is Himself, He reveals to man through the word, that is the written or spoken signs which convey a meaning; the meaning which they convey being the real word, or mind, of God, which is Himself. Not that the word is all that constitutes the Divine Being, but that it is all of Himself which He has revealed to man. He has revealed Himself "at sundry times, and in divers manners," here a little, and there a little, as men were able to bear it. Indeed, men are only able to understand a little at any one given time; just as the little child learns the speech and thought of its parents by constant contact with them, picking up their language and manner of thinking by slow degrees. In like manner the children of the Divine

parent learn his language and mind, little by little, and as the little gained is added to what has been already received, the mind of the Divine child grows in the likeness of the parent, until the Father's mind becomes the child's mind, ruling him in all his life. Such is the case when nothing interferes with its growth, as illustrated by the parable of the sower. All men are more or less under a bias, weighted on one side more than the other. This they have received from their ancestors. It is a weakness for which they are not to blame. The only remedy is in the power of the Word. Still, as the parable shows, some have become so barren of soil as to be unfitted for the growth of the word. Our first parents formed the character of transgression; their children have not improved the character, unless another character, that of the word, be imprinted upon them. "When the fulness of the time was come God sent forth His Son," first as a tiny babe, learning little by little, as other babes learn, so that he "increased in wisdom, and age, and in favour with God and man." The Spirit of the Christ in the prophet said: "The Lord God hath given me the tongue of the learned." How did He give him it? "Morning by morning He wakeneth mine ear, and I was not rebellious, neither turned away back." Again, "I have more understanding than all my teachers; for Thy testimonies are my meditation."

When He came to be about thirty years of age the Word of God, which had been His life's study, became perfect in Him, so that He was "The Word made flesh." It was His meat, and His drink, or His whole being. He lived by it, and He lived for it. When he passed through the fiery ordeal of the slain lamb, he passed from being the word made flesh, to being the Lord the Spirit, the Word of God. The Word, although manifested in the flesh, and perfected, so far as it could be perfected, for the time then being, is fully perfected in the head, and will yet be perfected in the body. That word is an everlasting word; for it is the Eternal Father, as He has revealed Himself to men. "The word of the Lord endureth for ever; and this is the word by which the gospel is preached unto you." God is begetting children unto Himself, and it is out of Himself they are begotten. In the Douay Bible, Isa.

lxvi. 9, reads thus, "Shall not I that make others to bring forth children, Myself bring forth, saith the Lord? Shall I, that give generation to others, be barren, saith the Lord thy God?" His word shall not return unto Him void; but in a multitude in whom He shall dwell; if He dwell in our hearts by faith just now. He will dwell in us then, in fact. CHAS. SMITH, Edinburgh.

As a further contribution towards an understanding of "The Word made flesh," we have received the following with an intimation that it will be followed by an exposition:—

John i. 1-14.—The subscribed translation from the Greek text supplies to the English reader, almost as perfect as it is possible, the expression of thoughts conveyed by the words and phrases in the original text, and in this respect (the writer claims) is an exception to any translation of this chapter extant.

1. In (the) beginning was the "declaration," and the declaration was with the "Deity," and the "declaration" (was) represented the "Deity."

2. The same was in the beginning with the "Deity."

3. Arising from "it" everything has transpired, and without it nothing has happened, which has happened.

4. In it was "life," and the life was the light of men.

5. And the "light" shineth in the darkness, and the darkness did not comprehend it.

6. There was a man born, having been sent from "Deity," named "John."

7. He came as a witness, in order that he should testify concerning the light, that all might believe through him.

8. He was not the light, but (was sent) that he might testify concerning the light.

9. (That) was the true light, which enlighteneth every man in entering into the "order."

10. It was in the "order," and arising from it the order was brought into existence, and the "order" did not understand it.

11. It came unto those who pertained to it, and they who pertained to it did not lay hold of it.

12. But as many as did embrace it, to them it gave privilege to become children of "Deity," to them (thus) believing into His name, "(i.e., Deity's name, The memorial name:—*Yahweh.*")

13. Who were not begotten out of bloods, neither out of the will of flesh, nor out of the will of man, but out of "Deity."

14. And the declaration, became flesh, and tabernacled among us—and we saw its glory, glory as of an only begotten from a father—full of favour and of truth." M. WYLLIE, Sydney, N.S.W.

33.—THE LAMB SLAIN FROM THE FOUNDATION OF THE WORLD.

Referring to our answer in No. 5 (p. 21) the author of Difficulty No. 23 writes as follows:—"I was a little surprised at your reading Rev. xiii. 8 as 'slain from the foundation of the world.' I have always taken the text to mean, when better arranged, 'Written from the foundation of the world in the book of life of the slain Lamb.' This is the reading of the French version, is confirmed by various passages referring to foreknowledge, &c., and is rendered positive by Rev. xvii. 8, 'Written in the book of life from the foundation of the world'—i.e., the Slain Lamb's book of life. Dr. Thomas (Ill. Eureka, p. 290) is very decided on this passage; of course, without questioning the phrase 'Slain from the foundation of the world' as a phrase expressive of a truth. In the Revised Version the alternative rendering is given in the margin to Rev. xiii. 8, and in the notes of the American Revisers at the end it says, 'Rev. xiii. 8. Let margin 5 and text change places—compare xvii. 8.'"

The wording of Rev. xiii. 8 in the Authorised Version is in the same order as in the Greek; but in view of Rev. xvii. 8 its meaning is probably as contended for by our correspondent; though we cannot admit that the writing of the names is based upon foreknowledge. The meaning of the passage would be fully met by the writing of these names being commenced at the foundation of the world. To have the name written in the Lamb's book of life is to be in Christ; and this, in the present dispensation, begins with baptism. Hence Paul says that certain brethren "were in Christ before me" (Rom. xvi. 7). The first names written would be Adam and Eve, when they were clothed with skins, and Abel's would follow, when his sacrifice was accepted; and all other names would be added as they entered the Name of Salvation. The entry of the name is equivalent to a Divine recognition of a change from a state of alienation to one of reconciliation.

The following questions, our readers will observe, still await answers:—

Luke xi 30-32. What is the meaning of this passage in conjunction with Jonah?

11. Peter ii. 4. Who are the "angels" here mentioned, and what was their sin?

Jude, vers. 6 and 7. What "angels" are these, and what is the "eternal fire visited on Sodom and Gomorrah?"

EDITOR.

An Enigmatical Protest.

The following letter, dated Sept. 3rd, 1895, from Bro. G. F. Lake, relates to the latter part of the criticism entitled "Passing Shots," in the last number:—

"In the current number of THE SANCTUARY KEEPER you attribute certain statements to me which I have never at any time made use of. On p. 56 you say (answering mine in the July *Christadelphian*) 'why was non-resurrection denounced as a "heresy," a belief of which would bring condemnation at the

judgment seat of Christ?' You must be aware that I have never said this; nor, to the best of my knowledge, has any brother. On the contrary, I have, upon principle avoided (what you have done much too freely) to presume to pronounce beforehand what the judgment seat sentence may be. The phrase in question makes a very telling point in your rejoinder, but is it right to attain that end by such means?"

"The same article contains several

false imputations, at which (as coming from you) I am very surprised. For example, on p. 54 you say 'he is teaching that Christ did not need a sacrifice for what he inherited from Adam,' and previously 'that men only need sacrifice for what they have done.'

"I have put it to you in many ways and many times that this is not so. My letter in the *Christadelphian* said that 'man is a sinner'—not limiting, or intending to limit, it to his personal misdeeds, and you, from many letters of mine, knew perfectly that I do not do so.

"Again on p. 55 you say 'that Bro. Lake describes justification from Adamic sin by means of baptism into Christ as a mechanical justification.' A reference to my letter in the July *Christadelphian* will show that these words do not occur in it. You have invented them for me and then replied to them. What the letter does say is that your theory of justification is 'a mechanical' one; and no reference is made to Adamic sin or baptism into Christ.

"How you can justify such a proceeding it is not easy to conceive. And why you should put into my mouth statements of your own, and then infer that I am 'beginning to be ashamed' of them, is incomprehensible, and unworthy of you.—I am, yours fraternally for Christ's sake, "GEORGE F. LAKE.

"P.S.—The first number of THE SANCTUARY KEEPER contained a quotation from the *Investigator*, deriding me for saying that responsibility was a question upon which differences of opinion were permissible. You thought this worth printing, and now you can allege that I have said non-responsibility is a doctrine which will bring condemnation at the judgment seat of Christ.

"G. F. L."

As this letter appeared in the October *Christadelphian*, I sent the following reply to the Editor, but only the second paragraph was inserted in the November number:—

"Bro. Lake has sent you a copy of a letter he has addressed to me, but he has not sent the reply I wrote him. I must, therefore, ask permission to write one for publication.

"I have not imputed to him the statement that non-resurrection out of Christ was denounced as a heresy; and therefore his disclaimer is superfluous. When he made a broad announcement about

the division in London not being caused by the non-responsibility question, I was entitled to refer to any utterance connected with it. He says that to the best of his knowledge the statement I quoted was not made by any brother. Very likely; for through residing at Windsor some twenty miles from London, Bro. Lake is not able to be at all the ecclesial meetings. Many things, therefore, were said which he did not hear. As his remark casts a doubt on my veracity, I am under the necessity of substantiating what I have said. The occasion to which I refer was the Christmas tea-meeting in Barnsbury Hall preceding the division, when the subject was, 'For what are we liable to be condemned at the judgment-seat of Christ?' Bro. A. T. Jannaway's answer to the question was 'heresy,' and he devoted the whole of a highly-impassioned address to an attempt to prove that the denial of resurrection out of Christ was a heresy. The hall was nearly full of brethren and sisters from North and South London, and therefore my statement can easily be confirmed.

"Bro. Lake, it is true, did not use the word 'heresy,' but his language amounted to the same thing. In his original letter of indictment he defined the belief in the non-responsibility of enlightened rejectors as 'unscriptural' and opposed to our basis of fellowship, and he subsequently proposed a resolution to 'withdraw from those who believe and teach it.' If an 'unscriptural' belief deserving of disfellowship be not heresy? what is heresy?

"The Brixton ecclesia, following suit, withdrew from the Barnsbury Hall meeting for 'avowing and teaching that enlightened rejectors of the Gospel are not amenable to resurrectional judgment.' And yet within fifteen months Bro. Lake announces through *The Christadelphian* that our division was not 'caused by the doctrine of non-responsibility.' I cannot believe that he and others wrote and spoke what they did not then believe, and therefore I can only conclude that there has been some change of mind.

"To prove that my rejoinder is 'full of misrepresentations, Bro. Lake quotes as positive statements two clauses of a sentence commencing with the words 'If by this he means.' Is this—which he calls an example—a just ground for making such a charge?

"Bro. Lake further complains that I have misrepresented what he said about 'mechanical justification.' He applied this term, he says, to my 'theory,' and made 'no reference to Adamic sin or baptism into Christ.' Well, what is my alleged 'theory,' or, more correctly, Bible truth? It is this: That Adamic sin, inherited sin, sin in the flesh, fallen flesh, uncircumcision of the flesh, the body of sin, sinning federally in Adam, being a constitutional sinner, legal condemnation for the offence of Adam, subjection to the law of sin and death, evil desire, sin that dwelleth in us, our old man, or the diabolos—all different expressions for or aspects of the same thing—is the subject of a justification by baptism into Christ. This is what I have set forth by speech and pen, and this is what I understood Bro. Lake, in the July *Christadelphian* to deny. If instead of denying it he believes it I shall be delighted to make known the fact. Only, in that case, I shall be utterly unable to comprehend what item in my belief he described as a 'mechanical justification.' Although Bro. Lake did not mention baptism into Christ he should know that this is an essential element of my belief in justification. If he attributes to me a belief which does not comprise baptism into Christ, it is I who should complain of misrepresentation."

After quoting the second paragraph the Editor of *The Christadelphian* says:

"Bro. Andrew goes on to comment on the remaining portion of Bro. Lake's letter, and re-states his position; but the publication of his letter *in extenso* would inevitably tend to the re-opening of the whole question, of which we have surely had enough."

Then why was Bro. Lake's attack on my belief allowed to appear in the July number? It is very curious that from time to time these attacks are deemed opportune, but that a defence from me is considered inopportune.

The Christadelphian, for May, 1894, reports that Bro. Lake and others had left the Barnsbury Hall meeting for refusing to reaffirm "the doctrine of light being the basis of resurrectional responsibility." This action was commended by the Editor, who said, "The decision of the assembly left Bro. Lake

and those who act with him no alternative but the course they have adopted" (pp. 203-4). Fourteen months after in the same magazine allows Bro. Lake to say to its readers, "It is a mistake to suppose that in London the division was caused by the doctrine of non-responsibility." Could two statements be more contradictory than these? If they can be harmonised let those who are able do it, for it is beyond my power. Bro. Lake refers me to the statement he made to the editor of the *Investigator*, quoted in the first number of THE SANCTUARY-KEEPER (p. 31) that "variations of opinion are permissible on amenability to judgment." But this affords no solution; it rather increases the difficulty. The statement to the editor of the *Investigator* appears to have preceded Bro. Lake's withdrawal from us; and as it is at variance with the resolution he proposed it looks very much like a change of mind within the space of a few weeks; and if he has now reverted to the opinion expressed to the editor of the *Investigator*, it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that there has been another change of mind. Bro. Lake has a perfect right to change from one position to another, but if he does so he is not justified, when I point it out, in charging me with misrepresentation. If "it is a mistake to suppose that in London the division was caused by the doctrine of non-responsibility," the "mistake" is entirely due to the words and action of himself and those who have co-operated with him.

It will be seen that Brother Lake's letter rendered it necessary for me to re-state my position; for, although he says that he applied the term "mechanical justification" to my "theory of justification," he does not say what act or ceremony in the alleged "theory" he denominates "mechanical." Candour requires that he should do so when charging me with misrepresentation.

In giving the two illustrations of alleged misrepresentations Brother Lake not only omits to quote the word "If" by which they are preceded, but he ignores the fact that I previously quoted his exact words; thus giving to the reader an opportunity of seeing whether or not I was drawing from them an unwarrantable conclusion.

J. J. L.

Our Letter Box.

JUSTIFICATION; WHAT IS NECESSARY FOR IT?

K., while believing that baptism, like the memorial supper, testifies to the death and resurrection of our Lord, contends that it is not a means of justification. "We are justified," he says, "by believing the record that the Father has given of His Son, and by a patient walking in the light;" "the overgrowth of the doctrine of baptism," he adds, "is beclouding the whole question of the righteousness of God."

Discipleship, he contends, consists only of being taught; Jews who were "taught of God" or "learned of the Father" (Jno. vi. 45), came to Jesus Christ and became His disciples. Hence he concludes, to "know and believe the truth as it is in Jesus constitutes discipleship, and most, of necessity, precede baptism," which, he considers, is the result of discipleship—its last act rather than its first—not its initiatory rite. This position overlooks the fact that previous to the appearance of Jesus large numbers of Jews had been baptised by John the Baptist (Matt. iii. 5). That generation was like a house which had been "swept and garnished" (Matt. xii. 44). When Jews who had been baptised by John the Baptist became disciples of Christ they did not need further baptism. But when other Jews avowed belief in the mission of Jesus they would require baptism before being accepted as disciples. True, "Jesus Himself baptised not, but His disciples" (Jno. iv. 2) did.

K. quotes the words addressed to Christ's disciples, "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. xviii. 3). But this was not conversion to God or His Son—not conversion to the Gospel as the word is now used. It simply had relation to the fleshly feeling which prompted the disciples to say, "Who then is greatest in the kingdom of heaven?" (ver. 1) This was not exhibiting the humility of little children; and hence Christ's reproof. The word "converted" simply means to turn, and it is so rendered in

the Revised Version. It was the fact of being already heirs of the kingdom which led them to indulge in unlawful ambition.

K. refers to passages which speak of the Word of God cleansing and sanctifying, and he says that it was by this means that the Corinthians were "washed," "sanctified," and "justified" (I. Cor. vi. 11). There is in this a confounding of things which, though related to each other, nevertheless differ. There is a cleansing by water (after belief), and there is a subsequent cleansing by the Word. They are represented in these two passages:—"Be baptised and wash away thy sins" (Acts xxii. 16); "Every man that hath this hope in Him purifieth himself" (I. John iii. 3). The Corinthians had, when the Apostle wrote them, partaken of the cleansing in its first stage; but there was much to be done in that which followed.

K. truly says that "It is not the symbol that saves us, but the thing symbolised"; or, to put it more correctly, The death of Christ saves us by means of the symbol. But K. thinks that, in certain cases, the unintentional or unavoidable absence of the symbol will not exclude salvation. The explicit testimony will not admit of any such exceptions. There is only one way of salvation, not two. What is salvation? Deliverance from sin and its penalty, death. For this the sacrifice of Christ is a necessity—not by simply believing it, but by conformity to it in the appointed symbol. Apart from this there is no provision for sins being washed away, and without such washing salvation in its first stage cannot commence.

In quoting the Words, "The just shall live by his faith" (Hab. ii. 4; Rom. i. 17), K. overlooks the fact that they are spoken of those under the Mosaic law, or in Apostolic times, who, by sin-cleansing ceremonies, had been made just. When the Apostle says that, "By the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification" (Rom. v. 18), he obviously refers to the "many" who are "made righteous"

(ver. 15) by the "righteousness" of Christ, in being "baptised into his death" (ch. vi. 3). Only in this way is God "in a Har of him which believeth in Jesus" (Rom. iii. 28); and only those who are justified can live for ever.

JUSTICE, MERCY, AND HUMILITY.

Micah vi. 8, is a favourite passage with some who object to baptism, and it is quoted by K. in support of his belief. Let us therefore look at it. The prophecy of Micah was addressed to the "people" of Judah, who are styled the "earth" (ch. i. 1, 2). Chapter vi. opens by saying that "the Lord hath a controversy with His people, and He will plead with Israel" (ver. 2). This He proceeds to do (vers. 3 to 5). One of the nation is there represented as asking whether he shall offer a multitude of sacrifices in order to please God (vers. 6 and 7). To this the prophet replies by saying, "He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" (ver. 8). These words being addressed to an Israelite, must be confined to such as are in covenant-relationship with God; to apply them to unjustified Gentiles, and to give them a superficial interpretation is to pervert their meaning. The vices of Israel included unjust dealings among themselves, lack of mercy toward the poor, and prondness of heart. The offering of sacrifices in such a state of mind was offensive to God. "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord: I am full of the burnt offering of rams, and the fat of fod beasts . . . cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow" (Isa. i. 11-17). God did not say that sacrifices were unnecessary, but that they must be accompanied by a mental attitude in harmony with their purport. To be just, merciful, and humble, could not take away their sin, but they were necessary for the prescribed sacrifices to be acceptable. In like manner, the brethren of Christ must now exhibit these virtues in order to maintain the justification of which they partook at baptism.

This is the obvious exposition of the passage quoted by our correspondent.

but if he should desire to do so, let him ask him to consider what, in its full sense, is involved in Micah's injunction. Can a man "do justly" who does not recognize that by birth he is unjust, and that he can only become just by partaking of the just death of Christ? Can he "love mercy" if he does not appreciate "the mercy to Abraham" (Gal. iii. 20) as to enter into the "covenant of promise" (Eph. ii. 12) "by sacrifice" (Ps. i. 5)? And can he "walk humbly with God" if he has not received the kingdom of God with the humility of a little child. (Matt. xix. 14) and been "baptised" (Acts viii. 12)? The justice, mercy, and humility must be viewed comprehensively from God's standpoint, not man's.

IS FAITH THE GIFT OF GOD?

In quoting Eph. ii. 8, K. implies that faith is "the gift of God." This is a mistake. "Faith is the substance of things hoped for" (Heb. xi. 1), that is, the belief of Divine promises. It cannot be "the gift of God" and at the same time necessary "to please Him" (ver. 6); for in that case none could "please" God but those to whom He gave faith. The passage in question reads as follows:—"By grace have ye been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God; not of works, that no man should glory" (Rev. Version). The expression "through faith" is a qualifying clause which might be put in brackets without affecting the main sentence. The "gift" is salvation, the condition "faith"—of course, with obedience; and the origin of the "gift" is "grace" or favour. The phrase "that not of yourselves" is, in meaning, the same as the one which follows, viz., "it is the gift of God;" the one is in a negative, and the other in a positive form. The Greek word rendered "that" is neuter, and cannot, therefore, relate to the word translated "faith," which is feminine. The antecedent to "that" is the whole of the preceding sentence, and the "it" relates to the same as the "that." Salvation originates, not with man, but with God; and therefore "not of works." It is a Divine gift, in its present and future phase, for those who believe and obey.

THE NATURE OF CHARITY.

A. ("F. Hodgkinson") writes as follows in reference to our reply to him, in No. 4

pp. 26-7:—"You have fairly criticised my few remarks upon the nature of Christ, a highly important doctrine, if we are to know Him. You do not, however, buttress your position by quoting from Psalm li.; hence I conclude that you agree with me that David in that confession and appeal was not referring to Christ: so far so good. If your God is omnipotent, He can bring a clean man out of the earth, a clean woman out of that man, and, after transgression of law, a clean child out of that woman's posterity. Now seed is deposited in the earth and fructifies; bad seed, poor crop; good seed, good results. What seed was sown in Mary the Virgin? Why the Word of God. Jesus was the offspring of the woman, not of the man.

"You mix up the double offering of the High Priest first for himself, then second for the people: this Jesus did only once (not twice) when He offered up Himself.

"Mary's purification is set forth in the law: Lev. xii. 7, 'And she shall be cleansed from the issue of her blood.' This was enjoined upon all mothers. Luke ii. 23: 'Every first male child shall be called Holy to the Lord.' Such was Jesus.

"I quoted 'in the likeness of sin's flesh' upon high Apostolic authority, and rest upon that.

"Flesh is prone to sin; it is too potent for us always to conquer. Jesus was tempted as we are, but He had that in Him that enabled Him to curb the mighty torrent of Niagara.

"You must confess that Jesus' origin differed materially from ours. We had a human father; His Father was Divine. His desires 'were not cut off' as you say, but He had power to strangle them. I do not believe a little babe to be a sinner, but when he grows up and transgresses law he becomes one. You say 'that babes ought not to die'; the transmission of infirmity by infected seed brings about death to the third and fourth generation. Why do animals die? They are not sinners; accident or disease carries them off. So with babes.

"I will put my idea about the saving from the second death in a more comprehensive form. Christ's death does not prevent the death of his saints, as the Apostles died, and it is appointed for us so to die; but it entitles them to resurrection, and once raised it delivers them from any future dissolution; for

those who have deliberately fallen out of line and kept out of dress. I write subject to correction. I do not believe in an unclean Jesus, and I hope you do not in your heart, although you do in print."

The hope of our correspondent, if realised, would convict us of insincerity; and in that case, although securing human approval we should deserve condemnation by Christ. Our non-quotation of Psalm li. did not arise from a belief that it applied solely to David, but because more direct evidence is to be found elsewhere. The question as to whether Christ was clean or unclean, in nature, is dependent, not upon God's omnipotence, but upon the exercise of His power within the limit of His own decrees. Having decided that the Saviour of men should be the Seed of the Woman, and therefore made of fallen flesh, He could not do otherwise and keep His word. The word "likeness" (Rom. viii. 3) is certainly Apostolic, but so is the word "same" (Heb. ii. 14); and we can see harmony between them, if we understand "likeness" in the sense of identity, but if we interpret it as a resemblance we make one Apostolic statement antagonistic to another. It will not be disputed that the nature of Seth was identical with the nature of his father, Adam, and yet it is called a "likeness" (Gen. v. 3). It will not be denied that the faithful will receive a nature identical with that of Christ, and yet this is called being "like him" (1. Jno. iii. 2).—the word "like" being the same in derivation as "likeness" in Rom. viii. 3. It is true that "Jesus' origin differed materially from ours," but this did not make His nature different. It was God's plan that His Son should be begotten "not of the will of the flesh" but of Himself; for He is the primary Saviour and Jesus is "the Arm" (Isa. liii. 1) put forth to save. It is true that Jesus had in Him that which enabled Him to resist temptation, but this was not due to His birth; it was due to the Spirit of God which entered Him subsequently—after circumcision—and which left Him when on the Cross (Matt. xxvii. 46). The admission that "Jesus was tempted as we are" should suffice to show the uncleanness of His nature. How are we tempted? From within and from without. What is it within? Evil desire or "lust." Was Adam so tempted? No;

only from without. He was made without evil desire; for he had no "knowledge of good and evil." Evil desire came through the enticement of the serpent, and made a clean nature unclean. This was what Christ inherited, and herein lies the wisdom, love, and power of God, that He developed in unclean flesh an obedience far superior—because more comprehensive and difficult—than that which He had, in the first instance, required from clean flesh. The statement that "Every first male child shall be called Holy to the Lord" (Luko ii. 23) is no proof that the nature of Jesus was clean. If it is, it proves also that "every first male child" born under the Mosaic law was of a clean nature; and this, we presume, is more than our correspondent is prepared for. The word "holy" in this passage has to do with purpose. The firstborn were originally appointed to be priests, but afterwards the Levites were chosen because of faithfulness in a time of national defection (Exod. xxxii. 26-28), the firstborn being released by exchange and redemption (Num. iii. 45-48). A Jewish mother was required to cleanse herself after the birth of the firstborn male as well as after the birth of his brothers. It is true that reference is made in Lev. xii. 7 to "the issue of her blood;" but it was her blood which gave life to her child, and therefore the child must have been defiled by it.

In saying that bad seed gives a poor crop, and good seed a good one, our correspondent is surely forgetting that there are other influences—such as soil, climate, temperature, moisture—which affect the results. In the case of Christ, whatever else He may have owed to His fatherhood, He did not owe the absence of evil desire; for this was a part of the flesh and blood of which He was made.

And the subsequent indwelling of the Spirit was necessary to keep this evil desire under control. Jesus had not this power in Himself; otherwise the bestowal of the Spirit would not have been necessary; and therefore His Divine begetting was not the cause of His sinless character.

Heb. vii. 27, contains a parallel and a contrast. The parallel is, that the high priest and Christ both offered for their own and the people's sin; the contrast is, that the high priest did so by separate sacrifices, whereas Christ did it by "one sacrifice" (Heb. x. 12). The expression, "This he did once," obviously refers to the preceding statement. If Christ did not offer for Himself as well as for the people He did not do "once" that which the high priest accomplished at twice.

The attempt to explain the death of babes by the death of animals is not permissible; because animals are not related to a law of sin and death, and babes are. Babes are included in the "all men" of Rom. v. 12, 18, on whom "death passed" and on whom "condemnation" came for "the offence of one." This "all" is evidently synonymous with the "many" who "were made sinners" and who are accounted as dead (vers. 19, 15).

The statement that "it is appointed for us to die" is, we presume, based upon Heb. ix. 27; but this does not relate to all men, or even to the brethren of Christ; it refers to the priests under the Mosaic law, as shown by the context. Those who are in Christ are not appointed to die; if they were, none of them could escape; whereas some of them will "not sleep" (1. Cor. xv. 51). They may die, but it is not a necessity; if they do, it is because their Judge and Life-giver is not here.

Within the Holy Place.

LONDON (NORTH).

BARNSBURY HALL, Barnsbury Street, Islington: Sundays, 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.; Wednesdays and Fridays, 8 p.m.

I have with pleasure to report that on October 20th we immersed into the saving Name Mrs. Johanna Simmons

(the daughter of our Sister Greenhalgh), formerly neutral; and on November 17th, Thomas Hughes Williams, formerly Church of England. Bro. Judd, on account of his employment, has, we regret to say, had to remove to Wellingboro'.

The quarterly business meeting of the Ecclesia was held on October 6th.

The Mutual Improvement Class held their annual tea meeting on October 21st, when a number of interesting addresses, based on Phil. iv. 8, were delivered by members of the class.

Commencing in September we have held in the evening of the third Sunday in each month a special meeting for the breaking of bread, for the benefit of those brethren who cannot always attend the Sunday morning meetings.

The lectures for the three months have been as follow: "Christ as a King - Where will He reign?" (R. H. Ford); "Ancient and Modern Babylon—a parallel and a contrast" (W. Owler); "Good tidings of great joy to all people" (C. S. Bore); "How to turn from the power of Satan unto God" (J. J. Andrew); "What have we to do with the Old Testament" (J. Owler); "The doctrine of eternal torments unscriptural" (W. H. Clifford); "The doctrines of universal salvation and eternal suffering considered" (C. Balla); "The Bread of Heaven" (W. Owler); "The promises to Abraham" (R. H. Ford); "What advantageth it me if the dead rise not?" (W. Deane); "The approaching collapse of Turkey—portrayed in Bible Prophecy" (J. J. Andrew); "The Light of the World, past, present, and future" (W. Owler); "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved" (R. H. Ford).

R. OVERTON, Recording Brother.

LONDON (SOUTH).

SURREY MASONIC HALL, Camberwell New Road, S.E.; Sundays, 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.

It gives us pleasure to report that the following persons have put on the name of Christ by immersion:—On September 19th, Miss Mary Sollis, formerly Church of England; on October 17th, Miss Cecilia Caroline Page, daughter of our Sister Page; on October 20th, John Balfour Purvis, formerly Presbyterian, and Samuel Timpson, who was baptised over 15 years ago by those who contended for the "no Adamic condemnation" theory.

Our number has also been further increased by the removal from Bra-bourne, Kent, of Brother Box, who will in future meet with us, having given a hearty adhesion to our basis of fellow-ship.

The annual business meeting was held on October 13th, when satisfactory reports were given. The Registrar in his report announced that the Ecclesia numbered 26; the additions since bring the number up to 30.

Brother Whitehead, of New Romney, paid us a welcome visit on Sunday, November 3rd, when he exhorted at the breaking of bread, and delivered the lecture in the evening. The brethren were delighted with his visit.

The lectures in September, October, and November have been as follows:—"The Government of the World" (C. Bore); "Bible Teaching concerning the Spirit of Man subversive of Spiritualism" (R. H. Ford); "It is Life Eternal to know the only True God and Jesus Christ whom He hath sent" (C. Balla); "Popular notions in regard to Heaven and Hell at variance with Bible Teaching" (J. Owler); "What advantageth it me if the dead rise not?" (W. Deane); "Daniel's visions of the night" (G. F. Guest); "The Hidden Manna" (W. Owler); "Another King—one Jesus" (R. H. Ford); "The Rest that remaineth for the people of God" (W. H. Clifford); "Startling Facts for Professing Christians" (W. Whitehead, of New Romney); "The Fate of the Wicked" (R. H. Ford); "The Meek shall inherit the Earth" (J. J. Andrew); "The Lord cometh with ten thousands of His saints" (G. F. Guest).

THOS B. CLIFFORD, Recording Brother.

NEW ROMNEY.

We still continue our public effort, but, ever as of old, the general bulk of the people have no interest in the "things of the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ." We are, however, grateful to God for the privilege bestowed, and we can only do our humble best, knowing that if we do we shall be accepted of Him. Our meeting has suffered another loss by removal; our Sister Allen, who has been a diligent worker in our midst for many years, having had to remove to Tenterden, fourteen miles from us, where she is in complete isolation. We shall rejoice when these separations will be no more. We have decided to conduct our evening meetings without singing, and I think that even those who were somewhat opposed to the change now prefer the course adopted. WM. WHITEHEAD.

NORTHAMPTON.

TEMPERANCE HALL, Newland: Sunday, 11 a.m. and 6.30 p.m.

Since our last report the number of this Ecclesia has been increased by receiving into our fellowship the following brethren and sisters, who, realising that they were one with us on the "Adamic condemnation," "Justification in Christ," and all that is involved in His nature and sacrifice, and being thoroughly out of harmony with the brethren at Gymnasium Buildings, withdrew from them, and were united with us on Sunday, September 22nd:—

Bro. Helms,	Sis. Ada Helms,
Bro. Bancutt,	Sis. Bancutt,
Bro. Wilson,	Sis. Freeman.

For this event we are all full of gratitude to our Heavenly Father.

We have also had the joy of assisting another into the "bonds of the Covenant," in the person of Mrs. White (the wife of our Brother White), who was immersed on September 20th.

Lectures delivered from October 6th to November 3rd have been on the following subjects:—"Without God in the World" (T. E. Boldington); "The Aryan Announcement" (C. Bore, London); "Life Beyond the Grave" (G. Handley); "Joint-heirship with Christ—What are its Privileges and Prospects?" (J. J. Andrew, London); "Nebuchadnezzar, or a King's Wonderful Dream" (A. E. Thorneloe).

G. HANDLEY.

SYDNEY.—LEICHHARDT TOWN HALL, ECCLESIA.

We continue to hold forth the word of life to small audiences. Since the fundamental doctrine, viz.: Our justification from the "Adamic condemnation" has been assailed by *The Christadelphian*, and through it, by those who went out from us, we deem it the more necessary to strenuously press home to the minds of

one another and to outsiders, the glorious truth re our absolute justification in "Christ Jesus," from the "Adamic condemnation," and the aggravation of the same by our own wicked works. Not gauging our success (as many do) by the numbers we convert, we are therefore, not cast down.

It gives us pain to have to report after a good deal of correspondence, in which we endeavoured to restore four of the members of our ecclesia to the path of rectitude, from which they have strayed, that failing in our endeavours, we have had to withdraw from them. Their misconduct arose from the recent controversy on "amenable to Christ's judgment seat, and justification in Christ," in which their minds (like many others here), were affected by the influence of the editor of *The Christadelphian*, to the detriment of their position in "Deity's truth." At the quarterly meeting, held at the Town Hall on Sunday, October 6th, the following resolution was submitted and carried:—"That we solemnly, in Christ's name, withdraw our fellowship from Bro. and Sister Mamby, and Bro. and Sister Butler, for disorderly conduct, such misconduct being, the forsaking the fellowship of their brethren and sisters, without a just cause, and in refusing to meet their brethren and sisters (as commanded by Christ) to reason together on any misunderstanding which may have arisen."

On the other hand, our number has been augmented by the addition of Bro. Gregory and Sister Hacke, both having refused to follow their late fellow-members of "Albert Hall Ecclesia" in their downward course, in their change of ideas on "Justification in Christ." They are also at one with us on the plain Scripture teaching re amenability to the "Judgment seat of Christ," as solely pertaining to "the household."

M. WYLLIE.

Editorial flyleaf.

(Continued from page 78.)

The news just to hand of an insurrection in Arabia is very ominous. If Turkey loses the city of Mecca a lineal descendant of Mahomet may be appointed Caliph; and then the prayers in every Mohammedan mosque in the world would be offered for him instead

of for the Sultan of Turkey, who, the Arabs contend, has none of Mahomet's blood in his veins. And if Aden be threatened, Britain may be led to occupy a portion of the Arabian peninsula.

The Sanctuary-Keeper:

A QUARTERLY MAGAZINE FOR THE EXPOSITION AND
DEFENCE OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

"Ye (Aaron and his sons) shall keep the charge of the sanctuary, and the charge of the altar."—(Num. xviii. 5.)

"Ye (brethren of Christ) are . . . an holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices." (I. Pet. ii. 5.)

"Thou hast kept My Word and hast not denied My Name."—(Rev. iii. 8.)

No. 8.

MARCH, 1896.

Vol. II.

"The Sacrifice of Praise."

This expression from Heb. xiii. 15 has its origin in the Mosaic shadows. In giving instructions about "the sacrifice of peace offerings," the law says, "If he offer it for a thanksgiving then he shall offer with the sacrifice of thanksgiving unleavened cakes mingled with oil, and unleavened wafers anointed with oil, of fine flour soaked" (Lev. vii. 12). A portion of this sacrifice was to be "an heave offering unto the Lord," and then it was to become "the priest's that sprinkleth the blood of the peace offerings." The remainder, styled "the flesh of the sacrifice of his peace offerings for thanksgiving," was to be "eaten on the day of his oblation" (vers. 14, 15). Thus thanksgiving was associated with sacrificial blood-shedding. This should be remembered in subsequent Old Testament references to "thanksgiving" and "praise." It was evidently in the mind of the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews when penning the phrase "sacrifice of praise"; for in a preceding verse he says, "We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat who serve the tabernacle" (Heb. xiii. 10); and this is followed by a parallel between the animals which were "burned without the camp" and Jesus who "suffered without the gate" (vers. 11, 12). On this the inspired writer bases two exhortations:—

1. "Let us, therefore, go forth to Him without the camp, bearing His reproach." 2. "Through Him then let us offer up a sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of lips which make confession to His name" (vers. 13 and 15).

By this we are taught that "praise" or thanksgiving in regard to the things pertaining to Christ is "a sacrifice," and that its position is parallel to that of "the sacrifice of thanksgiving" in the Mosaic "form of knowledge and of the truth" (Rom. ij. 20). The statement that the Levitical priests had "no right to eat" of the antitypical "altar" embraces every-

thing arising from Christ's sacrifice; and in excluding them it excludes all who have not been incorporated into Christ's "holy priesthood."

SPIRITUAL SACRIFICES: QUALIFICATIONS FOR OFFERING THEM.

Writing to certain ones who had partaken of the "sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ" (I. Pet. i. 2), an Apostle says, "Ye also, as living stones, are built up a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ" (I. Pet. ii. 5). The meaning of "spiritual sacrifices" may be ascertained by "comparing spiritual things with spiritual" (I. Cor. ii. 13). The manna given in the wilderness is styled "spiritual meat;" the water miraculously produced, "spiritual drink;" and the source of the water, a "spiritual rock." These "things" originated not with the flesh but with the Divine Spirit, and they were accompaniments—or indeed necessities—of a life dependent on Divine favour. In like manner "spiritual sacrifices" are related to a wilderness pilgrimage which has for its object—attainment to immortality. Those who have entered on this path are exhorted to "present" their "bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God" (Rom. xii. 1), and to "glorify God" in their "body" because it is included in the "price" by which they "were bought" (I. Cor. vi. 20). No others are exhorted to "present" such a "sacrifice;" and if any did, it would not be acceptable, because not offered on the Christ-altar. For the same reason the "thanksgiving" or "praise" which is styled "a sacrifice" can only be acceptably offered by those who have been "built up a spiritual house." Therefore, when the Apostle John was told to "Rise, and measure the temple of God, and the altar," it was accompanied by the limitation—"and them that worship therein." "The court which is without the temple" he was told to "leave without, and measure it not" (Rev. xi. 1, 2).

Christ's "holy priesthood" are the only occupants of "the temple of God," and therefore they only can "worship therein." To fit them for this act of service they have been cleansed by means of the Altar of Sacrifice, washed in the laver of regeneration, clothed with priestly robes of righteousness, and anointed with the covering name of "the Lord the Spirit" (I. Cor. iii. 18). When they praise or pray they, in effect, put incense into a censer and light it by means of fire from the Altar of Sacrifice. To be acceptable the incense must conform to that which God has prescribed; it must consist solely of the truths which He has revealed. To introduce the "vain imaginations" of man is to use "strange incense"; and to consume it by fire from any other source than the Altar of Sacrifice is to use "strange fire"—both of which are offences to God. What then must it be for Christ's "holy priesthood" to invite "strangers from the covenants of promise" (Eph. ii. 12) to join with them in officiating at the Altar of Incense? Before answering this question consider for a moment the position of these "strangers" as described in the Scriptures.

They are under "condemnation" (Rom. v. 18), "dead in trespasses and sins" (Eph. ii. 1), "children of wrath" (ver. 3), constituents of a "world" at "enmity with God" (Jas. iv. 4), unclean in nature and in conduct (Col. ii. 13), "separate from Christ, alienated from the commonwealth of Israel . . . and without God in the world" (Eph. ii. 12). No amount of goodness from a human point of view, or well-meaning intention, can condone or nullify this condition. It can only be terminated by dying and rising with Christ in the appointed way (Rom. vi. 3-5). Until this takes place they remain members of a creation marred by sin and doomed to pass away (I. John ii. 17). Being "far off" from God (Eph. ii. 13) they are not in a position to address Him as "Father," much less to approach Him through the mediatorship of Jesus Christ.

Contrast this with the position of the occupants of "the temple of God." Having been "washed," "justified," and "sanctified" (I. Cor. vi. 11), they have been "made nigh by the blood of Christ" (Eph. ii. 13), and are consequently at "peace with God" (Rom. v. 1). Having partaken of "the adoption of sons," they are able to cry "Abba, Father" (Gal. iv. 6), and having become "a purchased people" they are in a position to "shew forth the praises of Him who hath called" them "out of darkness into His marvellous light" (1. Pet. ii. 9).

MOSAIC ILLUSTRATIONS.

Under the Mosaic law the Jews were forbidden to mix things which radically differed. They were not to sow their vineyard with "divers seeds," nor "plough with an ox and an ass," neither were they to "wear a garment of divers sorts as of woollen and linen" (Deut. xxii. 9, 10, 11). What was the object of these interdicts? Something more surely than instruction in seed-sowing, ploughing, and garment-making. Consider what the Apostle says, in reference to the Mosaic enactment, "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn." "Is it for the oxen that God careth, or saith he it altogether for our sake? Yea, for our sake it was written; because he that ploweth ought to plow in hope, and he that thresheth, to thresh in hope of partaking" (I. Cor. ix. 9, 10). In this passage the Apostle states that the plowing as well as the threshing has its counterpart in the work of the Truth; and he doubtless had the enactments about plowing in his mind when saying, "Be not *unequally yoked* with unbelievers" (II. Cor. vi. 14). This command embodies a principle which is applicable in more directions than one—marriage, business, social relations, and religion. It was apparently intended to teach the Corinthian brethren that they ought not to take part in the idol-worship which they had professedly forsaken; "For what fellowship have righteousness and iniquity?"—continues the Apostle—"or what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what portion hath a believer with an unbeliever? And what agreement hath a temple of God with idols?" (vers. 14 to 16). These questions are more far-reaching than the circumstances which gave rise to them. Do they not cover the case of an idol-worshipper attending a meeting of Christ's brethren and being invited to join in the worship of "a temple of God"? And are worshippers of the Papal "beast, full of Names of Blasphemy" (Rev. xvii. 3), or any of its progeny, in a different position, as regards God or His "temple"? If partially enlightened they are still "far off" from God and "alienated from the commonwealth of Israel" (Eph. ii. 12, 13). To invite them to join in the worship of God's sons and daughters is to plow with an "unequal yoke" and in this matter to "put no difference between the holy and the common" (Ezek. xxii. 26).

CHRIST'S MEDIATORSHIP: WHO FOR.

The exhortation in Heb. xiii. 15 to "offer up a sacrifice of praise to God continually" is accompanied by the condition "through Him," that is, through Christ. In a previous portion of the same epistle the reason for this is given. Christ is a high priest who, having been in "all points tempted like" His brethren, can "be touched with the feeling" of their "infirmities." "Let us, therefore," says the writer of the epistle, "draw near with boldness unto the throne of grace, that we may receive mercy, and may find grace to help in time of need" (Heb. iv. 14-16).

In Heb. x. 14 Christ's brethren are reminded that, "By one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified;" that, as a consequence, "their sins and their iniquities" up to the time of sanctification are

remembered no more," and that for such "there is no more offering to be made." On this ground they are thus exhorted:—"Having, therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holy place by the blood of Jesus, by the way which He hath dedicated for us, a new and living way, through the veil, that is to say, His flesh; and having a great high priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart in fulness of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our body washed with pure water." (Heb. x. 19-22). These conditions are obviously found in none but the brethren of Christ, and therefore they only can "draw near" by the "new and living way."

Jesus Christ, in addressing His disciples on this subject before His crucifixion, said, "If ye ask anything of the Father, He will give it you in My name. Hitherto have ye asked nothing in My name" (Jno. xvi. 23, 24); "I chose you . . . that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in My name, He may give it you" (Jno. xv. 16); "Whatsoever ye shall ask in My name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son; if ye shall ask anything in My name I will do it" (Jno. xiv. 13, 14). Previous to crucifixion and resurrection Christ's name was not available as a means of approach to God; for the Name of Salvation had not then been given to Him. But since His exaltation to immortality it is the only "Name under heaven" by which the brethren of Christ can approach their Father, either in prayer or praise. It is as obligatory for singing and thanksgiving as for petition:—"Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts unto God. And whatsoever ye do, in word or in deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus" (Col. iii. 16, 17). Although the mention of Christ's name is not as frequent in singing as in prayer, it is intended that it be equally recognised; when not expressed in words it should be mentally realised.

In view of these testimonies it is obvious that for Christ's brethren to pray or sing otherwise than in their High-priest's name would be to neglect a privilege and to be guilty of disobedience. They are required as much as was fleshly Israel, when "nigh" to God, to "sanctify the Lord of Hosts" (Isa. viii. 13). The meaning of this is illustrated in the case of Nadab and Abihu, who "offered strange fire before the Lord, which he had not commanded them." For this they were consumed with fire, and then the Lord said, "I will be sanctified in them that are nigh me" (Lev. x. 1-3; Rev. Ver. Marg.). Hence to obey God is to sanctify Him. If this be necessary for the offering of "incense" on the part of those who are already "nigh" to God, what must be requisite for those "afar off" before they can do likewise? Addressing "the wicked" in Israel Jehovah says, "What hast thou do to declare My statutes, and that thou hast taken My covenant in thy mouth? Seeing thou hatest instruction, and castest My words behind thee" (Ps. l. 16, 17). Is it not evident from these testimonies that obedience is a preliminary, and also a continued, condition of acceptable worship?

THE WORSHIP WHICH THE FATHER SEEKS.

Looking forward to the present dispensation Jesus said to the Woman of Samaria, "The hour cometh, when neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father. Ye worship that which ye know not: we worship that which we know: for salvation is from the Jews. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth: for such doth the Father seek to be His worshippers. God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship in spirit and truth" (Jno. iv. 21-24). This is more than a prediction; it sets forth the principle on which God seeks worship and accepts it. The expres-

sion "must worship in spirit" is often taken to mean earnest or warm-hearted worship; but a little consideration will show that it signifies more than this. The word (*πνευμα*) rendered "spirit" means "wind, air, breath, life, soul, a spirit, spiritual being," and metaphorically it may be used for "feeling" (Liddell and Scott's Lexicon). The leading idea is obviously *life*. God is essential, and never-ending, life. But man, by birth, is not related to that life; such life as he possesses is doomed to come to an end. He may, however, become related to it, and then he is said to have "passed from death unto life" (I. Jno. iii. 14). He is then "not in the flesh but in the Spirit" (Rom. viii. 9). "The flesh" being "sinful," is necessarily under the dominion of death, but "the Spirit" is life not under that dominion. In passing from the one to the other a son of Adam enters into an entirely new relationship with the Creator of all things; the alienation caused by sin is replaced by reconciliation and one-ness.

From the fact that "spirit" is sometimes used for *mind* it has been suggested that to "worship God in spirit" is to worship Him intelligently. But this is surely involved in the word "truth." To be "in the truth" is to be in Christ, and this requires an intelligent belief of God's revealed will. Under the Mosaic law incense was composed of ingredients prescribed by God; their counterpart, in the antitype—praise and prayer—is obviously Divine truth. Such as are in a position to offer this "incense," "the Father seeks" to be His "worshippers"—and none others. Should his sons and daughters do otherwise? Are they not called upon to be "imitators of God"? (Eph. v. 1). Has He not said, "Be ye holy, for I am holy"? (I. Pet. i. 16). He is "a jealous God" (Josh xxiv. 19) and "righteous in all His ways" (Ps. cxlv. 17). Can we improve on His "righteous ways"?

OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.

The obligation implied by these questions has been the subject of much solicitude on the part of a few of Christ's brethren for some years past; and attempts have been made to give practical effect to their belief. In some ecclesias a label has been affixed to the hymn-books lent to strangers, stating that "acceptable worship can only be offered by those who have been immersed after believing the things concerning the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ." But this, on one hand, has been deemed objectionable and on the other insufficient. The absence of singing at public lectures is, it is contended, the only satisfactory course. And what are the objections to its adoption? They are based chiefly on expediency. The arguments taken from the Scriptures deal not so much with principles as with incidents, the most oft-quoted being that of Cornelius. But is this to the point?—Although there is no proof that he was a Jewish proselyte, the statements that he "feared God with all his house . . . and prayed to God alway" (Acts x. 2), and was "of good report among all the nation of the Jews" (ver. 22), lend countenance to the suggestion. His "prayers" and "alms" came "up for a memorial before God" (ver. 4). With what result? He was instructed to send for Peter to hear what he "ought to do" in order to "be saved" (Acts x. 6; xi. 14). In this way his "prayer" was "heard" (Acts x. 31). For what, then, did he pray? That the way of salvation might be opened to the Gentiles. He was, therefore, acquainted with the Old Testament prophecies to this effect. Moreover, He knew "the word which God sent unto the children of Israel . . . by Jesus Christ . . . published throughout all Judea" (Acts x. 36, 37). The way of salvation having once been thrown open to the Gentiles, there has been no need to repeat the prayer of Cornelius. His case is unique; it finds no parallel among Gentile members of the Apostasy who came to hear an exposition of some phase of the Truth, and is, therefore, no foundation

for inviting such to join in the praises of Christ's "purchased people" (I. Pet. ii. 9).

In preaching to Cornelius and his household Peter said, "In every nation he that feareth Him (God) and worketh righteousness is accepted with Him" (Acts x. 35), from which it is concluded that any out of Christ who live moral lives are "accepted with God." This is a mistake. Peter's statement is evidently prophetic; it means that from that time "in every nation he that feareth God"—by *accepting* Divine wisdom or truth—"and worketh righteousness"—by *conforming* to "the righteousness of faith" (Rom. x. 6)—is accepted. This is only possible by baptism unto that death, which was a declaration of God's "righteousness for the remission of sins" (Rom. vi. 3; iii. 25), and by subsequent obedience to Divine commands. No one can "work righteousness" in relation to eternal life—and this is what Peter refers to—without having first "put on Christ" as a righteous robe. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness" said Jesus Christ (Matt. vi. 33). This cannot be done by altering the order. Seeking God's righteousness does not precede, but follows, seeking His kingdom.

The Psalms contain a number of injunctions about "praise" which are sometimes thought to have universal or indiscriminate application. But this is a misapprehension. Some of them apply to Israel in the past, when they were "high" to God, and others to that age when all nations will be in the same "high" condition. The Psalms were, like all the Old Testament Scriptures, "committed," through "circumcision," to the custody of the Israelites (Rom. iii. 1; ix. 4), and therefore they only were responsible for the obligations contained therein. "The oracles of God" are now, on the same principle, committed to the brethren of Christ, "the Israel of God" (Gal. vi. 16), and to none others.

STRANGERS AMONG ISRAEL.

In instructing Israel to "rejoice in every good thing which the Lord thy God hath given," special mention is made of "the stranger that is among you" (Deut. xxvi. 11); and, in ordaining the feast of tabernacles, it was said that "the stranger and the fatherless and the widow that are among you" should "rejoice" with the Israelites "before the Lord" "in the place where the Lord thy God hath chosen to place His name there" (Deut. xvi. 11), from which it is inferred that any Gentile could join Israel in their worship. But this conclusion overlooks the fundamental principle that "what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law" (Rom. iii. 19). Thus, "If a stranger . . . will offer an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the Lord: as ye do, so he shall do. *One ordinance shall be both for you of the congregation, and also for the stranger*" (Num. xv. 14, 15). How could "a stranger" present himself with a sacrifice unless he had previously been incorporated with Israel? The name "stranger" is evidently sometimes used to show that, although part of Israel, they were not so from birth; just as Paul distinguishes between Jews and Gentiles in Christ: "Thou art called a Jew" (Rom. ii. 17); "I speak to you Gentiles" (Rom. xi. 13). In decreeing that "the soul that doeth ought presumptuously . . . shall be *cut off from among his people*" a "stranger" is included (Num. xv. 30). Now a "stranger" could not be "cut off from" a "people" to which he had not been united in the prescribed way. The penalty of the law was only inflicted where its privileges were enjoyed. Equally with the Israelites, the "stranger" that "offereth a burnt offering or sacrifice" must bring it "unto the door of the tabernacle" or "be cut off from among his people" (Lev. xvii. 8, 9). And in like manner, if a "stranger" ate "that which died of itself" he became "unclean," and

had to do the same as an Israelite in order to "be clean" (ver. 30). He could not have become "unclean" unless he had previously been made clean. "A stranger" was forbidden to "keep the Passover" unless "all his males be circumcised" (Exod. xii. 48); and although no such interdict is given in regard to the feast of tabernacles, it is, in effect, embodied in the command elsewhere. "One law and one manner shall be for you and for the stranger that sojourneth with you" (Num. xv. 16).

These observations apply to the passage about strangers in Solomon's prayer when dedicating the Temple: "Moreover concerning the stranger, which is not of Thy people Israel, but is come from a far country for Thy great name's sake, and Thy mighty hand, and Thy stretched out arm; if they come and pray in this house. Then hear thou from the heavens, even from thy dwelling-place, and do according to all that the stranger calleth to thee for" (2 Chron. vi. 32, 33). The expression, "for Thy great name's sake," implies that the "stranger" in question was in the "Name of the Lord"; otherwise he could not acceptably do anything for that "name's sake." God only accepts prayer and praise "for Christ's sake" (Eph. iv. 32) from those who are in the name of Christ; for in announcing Himself as "the Way, the Truth, and the Life," Jesus said, "No man cometh unto the Father, but by Me" (Jno. xiv. 6). The "Name of the Lord" occupied the same position under Old Testament times. The chief burden of Solomon's prayer for Israel was that, when they prayed, God would forgive their sin. Although not specified, this is obviously included in that part relating to the stranger.

PREVIOUS UTTERANCES.

An article appeared in *The Christadelphian* for July and August, 1886, which was afterwards reprinted as a pamphlet under the title of "Worship in relation to the Alien, by A. T. Jannaway." The writer therein rightly contended that Israel "were called upon to submit to certain enactments (circumcision and sacrifice) as a means of effecting a provisional holiness—apart from which no one was included in the nation, nor accounted fit to approach in worship to Him"; that "the saints are described as occupying a parallel position" (p. 8); that "the saints are all priests" (p. 9), and are "accounted perfect in Christ (Col. ii. 10)"; but that "man by nature is a creature of wrath" (p. 17) "without Christ" and "without God in the world," and therefore "cannot have intercourse with God—his sins must first be covered" (p. 7).

This conclusion is recognised in the Preface to the *Christadelphian Hymn Book*:—"Strangers not having been immersed upon a belief of the things concerning the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, are without Christ, and, therefore, not in a position to offer acceptable worship." On this basis it is further said, "We ought not to invite strangers to take part in acts of worship, either expressly or tacitly, by handing them a hymn book." Unfortunately this "ought not" has been continually contravened. Brethren and sisters have been influenced by a feeling of courtesy to offer to strangers the use of their hymn-book; and in some ecclesias a supply of hymn-books—either the ordinary one or an abridgement—has been specially provided for the use of strangers. With what result? The propagation of that which the Hymn Book Preface styles "the prevalent delusion that sinners, convened indiscriminately in public assembly, are qualified engage in acts of divine worship."

PRACTICE SHOULD HARMONISE WITH PRINCIPLES.

What should be done to arrest this "delusion"? The only safe plan is to abstain from singing when strangers are invited to hear expositions of

the scriptures. This will help to maintain the broad line of demarcation between those who are Christ's and those who are not—a line which has been reduced in width in recent years.

The omission of singing will, it is said, require also the omission of prayer. But the difficulties which apply to the one do not apply to the other. In singing there are many voices, in prayer only one; and it is very easy for the one voice to specify before, and during, his petition, for whom he is the spokesman. Paul, when on board ship, "gave thanks in presence of them all" (Acts xvii. 35).

If singing be omitted at one meeting, it must, it is said, to be consistent, be omitted at all. This does not follow; all meetings are not alike. There is great difference between a meeting intended specially for those "without Christ," and one for the benefit of Christ's brethren at which a few strangers are present. It is always possible, in the latter case, to make a distinction by an arrangement of seats between the two classes, or by a few words from the presiding brother, to remind those present of the line of demarcation.

It is true that some have objected to singing or prayer at any times when strangers are present. But this is without scriptural authority. The Apostle Paul in writing to the Corinthians made express mention of the possibility of "unbelievers" attending a meeting of "the whole church," when there was singing, prayer, and speaking with tongues for the benefit of "them which believe" (I. Cor. xiv. 15, 22, 23). There is, however, no instance, in the New Testament of Apostles or others, when preaching the Gospel, inviting the unconverted to sing the "psalms and hymns and spiritual songs" enjoined on the children of God (Eph. v. 19, 1). The prevalent practice of indiscriminate worship is due to the Apostacy, not to the Word of God. And does not its adoption by Christadelphians arise from a desire to be like the denominations around?—just as Israel asked for a "king to judge," or rule them, "like all nations" (I. Sam. viii. 5). Is this to continue? Some have already, by their action, given a negative answer. Will others follow? To assist them in coming to a decision, the following questions are respectfully submitted for their consideration:—

1. Is it right, directly or indirectly, to invite those who are outside "the temple of God and the altar" to join in the "worship" of those who are within?

2. Is there any New Testament precedent for seeking the worship of any whom we are at the same time seeking "to turn from darkness to light" (Acts xxvi. 18)?

3. Seeing that "spiritual sacrifices"—which include the "sacrifice of praise"—are ordained only for Christ's "holy priesthood" (I. Pet. ii. 5), how can they be shared by those who have not been "made nigh by the blood of Christ" (Eph. ii. 13)?

4. As Christ is the High Priest for His own brethren only, how can God be approached by any others through His mediatorship?

5. Whom should the children of God imitate—the "abominations of the earth" (Rev. xvii. 5), which seek the worship of all classes, or "the Father," who seeks the worship of those only who are "in spirit and truth"?

EDITED.

Manifestation of the Deity.

I.—IN WORD OF PROMISE. 2.—IN FLESH. 3.—IN SPIRIT.

An exposition of John's Gospel. Chap. i. vers. 1 to 14.

THE SPIRIT'S MOTIVE IN INDITING THE BOOK.

In order to attain to a thorough understanding of these fourteen opening verses of John's Gospel—verses which have been the subject of long and bitter controversy outside the household—it is necessary for us to reconsider the motive of the Deity, as revealed, in inditing not only John's record, but also that of his three contemporaries, Matthew, Mark, and Luke.

The internal evidence of these four records proves that which is readily seen by everyone instructed in the truth, that the Deity's motive in moving the recorders was to prove through them the Messiahship of Jesus of Nazareth; and also to bear testimony to the Deity's part fulfilment in Jesus, of His age-lasting purpose expressed in Eden, "in the beginning." We have, moreover, the express statement of the spirit, as to motive, through John, chap. xx. ver. 31: "Many other signs (i.e., of His Messiahship) did Jesus But these things are written that ye may know that Jesus is the Christ," &c. . . . Although the immediate antecedent of ver. 31 is the expression in ver. 30, about the signs done by Jesus, it will not be contended that the record regarding His origin, Immersion, Transfiguration, vocal approval by Deity, &c., &c.—which form the subject-matter of the Gospels—are not included in the things mentioned, as having been written to prove the Christship of Jesus, and consequently the seed promised in Eden, "in the beginning."

In the light of the internal evidence of the four inspired records, and the expressed motive of the Spirit in inditing John's book, it is unnecessary to waste time in combating the vain notions of the semi-pagan Roman Catholic Fathers, who contended that John wrote his first chapter expressly to refute the philosophy of Plato and Philo; which tradition—like most of the other Roman inventions—was appropriated by the Protestant section. Indeed we have been saddened by meeting brethren of Christ who, probably through the ambiguousness of the Truth's literature on this subject, still retained this most extraordinary idea.

IN THE BEGINNING WAS THE DECLARATION.

John's readers, for whose benefit the record was written, and who were, and are acquainted with Moses and the Prophets, in an orderly way are led back, for the positive proof of Jesus' Christship, to the "word" expressed by Deity "in the beginning"—the word of promise given prior to the foundation of the "Law of the Spirit of Life," even the declaration upon which that law was founded. In this word of promise God embodied His purpose to raise up the "seed." Genesis iii. 15:—"It (the woman's seed) shall bruise thy (the serpent's) head." This is evidently the promise to which Paul refers in his letter to Titus (chap. i. verse 2):—"The Promise of Eternal Life;" and of which John makes mention in his first Epistle, chap. i. ver. 1 and 2: "*The Word of Life.*" At the time of writing, this "word" had been made concrete or embodied, first in flesh, and afterwards in substance, in the person of the One through Whom *the Life should be brought.*

It is granted, on all hands, that the Saxon word "Word," in the text of our English Version, is a correct equivalent of the word *Logos* employed in the reason. But a false definition is forced upon this little simple English

word, and it is in this that the folly of the theological schoolmen is exhibited. In the "Complete Edition" of Liddell and Scott's Lexicon, in something like thirteen hundred words used to define the meaning of the Greek word *Logos*, it is clearly shown, "from the best Greek authors, that the only meanings of that word are the *word*, or *outward form*, by which the inward thought is expressed and made known; also, the immortal thought—i.e. Reason—itself." It has no meaning whatever but that which is associated with language, and is, therefore, summed up in English as *A word*; *A saying*; *A declaration*. It is well, also, to note that it never means a word in the grammatical sense, as the mere name of a thing; but always the subject matter of the word spoken. And in the most polished dialect of the language—the *Attic*—it means something merely uttered, i.e., stated, or promised, and not made good.

Referring to the fact already stated, that *Logos* also means REASON, we may ask "What is REASON?" Does it not involve language, either expressed or residing in the mind? Wherefore, the Latins called language residing in the mind "*Ratio*," and language uttered "*Oratio*." The Greeks used the one word, *Logos*, to express both; whereas in English both ideas are expressed by the words *Speech* and *Reason*—the one meaning *language spoken* and the other *language in the mind*. The *Logos*, therefore, "in the beginning," is either something spoken by the Deity or something conceived in His mind, or both; as to which it is our privilege and our duty to determine.

On the basis of the above definition of the word *Logos* it must be plainly seen that John uses it in its primary sense as something spoken by the Deity, and not simply for the ratiocination in the Deity's mind; for it is only by His spoken Word—His revealed Will—that man is able to know His, the Deity's mind, or reason. Moreover, this *Logos* contained *Life*, and the *Life* served men as a light. This proves beyond a doubt, as already shown from the teaching of John himself, I. Epistle, chap. i, and from Paul in his letter to Titus, ver. 1, that the *Logos* was a statement of Deity's, a specific declaration of purpose in reference to the Messiah—the "Word" of promise of Life.

In our translation of the word "*Logos*" (see No. 7, SANCTUARY KEEPER, p. 87) we have deemed it expedient to select another English word, but expressive of the same idea, in place of that used in the Common Version. Our reason for the change will be seen later, and, when understood, will be appreciated.

The English word, "Word," in John's Gospel, has been variously defined to mean: a person, the second person of the Pagan trinity; and even in the literature of the Truth, as the *Spirit of Deity*; *Wisdom*, &c.; and by some, through misunderstanding the idiom, the language in John's Gospel, ver. 1, as the Deity Him-self. That our minds may be freed from the pernicious influence of such (in most cases) preconceived false definitions, we deem it advisable to dispense with its use. The word chosen, viz., *Declaration*, although conveying in its proper definition the same thought, yet has the advantage of not being associated with any false definitions.

AND THE DECLARATION WAS WITH THE DEITY.

That the declaration, in the beginning, was "with the Deity," is manifest, when we consider that the declaration was the outward expression of the inward intention of the Deity to carry His promise into effect. Thus, the intention to bruise the tempter's head by the seed, though outwardly expressed through the declaration, nevertheless remained "with the Deity" who is ever faithful, ever sure.

The force of the language may be seen in the following example:—A

father gives his *word*, or *declaration of promise*, to his child in reference to a present; that word is the outward expression of his *intention* to carry out the promise. Being honest and true, the intention, thus outwardly expressed, *remains with the parent as an intention*, until he fulfil the same; when the word of promise is fulfilled in the carrying out of the expressed intention, it ceases to be a *word* or a *declaration of promise*, for it has become an accomplished deed. We use the same idiom in English when we say, So-and-so is a man of his word; he *keeps his word*. How does he keep it? By fulfilling it; his declaration of promise is the outward expression of his inward intention, and this *intention* he does not allow to depart from him until fulfilled.

In like manner the “*Word*,” or *specific* declaration of promise in the *beginning*, in reference to the woman’s seed and His work, as an *abstract intention*, remained with the Deity, until He began to fulfil the terms of His *expressed intention*, by embodying the declaration in flesh. He provided the *seed promised*, in a *concrete* flesh and blood form, and anointed Him as the medium through whom the whole of the promised programme should be realised.

AND THE DECLARATION REPRESENTED THE DEITY.

This is one of several places, in the New Testament, wherein the translators have allowed their Trinitarian bias to overrule scholarship and common sense. They set out in their translation of the chapter, primed with a *false* definition of the word *Logos*; and it is, therefore, not surprising that their word for word rendering of the sentence from Greek to English, viz., “*The Word was God*,” shows gross disregard of the idiom of the language in which it was written. This blunder has its equal, in their rendering of Matthew xxvi. 26, and the parallel passages in the other records. Jesus is there made to say, in the common English versions, “*This is My body*,” “*This is My blood*,” upon which misunderstanding was established the false, but even now popular, doctrine of the real presence of Christ’s body and blood, in the bread and wine. Not only does their *rendering of this passage* in John nullify the chief principles of Deity’s Truth regarding Himself, but even the utterance in verse 1. “*The Word was with God*”—and reiterated in verse 2—is reduced to an absurdity. Is it reasonable that the Deity, who is the essence of order, indulged in such superfluous and meaningless language as to affirm that He, the Deity, *was in the beginning with Himself*?

The rendering of the clause, *The Word was God*, and its consequent interpretation, even by brethren of Christ, is subversive of that element of foundation of the Truth which recognises the Deity’s existence as a corporeal being. The glaring error, in both the translation and the interpretation is perceived when we consider that a *word* or *declaration*, and even the erroneous definition of *Wisdom*, are all names of *abstract* things. To affirm, therefore, that a *word*, a *declaration of promise*, or *wisdom* is the Deity, is to say that the Deity is *abstract*, or something which can only be conceived in the mind, and therefore non-existent as the *concrete, corporeal*, God of Israel, the express Image of Whose substance was seen in the transformed, glorified body of our Elder Brother. Again, we ask, in regard to the Deity, who is from Everlasting to Everlasting, in what beginning, or (as in John’s Epistle, ch. i. ver. 1), from (*apo*) what beginning was He?

It will, we trust, be admitted from the evidence adduced that the proper translation of the Greek text, in accordance with the Hebrew idiom expressed in the Greek version, is the one we have given, viz., *The declaration represented the Deity*.

For, although entirely ignored by the Trinitarian translators, it is well understood that in the Greek version of the Scriptures the verb “*to be*,” in addition to its ordinary use as expressing *existence*, is also used in the present

and past indefinite tenses, indicative mood, to express the idea conveyed by our English verb, to represent. This Hebrew idiom of the Greek Scriptures, is pointed out by Brother Thomas in a lucid and masterly manner in *Eureka*, vol. 3, p. 42; and in *Elpis Israel*, p. 262. Thus Jesus, speaking in reference to things then present, uses the verb to be in the present tense to express the idea of representation: "This is My body," or This represents My body. "This is My blood," or This represents My blood (Matt. xxvi. 28); "This is he who heareth," &c., or This represents him who heareth, &c. (Matt. xiii. 20). So, also, the Spirit, speaking in the past, says, "That rock was Christ," or That rock represented Christ (I. Cor. x. 4.) In like manner, "The declaration was the Deity," means The declaration represented the Deity.

Having thus attained to the proper understanding of the thought contained in the Spirit's language, we should expect to find it in harmony with the whole of the Deity's revealed truth; in this, as a matter of course, we are not disappointed. That the declaration of promise of life, solely represented the Deity, cannot be doubted by those who believe that "without the truth it is impossible to please Deity." As the foundation upon which the law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus is built, the history of the declaration proves that the outward expression of the Deity's intention represented Him in such a capacity that only through its reception—by faith, accompanied by its sacrificial requirements, could a man be justified from the condemnation passed upon all men in Adam, and from his own personal transgressions; and, therefore, the only means whereby man could have access to the Deity, and, in His favour, rejoice in hope of participating in the realisation of the declared intention—the fulfilment of the Promise.

Verse 2:—"THE SAME WAS IN THE BEGINNING WITH THE DEITY."

This repetition is a Hebraism to add weight to the statement, a form of emphasis used in nearly all of the most ancient languages, and met with today in some of the oldest living ones, e.g., the Welsh.

But there is more in this expression than appears on the surface; it was evidently given to serve as a reminder to those addressed by the Spirit, through John, that the intention of which the declaration was the outward expression, was not with man—who has ever been incapable and changeable—but "with the Deity," Who changeth Never; and, Who is able to perform that which He has promised.

M. WYLLIE, Sydney, N.S.W.

(To be continued.)

Things New and Old.—No. 7.

"But we all with unveiled face beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit (II. Cor. iii. 18 n.v.).

As brethren of the Lord Jesus Christ

it is truly grand to realise that we are placed in a state of glory with the privilege of passing on from glory to glory in a real and practical manner. The realisation of our present glory is a small factor in our onward move-

ment, and I fear that too many of the brethren are not sufficiently appreciative of their present glorious position.

Let us remember that, like the brethren in Galatia, we "have begun in the Spirit" (Gal. iii. 3). If you ask when? I must scripturally answer, *when we were inducted into Christ at our baptism—when we were brought into "the adoption of children by Jesus Christ . . . in whom we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of His grace"* (Eph. i. 5-7). Here is then our *basis* of glory; no mean one but contrariwise. The value of our present glory can be clearly seen by our looking back a little. A glory was bestowed upon God's servants who were related to the first or Mosaic Covenant; of which the Apostle Paul, in his epistle to the brethren at Corinth, writes: "For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory" (II. Cor. iii. 9).

Now what is the "ministration of righteousness" but the performance of that redemption which was effected by Christ Jesus for our salvation? This the law could not effect; though the brethren in Galatia were trying to induce some to believe that it could, and were thus acting like Israel of old, of whom the Prophet Jeremiah said, "Hath a nation changed their gods, which yet are no gods? But *my people* have changed their glory for that which doth not profit" (Jer. ii. 11). It was this misunderstanding of their glorious position in Christ and the substitution of a glory which had been "done away," that caused the Apostle to pen these words (dictated undoubtedly by the Spirit), "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel; which is not another" (Gal. i. 6). There can be no passing on from glory to glory when first principles of the truth are denied. Let us therefore be minded of the

"things written aforetime for our learning."

The word "glory," though of varied meaning, is evidently used in the third chapter of the second letter to the Corinthians for the blessings of righteousness. The "righteousness of the law" (Rom. x. 5) was so stringent that it brought the "condemnation" of death to all under it. The law "was weak through the flesh" (Rom. viii. 3), and hence the statement that "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God" (Rom. iii. 23). As a consequence, the long life in flesh and blood nature, with its abundant blessings, promised by the Law, were not realised. The "glory" pertaining to "the ministration of the Spirit" is much superior. They who attain to "the righteousness which is of faith" (Rom. x. 6), by putting on Christ as a robe (Gal. iii. 27), are at once "blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly things in Christ" (Eph. i. 3); and they retain them by holding fast to that which has been given them. Wean, through the weakness of the flesh, they are "overtaken in a fault" (Gal. vi. 1) they can be restored through their High Priest, and so "wash their robes in the blood of the Lamb" (Rev. vii. 14).

"He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord" (II. Cor. x. 17). How effectually this excludes glory from any source *whatever* outside the Lord! All who glory in the flesh are deserving of "shame" (Phil. iii. 19). The contrast is to be "filled with the fruits of righteousness which are through Jesus Christ unto the glory and praise of God" (Phil. i. 11). Realise this, brethren; for it is real and true, and it is practicable for all the servants of Christ to accomplish. Our trials and difficulties in the present dispensation obscure the clear beholding which we desire, so that we behold the glory of the Lord as through a glass. Nevertheless it is there all the same; that is not dimmed. To some the glass is very much darkened; to some less so. But to all the perception may be made

clearer in the present time of our glory. To this end let us aim; it will not come of itself; it must be persistently, patiently, diligently, lovingly, and continuously sought after by increased understanding of the Word, and asked for, by prayer, through Him, who is indeed "our glory." The means thus employed will tend to that development in righteousness which may be fitly described as passing "from glory to glory," for is there not a glory in the increase of wisdom and knowledge "begun in the Spirit" which by unflinching diligence produces in the mind a fruitifying influence in accordance with the mind of the Spirit? It is a slow process with the best, but it is none the less real.

There is also this fact which we should ever keep before us, viz., that the more we apply our minds to this development of mind and heart the less likely are we to revert to the weak and beggarly "elements" of the world. Brethren thus minded will be anxious that the "glass" through which they behold the glories of Christ shall be as clear as it is possible, so that their conception of the several phases of the Truth may be accurate and comprehensive. This "liberty" which we have in Christ Jesus is one of the grand features of our present glory. It is a liberty of "search," "walk," of "love." Searching without fear of finding any phase of the Truth imperfect; walking in the light; and loving as brethren. Thus there can be confidence, uprightness, and affection of the highest order. Truly a "glory" in this inglorious age.

The "glass" is in need of attention, brethren, when unscriptural statements concerning doctrinal principles are asserted. Scriptural doctrines have only one outline; that of the "Kingdom of God" is traceable by the "meanest saint," and such are ever ready to show others that beautiful and important outline. I am not so sure that all, or as many as might be, have an equally clear

perception of "the things of the name of Jesus Christ." Certain it is that neither in private communion (except at the "breaking of bread") nor in the public assemblies is there as much allusion to the latter as there is of the former. This is not right, brethren, in view of the prominence given in the Word to the things of the Name. Is the confidence of your ability to explain the latter less than of the former? If so, to what is this attributable? Is it not that less study has been given to this glorious and supremely important phase of the Truth, in which we should be well grounded?

There is obscurity of the "glass," brethren, when it is declared that Jesus Christ, by his flesh nature, was not under the condemnation brought on Adam's posterity by the "offence of one;" or that they were not thereby "made sinners." The fear of being thought to sanction "Unitarianism" or "Josephiteism" has covered the outline of the things of the Name: brush the obscurity away, and you will perceive the true outline, which reads thus:—"And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed. It shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel" (Gen. iii. 15). "For he hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him (II. Cor. v. 21). "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that hath the power of death, that is, the devil, and deliver them who, through the fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage. For verily not of angels doth He take hold, but He taketh hold of the seed of Abraham" (Heb. ii. 14-16). "And being found in fashion as a man He humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross. Wherefore also God (who made Him to be sin) highly exalted Him, and gave unto Him the

Name which is above every name" (Phil. ii. 8, 9).

Thus we see the "Captain of our Salvation" and glory passing on from glory to glory. All this was revealed before He commenced His sufferings, and it has since been much amplified. Too many indeed are the portions of the Word hereon for me to reproduce in this article; but one or two will not be inappropriate:—"The Lord will perfect that which concerneth me; thy mercy, O Lord, endureth for ever; forsake not the works of thine own hands" (Ps. cxxxviii. 8). To assert that Christ was perfected before He ascended to His Father's nature is to ignore Christ's own words when He said: "Go ye, and tell that fox, Behold, I cast out devils, and I do cures to-day and, to-morrow, and the third day I shall be perfected" (Luke xiii. 32). It also ignores John's testimony: "For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an anti-Christ" (II. John 7). They who make a distinction between the flesh of Jesus and the flesh of His brethren, do not realise that though "begotten of God," yet He was "Son of Adam." They do not realise that "sin had hold of Him in His nature which inherited the sentence of death from Adam." They fail to perceive that there is no incongruity in sin having hold of Him in His nature but not in His character. Everything concerning Jesus Christ as to His nature and work in its first stage God hath indeed perfected; "the works of His hands" have not been forsaken, and, therefore, His mercy endureth for ever (Ps. cxxxviii). Yes, brethren, or we should not have been wrought upon by Him for Christ's sake, but such is the fact. Trace you not the outlines through the "glass?" Here they are:—"Simson hath declared how God, at the first, did visit the Gentiles to take out of them a people for His name" (Acts xv. 14). "He hath called us to glory and virtue"

(II. Peter i. 3). "For by grace have you been saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God: not of works, that no man should glory. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works which God afore prepared, that we should walk in them" (Eph. ii. 8-10). It is, indeed, by these "works," prepared by God, that we pass on from glory to glory.

There is a dark spot on the "glass" obscuring the importance and value of baptism into Christ when that rite is said to be only effectual to the washing away of transgressions we have committed, and is not a justification from inherited sin. This latter was, equally with the former, a fatal disability to our becoming children of God, to our being made Christ's brethren, to our being clothed with the righteousness of Christ, to our becoming heirs of His kingdom and glory. Are these "glorious" advantages to be lightly esteemed? Trace you not the outline that at your baptism you were justified not only from "wicked works," or your personal transgressions, but also from inherited sin in your nature? Blow away the mist of prejudice and unhealthy sentiment, and you will see that such is indeed the truth of the Word.

Is not baptism now the doorway of our entering into Christ? Is it not the means by which "God hath reconciled us unto Himself by Jesus Christ"? If baptism only washes away our individual sins, in what sense can we view Christ's baptism, seeing that he had none? It must limit Christ's fulfilment "of all righteousness" to that of mere example-ship. And with such a view, the glory is not perceived that it was through Christ "having obtained in Himself eternal redemption." "And being made perfect, He became unto all them that obey Him the author of eternal salvation."

How ravishing the thought, how truly grand is our hope who have been called unto this glory! By the glory which existed under the Mosaic law, the Israel

of old were as much a "body" as the Ecclesia of God are the body of Christ. When we remember this can we not perceive the meaning of the Apostle Paul when he says, "There are also celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial; but the glory of the celestial is one and the glory of the terrestrial is another" (I. Cor. xv. 40)? Is not this an allusion to the glory of the Mosaic dispensation and the glory of the things in Christ? The law was a transitory thing, whose object ceased when it had been fulfilled by Christ. It is clear, from the outline given in the Epistle to the Hebrews, that the Holy Spirit signified, by the various vessels and furniture of the "worldly sanctuary," "that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing." Thus the celestial or heavenly bodies were the development of God's purpose, or a passing on "from glory to glory." After alluding to the two kinds of "bodies," the Apostle declares that "There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars; for one star differeth from another star in glory" (ver. 41). Whilst admitting the truth of this statement in regard to the luminaries in the natural heavens, we must see that it applies also to individuals, inclusive of the Saints and Jesus Christ. Recognising this, we should be able further to see that there is a glory resulting from the quickening received at baptism; "And you did He quicken, when ye were dead through your trespasses and sins" (Eph. ii. 1). To the glory arising from this quickening we should be wholly devoted. There is nothing in the world to compare with it. What is the "wisdom of the world?" "Foolishness with God," says the Apostle; and he declares that "the Lord knoweth the reasonings of the

wise that they are vain." On this he bases a practical conclusion—"Wherefore let no one glory in man;" and he enforces it by a graphic picture of the glory pertaining to the brethren of Christ: "For all things are yours; whether Paul or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's" (I. Cor. iii. 19-23).

Could we desire anything more comprehensive than this? The world with endless life is ours; and so is death. For have we not been freed from "the law of sin and death" by "the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus" (Rom. viii. 2)? And if we are but faithful to our privileged position, "neither death, nor life," nor anything else "shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (vers. 38, 39). It is a glory to know that God did reveal unto the Apostles, by His Spirit, the things which He hath prepared for them that love Him. If we would attain to them we must be spiritually minded. There is certainly no lack of provision for God's children; there may be lack of application, but let us rouse ourselves. The Master is at the door, and it will be well for all those who "with open face beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord."

"High is the rank we now possess,
But higher we shall rise;
Though what we shall hereafter be
Is hid from mortal eyes."

"But this we know, when He appears,
We'll bear His image bright;
For all His glory, full disclosed,
Shall open to our sight."

W. WHITEHEAD.

New Romney.

Editorial Flyleaf.

This number is a few days behind time—due to ill-health, now happily passed away. As it completes the second volume, we enclose in each copy an Order blank for the use of those who desire to subscribe to the third volume.

The past three months have given to the world three political surprises:—1. The inability of the combined Powers of Europe to deliver the Armenians from Turkish persecution; 2. The elevation of the Venezuelan question into a quarrel of the first magnitude between Britain and the United States; and, 3. The danger of war between Germany and Britain through events in the Transvaal. The victory of the Sultan is clearly shown, by the publication of diplomatic documents, to be due to the refusal of Russia to sanction the use of force; and the British Government, realising its isolation, did not feel justified in acting alone. It is evident, therefore, that the "complete" drying-up of the Euphratean power has not quite arrived. The effect of the Venezuelan and Transvaal difficulties has been two-fold. It has shown to modern Tarshish the necessity for putting itself into complete fighting trim, and it has also evoked from the Colonies expressions of allegiance toward the mother country; in the language of prophecy the young lions have proffered their help to the old lion. Perhaps these were the main objects Divinely intended by the two startling events which ushered in the New Year.

We have received a pamphlet of about one hundred pages, entitled, "The Editor of *The Christadelphian* Unmasked. By

George Cornish." Its style is not to be commended. When attacking the teaching of anyone, personal matters are out of place; their introduction is a sign of weakness. The first portion is occupied by some account of a short debate with the Editor of *The Christadelphian* on October 22nd, in Melbourne, in the presence of the meeting in fellowship with "Geo. Cornish." The Editor objected to the presence of any of the meeting with which he himself is in fellowship, and also to the taking of shorthand notes. The awkwardness arising from a published shorthand report can easily be imagined by those of our readers who have noted his contradictory utterances reproduced in previous numbers. It is, however, quite apparent from the few statements reported by "George Cornish" that the Editor has been compelled to take up in Australia an attitude quite the reverse of that which he occupied in England during the Responsibility controversy. On one occasion it is said that he was asked this question:—"In your magazine for June, 1894, p. 241, you say that 'a child is not sinful when born, not until it actually sins.'" And what was his reply? "I am not responsible for what they put in when I am away." If this be correctly reported it was more than an evasion; for he was in Birmingham at that time. The statement in question (of which the above is a condensation) is part of an Editorial criticism on the Resurrectional controversy in London, and it was repeated, in other words, in the September number, p. 346. If convinced of its truth when written, why did he not defend it when reproduced

seventeen months later? The reason is not far to seek; it would, on the latter occasion, have cut the ground from under his feet. This may be polemical skill, but it is not faithfulness to a conviction professedly based on the Word of God.

To reply fully to the fallacies set forth by "George Cornish" would be to reproduce much of what we have written in previous numbers, and for this we have no space. Those who are "rooted and grounded" in "the things of the Name" will see where he goes astray. He denies the existence of "sin in the flesh," and says that "there was no need for Christ's death in order for God to forgive sin" (p. 82)—two statements which make it impossible for him to "rightly divide the word of Truth." He is, we think, mistaken in attributing to the Editor of *The Christadelphian* the statement that God put "sin" into the flesh of Christ (p. 70). We have not met with it.

The recent discovery in electrical science—somewhat incorrectly described as the "new photography" by which rays of light can be made to pass through human flesh, wood, cardboard, leather, slate, ebonite, and other opaque substances, is one of the most marvellous events of this age of marvels. It has already been put to practical use in some surgical cases, and it bids fair to be of service in other directions. The discovery is said to be due to an accident. This is, of course, the mere human view, and it suggests the question: Have any of the great discoveries of science been the result of mere accident? If so, how is it that they show a progressive

development? How is it, for instance, that dynamite was not discovered before gunpowder, or that the capabilities of electricity were not brought into use before the power of gas or of steam? There is a reason for this which can only be given by those who recognise that an unseen Power is controlling all human affairs. There is a time for revealing to man the forces of his surroundings—as for everything else—and God alone knows what that time is. The discoveries of the present century have already revolutionised the facilities for intercommunication and production, with this result—that commerce has now reached a state of stagnation. What would have been the consequence if these discoveries had been made, say, five hundred years ago, it is impossible to say; but in all probability the world would have become prematurely old and worn out. It is in harmony with Divine wisdom that the latent forces of Nature should be hidden until the epoch immediately preceding the final and perfect age of the human race. The revelation of the power known as electricity, and its multifarious capabilities, is a fitting prelude to the day when the knowledge of God will cover the whole earth. Its latest application gives a vivid reality to the words of the Psalmist: "Whither shall I go from Thy spirit? . . . if I make my bed in hell (the grave), behold, Thou art there. . . . If I say, Surely the darkness shall cover me; even the night shall be light about me. Yea, the darkness hideth not from Thee; but the night shineth as the day: the darkness and the light are both alike to Thee" (Ps. cxxxix. 7-12).

Sips from "The Brook in the Way."

APOSTLE'S MEDITATION ON THE LAW.

Psalm vi. 6.—"I am weary with my groaning; all the night make I my bed to swim; I water my couch with my tears." How applicable these words of the Spirit are to Christ during his probationary career. We can here obtain a glimpse into the depth of the feeling of Jesus, which brought forth those strong cryings and tears unto his Father to save Him from death.

From the Gospel records we find Jesus, after having been sore distressed with his day's work, leaves his disciples to spend the night in solitude on the hills of Israel's land. Was it to seek that sweet repose in restful sleep? Not altogether. He could have obtained that in the towns close by. He could sleep on the raging storm-tossed sea of Galilee, and doubtless he could do the same in the cities where he had done his mighty works, whether noisy or quiet.

There appears to be a deeper reason why Jesus sought the stillness of the mountain. The Scripture first quoted infers this. David, in the first Psalm, describing the man in whom God delights, declares that such a man's delight is in the law of the Lord, and in his law doth he meditate day and night.

Oh, what strong support Christ received from these written testimonies while he traversed this vale of tears—the valley of the shadow of death! How real must have been the sweetness of overcoming—the end which was always raising its voice in the Psalms. "Thou wilt show me the path of life: in Thy presence is fulness of joy; at Thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore" (Psalm xvi. 11).

The effect of these nights of grief and tears which Christ endured, evidently made a deep impression on his appearance. Isaiah declares "His visage was so marred more than any man." "There is no beauty that we should desire him." "A man of sorrows and acquainted with grief" (Isaiah lii. 14; lii. 2, 3).

Contemplating these testimonies we can realise somewhat the intensity of the sufferings which Christ endured to make his salvation sure, that He might be the "Firstborn of a new creation." Let us pause a moment, brethren, in our life of hurry and distraction, and grasp more effectively the example that Christ has set us—to help us to obtain the stephan wreath of glory.—A. E. THORNE-LOF.

CHRIST'S RESTRAINT OF SPEECH.

Psalm xxxix. 1.—"I said, I will take heed to my ways, that I sin not with my tongue; I will keep my mouth with a bridle while the wicked are before me." We know how accurately the above resolve of the Psalmist applied to the Lord Jesus. For during the day of His humiliation He was often surrounded by "the wicked" who "urged Him vehemently to speak of many things; laying wait for Him, and seeking to catch something out of His mouth, that they might accuse Him" (Luke xi. 53, 54). And He, knowing their thoughts and the wickedness of their sins, said, in the language of the Psalms, "I will keep my mouth with a bridle while the wicked are before me." And so we, brethren, being desirous of the Father's approval and blessing—when the High Priest of our confession reappears from the Holy of Holies—must, "take heed unto our ways" now, that we sin not, with our tongue. For it is written, "Death and life are in the power of the tongue" (Prov. xviii. 21; James iii.). And Jesus himself said: "By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned" (Matt. xii. 37). Therefore with uplifted hands we pray, "Let the words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, my strength and my redeemer" (Psalm xix. 14). — E. HEMINGWAY.

CHRIST'S ANSWER TO THE CONVERTED SAUL.

Acts xxiii. 10.—As soon as Saul of

Tarsus was convinced that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah, he said, "What shall I do, Lord?" The question received but a limited answer:—"Arise and go into Damascus; and there it shall be told thee of all things which are appointed for thee to do." Saul complied, and on his arrival Ananias met him and said: "Arise and be baptised, and wash away thy sins." There must be a reason why Jesus did not instruct Saul how to obtain remission of sins. Is it not to be found in the fact that He had already given "the keys of the Kingdom" to Peter (Matt. xvi. 19), and that Peter had made known what was necessary "for the remission of sins?" (Acts ii. 38). Having given this commission to Peter, Jesus did not interfere with it; he simply sent the converted Saul to one who could instruct him in what had been revealed on the day of Pentecost. This suggests the application of the same principle to a similar case. In giving to Jesus Christ "the keys of hell and of death" (Rev. i. 18), God has vested in His son the power of resurrection, and, therefore, will not interfere with its exercise. But the use of these keys, like those given to Peter, is limited by conditions. Although Peter was informed that "whatsoever he should loose on earth" should "be loosed in heaven" (Matt. xvi. 19), he could not give "remission of sins" without belief and baptism. In like manner the use of the keys given to Christ is confined to those who have been "bought" from the bondage of "the law of sin and death," and made heirs of eternal life.—J. J. A.

METALLURGY OF THE BIBLE.

Since the days of Zillah's son, when Tubal Cain instructed "artificers in brass and iron," men have been wresting from the embrace of jealous earth her bountiful mineral stores, and fashioning from them articles for use, comfort and adornment.

Metallurgy forms an interesting study from a Bible point of view, because its elements are extensively used to adorn its language and illustrate its prophecies.

A graphic view of ancient mining is pictured by Job in ch. xxviii. displaying man's tireless energy in the pursuit of wealth; whilst in the apocryphal Scripture of Ecclesiastics the unhealthy nature of some of its crafts are vividly portrayed: "To every

craftsman and workmaster that laboreth night and day, and they that cut and grave seals and are diligent to make great variety, and give themselves to counterfeit imagery, and watch to finish a work: the smith also sitting by the anvil and considering the iron work, the vapour of the fire wasteth his flesh, and he fighteth with the heat of the furnace, the noise of the hammer, and the anvil is ever in his ears, his eyes look still upon the pattern of the thing that he maketh; he setteth his mind to finish his work, and watcheth to polish it perfectly" (ch. xxxviii., 28-31).

The art of metal-working was in great repute among the Phœnicians, Assyrians, Egyptians, and Jews—craftsmen, as well as smiths, being considered of value sufficient to be transported to Babylon during the captivity.

The Jews had the works of Bezaleel and Aholiab—men of ability who received divine tuition—and also those of the Tyrian artist, Huram, whose mother was an Israelite; which, so far as seen would serve as specimens of skill to be emulated.

Josephus records some artistic marvels wrought by command of Ptolemy Philadelphus (of Septuagint fame) for the Temple service. They consisted of a solid gold table, laver and vessels, ornamented with lilies, ivy leaves and tendrils of the vine "sending forth clusters of grapes, that you would guess were in no wise different from real tendrils, for they were so very thin, and so very far extended at their extremities, that they were moved by the wind, and made one believe them to be the natural product of nature and not the representation of art."

However beautiful, these were not made "according to the pattern" prescribed by Moses and David; they were seized by Antiochus, who ransacked the Temple and profaned its altar.

In Numbers xxxi. 22, we have a list of every metal of the Bible save one. This is antimony, in Hebrew called *pooch*. This word is used in Isa. liv. 11, "O thou afflicted and not comforted, behold I will set thy stones in fair colours" (antimony). The meaning, though obscure, is beautiful. Eastern ladies used *pooch* to beautify the eyes. It was applied to the edges of the lids, and imparted brilliancy both to the iris and the eyelash. It was with this that Jezebel "painted her eyes." The eye,

always a beautiful object, is used as a figure of Israel's future gladness, when comforted, and their tears wiped away; their state will then resemble those whose eyes were increased in beauty by the use of antimony.

Keren-Happuch, the name of one of Job's fair daughters, literally and inelegantly transcribed, means "paint-pot," but poetically indicates loveliness and personal charm.

Lead is found in Sinai, and was bartered in the fairs of Tyre. Job wished his words were graven in lead in the rock; there is evidence that the Ninevites and Egyptians used it in the same injurious way as it is used to day in glazing pottery.

Where brass is mentioned, bronze is probably meant. It is a compound of copper and tin, and largely found in ancient remains. Its lustre resembled gold; the Israelites had mirrors of it, of which Moses made plates for the altar—significantly reminding them of the necessity of "examining themselves" when presenting their offerings.

Tin was an item of great importance to the ancients, and the source of their supply has a bearing upon the identification of Tarshish. It is natural to Northern Europe, Spain, and S.W. of England. There is evidence to show that Phœnicians worked the mines of Cornwall before the Roman invasion; its locality being kept a profound secret. A writer says, "The practice of the Egyptians of imparting hardness to copper by tin alloy is surprising when we know the ancients had no tin-mines; all the tin they used they had to procure from the Cassiterides," the present Cornwall. It is curious to think, while looking at the bronzes in the British Museum, that these relics from Greece contain the tin which left these shores in Phœnician galleys, to return after centuries to the land from whence it was extracted.

Steel, mentioned four times in the Old Version, is translated brass in the New. Moses declares of Canaan that it is a land "whose stones are iron," which infers that it had been abundant there; whether it was smelted from Lebanon or Moab, or of meteoric origin is not known. The excellence of iron depends on the quality of the ore. On the southern shores of the Black Sea Herodotus asserts that the Chalybes had a method of making steel by combining carbon with iron, which, perhaps, gives force to

Jer. xv. 12, "Can one break iron, even iron from the north?" Throughout the Middle Ages the steel of this neighbourhood and Damascus was in great repute.

Silver is first mentioned as among the great possessions of Abraham; it was obtained from Tarshish and elsewhere.

Gold was known from the earliest times, and in Solomon's age was of such superabundance as to reduce its value to that of silver; "all Solomon's cups and vessels were of gold, and silver was nothing accounted of." Yet of the Future Temple it is said that its glory will exceed that of Solomon's edifice.

One thousand millions is the estimated amount expended upon Solomon's temple. We can easily imagine what a rich prize this would be in the eyes of the nations; and when Nebuchadnezzar absorbed the remnants and heaped to himself all the wealth of the world besides, we can see the appropriateness of the symbolism of the image which represented him as the "head of gold."

When the Persians succeeded to the monarchy silver seems to have been more abundant. It was lavishly used in the court and by the army.

The king's chariot was made of it, and the bodyguard of "Immortals," so-styled, had silver armour and spears.

Fittingly, too, the Grecian kingdom is symbolized by brass, to which many allusions are made by Homer: "No, let my Greeks, unmoved by vain alarms, once more refulgent shine in brazen arms."

How appropriately does iron suggest both the Roman character and period down to our time. Both on land and sea it is indispensable. The age of steam and electricity could not survive without it; it is a necessary feature of the Gentile preparation for the glorious age of the Great King.

In spiritual metallurgy we may find comparisons to these minerals. Some we should acquire, others purge out. Gold finds its counterpart in faith; unswerving, tried in the fire (I. Pet. i. 7). Silver should be found in our speech, for "the tongue of the righteous is as choice silver" (Prov. x. 20). We want sufficient iron in our mental constitution to give firmness (not obstinacy) to our thoughts and actions. Sounding brass, however, we can well dispense with; it represents fulsome profession without affection (I. Cor. xiii. 1).

"Behold, I send my messenger, he

shall prepare my way before me." "But who may abide the day of His coming?" "For He is like a refiner's fire . . . and He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver" (Mal. iii. 1-3). Silver, which requires refining, is submitted to the action of fire; the lead ore is precipitated while the pure metal rises above it. A film of oxide of lead constantly forms on the surface, and must be removed until no more appears. As its purity becomes more complete a succession of iridescent tints appear till the last particle of impurity is purged away,

and the molten mass reflects the face of the refiner.

We may each fill in the counterpart of this beautiful natural parable for ourselves. Paul supplies a key to it, while he says, "We all with unveiled face reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord, the Spirit" (II. Cor. iii. 13).

Whether we be vessels of pure silver, or merely vessels of clay coated with silver dross, the day of the refiner will make manifest.—R. B. FORD.

Things Hard to be Understood.

34.—THE MOSAIC LAW AFTER CHRIST'S DEATH.

Did the Mosaic law have power to justify after the death of Christ? If not, how were those Jews justified who rejected the preaching of the Apostles and who stand condemned? (Mark xvi. 15, 16).

The Mosaic law had no power to justify after its abolition at the Crucifixion. It never had power to justify unto eternal life; it could only justify unto a continuance of life in flesh and blood nature. But even this limited power of justification necessarily ceased when the law was abolished. The Jews who rejected the preaching of the Apostles were previously "nigh" to God (Eph. ii 17) through the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants; and this "nigh"-ness not completely end until that gone a had passed away.

35.—THE CHILDREN SLAIN BY HEROD.

Were not the children circumcised who were slain by Herod, and therefore in a state of oneness with God until they sinned personally? Why, then, did he allow them to perish?

The nation as a whole was in a degenerate condition, as shown by the mission of John the Baptist, the object of which was "to revive the hearts of the fathers in the children" (Luke i. 17). Speaking parabolically, they are described as the abode of an "unclean Spirit" (Matt. xiii. 43-45). In the giving of the law God had declared that

He would visit "the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, unto the third, and to the fourth generation" (Exod. xxxiv. 7). Hence immunity from the curses of the law required faithfulness on the part of the parents. The circumcised children of wicked Jews were not necessarily preserved from disease until they arrived at an age of individual responsibility; it depended entirely on God's forbearance. And where He specifically decreed punishment on descendants because of the sin of an ancestor, circumcision would have no effect in warding off such punishment. Thus it was declared that "leprosy" should "cleave unto" Gehazi and unto his "seed for ever," because of his iniquity (II. Kings v. 27). After this utterance, Gehazi's descendants could not be cured of leprosy by any of the features of the Mosaic law. The Jews living in Bethlehem at the time of Christ's birth partook of the degenerate character of the nation, and, therefore, their children would not be exempt from the vicissitudes resulting from the absence of special Divine protection. Not so with Joseph and Mary; they were devout and faithful to the law, and hence, with the child Jesus, were the subject of special interposition.

36.—THE POSITION OF THE PHARISES.

Is it a fact that none who have not entered the name of Christ will be raised?

If so, will the Pharisees who had no knowledge of the one faith—who rejected Christ, and who could not therefore have entered upon probation by the name of Christ—be raised?

It is not true that the Pharisees "had no knowledge of the one faith." They believed in "resurrection," "angel," and "spirit" (Acts xxiii. 8); and they formed part of the "twelve tribes" whom, says Paul, hoped in "the promise made of God unto our fathers" (Acts xvi. 6). Was not this the belief of Paul himself, when he "lived a Pharisee, after the most straitest sect of our religion" (Acts xvi. 5)? He did not require instructing in it at his conversion; all that was necessary was to convince him that the crucified Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah. This was the position of the religious Jews generally; for Christ said to them, "Ye search the Scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life; and these are they which bear witness of Me; and ye will not come to Me that ye may have life" (John v. 39, 40, &c.). The Pharisees were prevented accepting Jesus as the Christ because they "were lovers of money" (Luke xvi. 14, &c.), and because all their works were done "to be seen of men" (Matt. xxiii. 5). In saying that Jesus "had a devil" (John viii. 48), and in stoning Him for alleged "blasphemy" (John x. 33), the Jews evidently thought—as when they afterwards expelled and killed the Apostles—that they were doing "God service" (John xvi. 2). They believed in the kingdom, but they refused to recognise Jesus of Nazareth as its king. It was to "the chief priests and the elders of the people" that Jesus on one occasion said, "The publicans and the harlots, go into the kingdom of God before you" (Matt. xxi. 23, 31)—a statement which implied that they were not ignorant of the kingdom. And elsewhere He styled them "the children of the Kingdom" (Matt. viii. 12).

The name of Christ could not be entered by anyone before Christ's crucifixion and resurrection. Prior to these events he said to His Apostles, "Hitherto have ye asked nothing in My name . . . but the time cometh when . . . ye shall ask in My name" (John xvi. 24-26). If the twelve could not pray in His name, they could not be in it; and if they were not, no other Jews could be. And yet they could be in "the name of the Lord," which

commenced with sacrifice in Eden, and on which "men began to call" soon after the expulsion (Gen. iv. 26). It was not until after "the death of the cross" that that Name was given, to Mary's Son (Phil. ii. 8, 9), and, therefore, prior to that event Jews could be in "the name of the Lord" (Prov. xviii. 10) without believing Jesus to be the Christ.

37.—CHRIST'S BRETHREN; WHY THEY DIE

If Christ's death takes away our Adamic condemnation at baptism, how is it that we die? And how is it that when we are raised we come out of the ground with the nature in which we entered—a nature subject to death and sin-stricken?

The answer to the first part of this question may be given in a two-fold form:—

1. Because the change effected at baptism is one of relationship. It brings the believer under "the law of the spirit of life," and makes him "free from the law of sin and death" (Rom. viii. 2). The body, though still corruptible, is viewed, no longer as unholy, but as holy, for Christ's sake, its inherited sin having undergone a justification.

2. Because a day has been fixed for the judgment of all in Christ, and their probation closes—with the exception of the last generation—before that day arrives.

To present the matter fully it is necessary to ask another question—If Adamic condemnation is not taken away at baptism, how is it that the saints alive at Christ's coming do not die before being judged? And how is it that those who are approved never die? To this question no answer has been given by any of those who contend that Adamic condemnation rests as much on a believer after baptism as before; and no satisfactory answer can be given.

The death of one in Christ has not the same aspect as the death of one in Adam. To die in Christ is to be certain of resurrection. On what grounds? Because of the justification from inherited condemnation obtained through Christ. "The dead in Christ" are thereby placed, before judgment, in precisely the same position as the living in Christ. Their literal death has not contributed one iota towards the removal of their Adamic condemnation: first, because that death was not sacrificial; and second, because they were not, through being trans

gressors, in a position to die a sacrificial death. Adamic condemnation can only be taken away by the sacrificial death of one who commits no sin. This was accomplished by Christ, and therefore all who are baptised into His death participate in the benefit of that death. Of all such it is said, "There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. viii. 1). On what authority does anyone eliminate the words "is now" and substitute *will be*?

The answer to the second part of the question may be given in a threefold form:—

The dead come out of the grave with the nature in which they entered:—

Because incorruptibility does not come out of the earth, but from heaven.

2. Because the dead in Christ have to be judged in respect to their works, while under "the law of the spirit of life."

3. Because resurrection is intended simply to replace the dead in the position they occupied before dying.

38.—CHRIST'S RELATIONSHIP TO ADAMIC CONDEMNATION.

If Christ by circumcision was freed from Adamic condemnation, how was it he died under Adamic condemnation, and was still under it until delivered by resurrection and change of nature?

Christ as a babe was freed from Adamic condemnation provisionally. His circumcision on the eighth day was subject to His "circumcision" on the Cross. The justifying effect of his infantile circumcision was made void by His being nailed to the tree, when he was "made a curse" (Gal. iii. 13), under the Mosaic law. This deprived Him of His provisional sin-covering. In harmony therewith He was crucified naked, "the shame" of which He "despised" (Heb. xii. 2). It was then that God forsook Him and "condemned" the "sin" in His "flesh" to be deprived of life. But immediately His blood was shed He was provided with another and superior sin-covering, which entitled Him to resurrection (Heb. xiii. 20). He rose in flesh and blood nature, it is true, but not under Adamic condemnation; for He had "obtained eternal redemption for Himself" (Heb. ix. 12). "The law of the Spirit of life" had then made Him "free"—not provisionally, but permanently—"from the law of sin and

death." "He that hath died is justified from sin;" "death hath no more dominion 'over him'" (Rom. vi. 7, 9). His subsequent change of nature was the consummation of what had already been effected.

39.—THE SECOND DEATH IN RELATION TO ADAMIC CONDEMNATION.

The condemnation of violent death for disobedience to the Mosaic law did not supersede the Adamic condemnation which brought every Jew to the grave—even Christ Himself—but was added to the first condemnation. In like manner the condemnation of the second death at the judgment-seat is not in place of the Adamic condemnation—which will rest on all who are arraigned at that tribunal until removed—but will be an additional condemnation defining the manner in which the Adamic will be carried out. Therefore baptism only frees us prospectively from Adamic condemnation.

It is true that the Mosaic condemnation did not supersede the Adamic condemnation; one condemnation has no power to remove another. Condemnation can only be taken away by a justification. Every Jew under the Mosaic law was provisionally justified from Adamic condemnation, but as none of them kept the law they died under its curse. Those, however, who had become related, by sacrifice, to the eternal life of the Abrahamic covenant, died in a condition which required only the death of Christ to justify them from both Adamic and Mosaic condemnations.

The idea that condemnation at the judgment-seat defines the manner in which the Adamic condemnation will be carried out, is at variance with fundamental Bible principles. It says, in effect,

1. That the rejected suffer Adamic condemnation because they have not freed themselves from it by probationary well-doing;

2. That the accepted escape Adamic condemnation by reason of their probationary well-doing; and

3. That the sacrificial death of Christ is insufficient to free anyone from Adamic condemnation.

To take up this position is to substitute our own works for the work of Christ, and thereby to lessen the preciousness of His shed blood; whereas it is plainly stated that after having "done all" that is commanded we are "un-

profitable servants" (Luke xvii. 10); that is, our faithfulness is of no value in itself to justify from sin; all that, it does is to preserve us from condemnation.

The statement that "baptism only frees us prospectively from Adamic condemnation" is based on the fallacy that this condemnation consists only of a corruptible nature. It ignores the fact that there is a preceding decree or sentence which constitutes a breach between God and men; this it is which is removed at baptism. It is an actual, present removal, not a prospective one—as shown by the statement that believers are now "reconciled" to God (Rom. v. 10).

40.—THE ANGELS WHICH SINNED.

II. Pet. ii. 4 and Jude vers. 6 and 7.—These two questions appearing in the last number have elicited the following answer:—

The author of *Christendom Astray* suggests that these angels were probably beings who inhabited this globe prior to the Adamic creation, and who, presuming to leave this earth without authority and against command, were overthrown with a great destruction (p. 157 first edition, or p. 114 subsequent edition). But the natural way in which this event is recorded leads to the conclusion that both II. Pet. ii. 4 and Jude vers. 6 and 7 refer to some incident which occurred subsequently, and which was already known as an historic fact to those to whom they wrote. Jude, writing of corruptors of the truth, reminds his readers that such will meet with destruction, and gives Old Testament examples (1) Israelites who believed the false report of the spies; (2) The angels who kept not their own principality, but left their proper habitation, of whom Peter says, "God spared not these angels, but cast them down to Tartarus"; (3) The overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah.

The Greek word "Angelos" (transferred to English) meaning message bearers, we may safely apply the same interpretation to the angels of the passages under consideration. We find mortal "angels" mentioned in Rev. ii. 1, who are said to have "fallen" (ver. 6). These were the overseers of the Church of God who were endowed with the gifts of the Spirit for the edifying of the body of Christ. Looking back to the

time of the church in the wilderness (Acts vii. 38), we find a similar arrangement in existence. Moses, as a chief angel or message-bearer, was assisted by seventy chosen and spirit-endowed elders, who were to act with him as overseers (Num. xi. 16-28). These we find (Num. xvi.), not satisfied with their position, aspired to the dignity of the priesthood, who dwelt in a separate encampment (Num. iii. 38). As the punishment for their presumption the earth opened and enclosed them in "Tartarus," which in Peter's day was understood to mean the interior of the earth, where the ancient Greeks supposed the wicked received punishment.

The fact that the punishment of Sodom and Gomorrah was inflicted by the Eternal Jehovah is sufficient to warrant the term "eternal fire"; but the true meaning is that the destruction to these cities was for ever. The Emphatic Diaglott rendering is, "enduring the retributive justice of an aionian fire" (Jude, ver. 7), which suggests the idea that the punishment relating to that age was fire, whereas at other periods the punishment has been by plague, sword, earthquake, water, &c.

N. J. PRIGG, Jersey.

THE WORD MADE FLESH (No. 32).

We have received the following criticism from the author of the question on this subject which was answered in our last number:—

The answer given to this question in the last issue of *THE SANCTUARY-KEEPER*, by Bro. Chas. Smith is not clear to the point. If, as he says (in par. 1), "Even the same word which is mentioned in the first verse of the chapter. The word that was in the beginning, the word that was with God, even the word that was God"—then the obvious conclusion is that God, who "is Spirit" (Jno. iv. 24), was made, became, or was converted into flesh. Or to put it clearer, God is Spirit (Jno. iv. 24) and Spirit is God. His Word is Spirit (Jno. vi. 63); therefore like Himself, as the following testimonies will show:—

Ps. xxxiii. 6.—"By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the hosts of them by the breath of His mouth."

Ps. xxxiii. 9.—"He spake, and it was done; He commanded, and it stood fast."

Gen. i. 1.—"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth."

Job xxvi. 13.—“By His Spirit He hath garnished the heavens.”

These, and numerous other testimonies which could be brought, show plainly that God, the Spirit and the Word, are the same; and this agrees with Jno. i. 1, that “the Word was God.” Now, the question is, was it that Word or God that was made flesh? On the other hand, if the Word was God (the Eternal Spirit), and it (the Word, or Spirit, or God) was made flesh, does it not look absurd that the Eternal creator of all things at one time became a man, possessing sinful flesh and blood (Heb. ii. 14)?

I can understand Jesus as a flesh and blood man (Heb. ii. 14), as the Word of God, or more properly, God’s mouth-piece to man (Deut. xviii. 18, 19; Jno. x. 10-24; xii. 50; iii. 34), subsequent to His resurrection from among the dead (Rom. i. 4) becoming “the Lord the Spirit (II. Cor. iii. 17) by a change from a flesh and blood constitution (or nature) to a spiritual being or glorious body (Phil. iii. 21); but I cannot understand how the Word which was God (Spirit) was made, became, or was converted, into flesh. I understand that Jesus, after he became the Lord the Spirit (II. Cor. iii. 17; Rom. i. 3, 4), became the embodiment of God’s Word, or the word of God (Rev. xix. 13) in the sense that He is now Spirit, as God is (Jno. iv. 24). And as God, the Spirit, and Word, are the same: so Christ, the Spirit, the Word and God, are all one (Matt. xxviii. 18).

THE GREEK TRANSLATION.

By M. Wyllie, Sydney, N.S.W.

This lessens the difficulty a great deal, and could be more easily comprehended (Jno. i. 1). “In the beginning was the declaration, and the declaration was with the Deity, and the declaration (was) represented the Deity.”

If by “the declaration” is meant the promise expressed in the garden of Eden (Gen. iii. 15), which was a declaration of God’s purpose, then it was with Deity (in his mind), else he could not have expressed it; therefore it was the same, sent to Mary by the angel Gabriel, that she should have a son, &c. (Luke i. 27-56). This declaration (or purpose) (Gen. iii. 15) was told to Mary when the full or set time came for its (Gen. iii. 15) development (Gal. iv. 21). It was then made flesh (Jno. i. 14), or assumed

material form, and the declaration did represent, or was a representation, of Deity, as the following and other Scriptures teach: Matt. i. 23; Jno. iii. 34; v. 43; vi. 63; Deut. xviii. 18, 19. I understand that the declaration or purpose (Gen. iii. 15) became or was made flesh (Jno. i. 14) on the same principle that the heavens and all their hosts (Isa. xlv. 13) were made by the Word (Ps. xxxiii. 6), command (ver. 9), declaration (Isa. xlvi. 13), power (Jer. xxiii. 17), of Deity; and just as Adam was produced by the power, spirit, declaration (Gen. i. 26), or command of Deity (Ps. xxxiii. 6-9) from the dust of the ground (Gen. ii. 7), so Jesus was produced by the Word, Spirit, command and power of Deity, as expressed by the angel to Mary (Luke i. 27-35).

J. H. PILGRIM.

There still remains the following question to be answered by our readers:—

Luke xi. 30-32. What is the meaning of this passage in conjunction with Jonah?

To this we have now to add further questions received:—

Ps. xl. 12-15.—How do these verses apply to Christ?

Ps. lxi. 5.—If this verse applies to Christ how is it to be explained?

N. J. P. desires information on the following points:—

1. Do the Scriptures teach one resurrection only?
2. Will death be an experience unknown to faithful subjects in the Millennial Age?
3. Is it a fact that the first clause of Rev. xx. 5 is spurious?

If the answer to these questions be in the affirmative, do they not prove to those who believe that the household only are to appear at the Judgment-seat? That all others being under “the law of sin and death” must remain in the grave eternally—there being no other tribunal appointed by God for their arraignment?

4. If, as generally taught, life in the future age is to be simply lengthened, yet followed by death and resurrection, does it not follow that though the first portion of the age be practically free from death, the latter portion must be peculiarly the time for an exceptionally high death rate?

EDITOR.

Our Letter Box.

WORSHIP AND THE PROCLAMATION OF THE TRUTH.

Bro. H. Davies, of Sydney, New South Wales, writes as follows:—

Seeing in a recent issue of *THE SANCTUARY-KEEPER* the announcement from New Romney that the brethren there had ceased to make singing a part of their meetings held for the proclamation of the truth, I concluded that a few thoughts upon the subject would be opportune, now that the matter has been brought under the notice of the brethren.

The Question is not, "Are alien in a position to worship Deity?" To this there can only be a negative answer, as ably shown by Bro. A. T. Jannaway in his pamphlet entitled "Worship in relation to the Alien," which I would advise every member of the household to read. My object in now writing is rather to discuss the expediency or otherwise of introducing worship into a meeting specially held for the proclamation of the truth.

We may ask, 1st. What effect has the practice (commonly in vogue among us) upon the brethren and sisters?

2nd. What is the effect upon the alien who are present?

3rd. What scriptural precedent have we in relation to the matter? First, In the law; and second, In the practice of the Apostles.

1st. The act of worship in a meeting consisting of brethren and alien tends to break down that separateness which is so necessary for a faithful walk in the truth. The great majority of brethren have for the main portion of their lives been connected with one or other of the religious sects whose beliefs and practices are so contrary to the Truth, and where no distinction is made between one and another in the matter of worship; for as we know all are encouraged to sing and pray irrespective of their standing.

We are well aware of the difficulty experienced in ridding the mind of ideas of long standing; and when obedience is rendered to the Truth by any from the sects, the fact that we to all appearance

conduct our meetings, when strangers are present, very much like that followed by our contemporaries, must tend to an imperfect discrimination of the respective positions of those in the household and those outside. On the other hand, where the meeting is devoted wholly to the purpose for which it is designed (viz., proclaiming the truth), that in itself is sufficient to set anyone thinking on the reasons for such a course of action.

The unhealthy practice of worshipping in a mixed assembly is illustrated by some remarks in a recent number of *The Bible Shield and Reflector*—"a monthly magazine devoted to the Spiritual upbuilding of the Christadelphians throughout Australasia." The publication of a 3d. hymn book is hailed as supplying a "long felt want" "for a small hymnal especially adapted for outpost work where there are no brethren." This loose view of the privilege of worship is partially due to our practice of worshipping in a mixed assembly.

2nd. In a meeting where the hymn or prayer is announced without any reference whatever to the position of the stranger (and the fact that such meetings exist will not be questioned) the effect is decidedly in the direction of encouraging those to worship who are not in a position so to do. This creates (or rather fosters) in their minds a wrong conception of their position, which at a subsequent time we expect them to give up; and which must be given up before a clear understanding can be attained of the relation to Deity of men in Christ, and men in Adam. Thus the task of enlightening them is made more difficult, and at the same time injustice is done to them, in encouraging them in an act not acceptable to God, instead of doing our utmost to discourage it.

We are exhorted by Christ to pray in secret, and not before men to be seen of them; and we are ready enough to apply this Scripture when we see the leaders of the sects engaged in such an act upon the street corner before an assembled company. Are we not rather

allowing that which we condemn, when we engage in worship before the stranger who has been invited to hear the truth proclaimed?

3rd. There is certainly no Scriptural precedent for our present practice. Under the law everything points to the distinction existing between Israel and the nations. The work of the priests was confined strictly to Israel, and no stranger, unless circumcised, was allowed within the precincts of the house. It may be urged by some that if this is so, we should exclude the alien from our morning meeting. This, however, arises from a misconception, in confounding the Temple with the room in which we meet. It is we (the brethren and sisters) who constitute the Temple; and although there is no proof that it is wrong to worship with a stranger present, the evidence certainly shows that there should be no co-operation between the one and the other. There is a difference between the meetings convened solely for the brethren and sisters and the meetings held specially for the stranger. In the one case his presence is ignored, while in the other case his presence is the result of our efforts on his behalf; and we must adapt the meeting to his need, which is enlightenment, and not the hearing of prayers and hymns, in which he has no part or interest.

Looking to the New Testament we can find no recorded instance of meetings held for the enlightenment of the stranger, including worship. The Apostles devoted their whole efforts and time to making disciples by instructing the unenlightened in the truths of the Gospel.

Whence then comes the practice? From the pious enemies of Our Lord. Their custom is no guide to us, and as it is without Scriptural authority it would be better for us to discontinue it.

H. DAVIES.

L. sends us a long letter of some forty-six octavo pages—sufficient to occupy six or seven pages of the SANCTUARY-KEEPER—consisting partly of expostulation and condemnation, and partly of argument. If there were no basis for the argument there would, of course, be no censure. We will therefore deal with the argumentative portion.

CONDEMNATION FOR ADAM'S SIN.

L. says that we "cannot offer God a greater insult than to say He holds us

responsible for what Adam did." The strength or weakness of this statement depends upon what is meant by the word "responsible." If moral guilt—like Adam's—we know no one who has taught it; certainly we have not. It is not involved in the statement, "Justification from the offence of Adam." A justification or atonement is required where there neither is, nor can be, moral guilt—as witness the "atonement" offered for the Mosaic altar (Ex. xxix. 36). The origin of this was Adam's offence; for the earth—out of which the altar came—was "cursed" because of Edenic sin (Gen. iii. 17). In like manner the "condemnation" of "all men" for "Adam's offence" (Rom. v. 18) requires atonement apart from their individual moral guilt. To say that they "partake of the effects of Adam's sin" and that this consists of "mortality" is a defective statement. It omits the breach introduced between God and the human race, and the inheritance of "sinful flesh" from the first man. The rite of circumcision, and the dehlement of every Jewess when she became a mother (Lev. xii. 2, 5) are proofs that this breach and "sinful flesh" exist from birth. Hence to be justified from that which is due solely to Adam's "offence" is to be justified from that "offence." He is the head of a multitudinous body which consists of all his descendants; and they suffer the consequence of his sin.

L. admits that we are "all under condemnation by law" (Rom. v. 20), but, says he, "not because of Adam's sin." This is in direct conflict with the testimony: "By the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation" (ver. 18). The reason assigned by L.—"because God had predetermined it"—does not conflict with this statement; but, in omitting the cause, L. represents God as acting in an arbitrary manner. "Condemnation by law"—as L. admits—implies that law precedes condemnation. When, then, was the law given? In Eden (Gen. ii. 17); and the condemnation came (Gen. iii. 17-19) when the law had been violated.

COVERING THE SIN-NATURE.

L. denies that baptism either "justifies from the offence of Adam," or "covers the sin-nature." The reason he gives shows a misapprehension of what is meant. He says that when the

sin-nature is covered "those who participate in it will be immortal." How can this be? The sin-nature will then be consumed or "swallowed up" (II. Cor. v. 4), and consequently will need no covering. It is while it continues to exist that it needs to be covered. And if it be not covered by the ceremony of baptism there is nothing in this dispensation that can cover it. Has L. ever considered why the body has to be covered with water? And why, as a consequence, it is accounted "holy" (I. Cor. vi. 19, 20)? If the individual acts of the believer were alone affected, why has the body to go through the ceremony? Subsequent acts of transgression do not require such a process; petition for forgiveness through the sacrifice of Christ is sufficient. If, as L. remarks, "condemnation rests upon Christ's brethren as much after baptism as before," how is it that the Apostle says, "There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. viii. 1)? And how can there be condemnation where there is reconciliation (Rom. v. 10), peace (ver. 1), and fellowship (I. John i. 3)? The two conditions cannot exist in reference to the same persons at the same time. Perhaps L. believes that the condemnation means nothing more than mortal nature, for he says that "the justification and the removal of condemnation are only ceremonial and prospective." If so, he has not fully grasped the Scriptural meaning. The word "condemnation" involves a decree, or sentence; sin being its origin, the consequence is death. All sin produces a breach between God and man, and, therefore, the condemnation arising from Adam's sin is accompanied by a breach. When justification takes place at baptism what is involved? The breach is healed and the decree is reversed. The justification is unto "life" (Rom. v. 18), and hence the expression, "passed from death unto life" (I. John iii. 14).

To minimise this change by saying that it is "only ceremonial" is neither wise nor scriptural. How would L. like to be told that his "wicked works" (Col. i. 21) before baptism had only been ceremonially removed, inasmuch as the effects of them still remained in his constitution? And yet this would be on a par with the contention that because the nature of the body is not changed

its justification is "only ceremonial and prospective."

Eve's Disobedience—How Caused.

L. disputes our statement that Eve "disobeyed through false reasoning;" on the ground that we "have to develop our reasoning powers by a slow and gradual process." Yes, but there is a marked difference between the first human pair and their descendants. Adam and Eve came into existence as full-grown adults, whereas we commence as babies. The evidence that Eve reasoned is to be found in Gen. iii. 6. She partook of the forbidden fruit because, 1. "The tree was good for food;" 2. "It was pleasant to the eyes;" 3. It was "a tree to be desired to make one wise." Here are three reasons, albeit fallacious.

CHRIST, THE SEED OF WOMAN.

L. appears to have misunderstood what we have said about Christ being the Seed of Woman, not of Man. This does not imply that He was not of the Seed of David, but that He was not the Seed of Man by begetting, as He would have been if Joseph had been His actual father. The expression, "Seed of David" is applied to Christ not in the sense of direct begetting, but of descent. If the Holy Spirit had not operated on Mary there would have been no Seed of the Woman.

THE SERPENT: WAS IT LITERAL?

L. is astounded to find that we treat this in the affirmative, and says that it would be just as reasonable to believe in "a literal personal devil." He believes the serpent which tempted Eve to have been the "lust" or desires of the flesh (Jas. i. 15), and as evidence he quotes Paul's statement, "I had not known lust except the law had said, 'Thou shalt not covet'" (Rom. vii. 7). But these passages apply to human nature after the Fall, not before. Desire for good or evil could not exist in a nature which had no "knowledge of good and evil." By "the law," the Apostle means the Mosaic law, not the Edenic law; and the "sin" he speaks of is "sin in the flesh." The existence of this "sin" was realised by the interdict forbidding its exercise. To say that man was created with his present evil desires, and that they are the serpent or devil which Jesus Christ was manifested to destroy, is equivalent to affirming that God put

His Son to death in order to destroy His own creative work.

If, says L., Adam and Eve were tempted by a literal serpent they were tempted in a very different way from what Christ and we are. Certainly they were. They were tempted only from without; but we are tempted from within and without, as also was Christ.

If the serpent was not literal, how is it that God spoke to it separately from Adam and Eve (Gen. iii. 14, 15), and pronounced upon it a condemnation distinct from theirs? Why did God "curse" it "above all cattle, and above every beast," if it was not one of the animal creation? And what is to be understood by evil desire going on its "belly" and eating "dust" all its "life"? We trust that L. will, on further consideration, see the fallacy of his belief.

GOD'S FOREKNOWLEDGE.

L. thinks that what we have written about the events in Eden, questions God's foreknowledge. Nothing of the kind; we have dealt only with what He has done and revealed. Everything took place in its proper order. As to what God intended from the very beginning, we need not discuss; it would be unprofitable. There is quite enough to comprehend in what He has revealed without penetrating further.

ADAM'S PROBATION.

L. contends that Adam did not commence a probation until after he had transgressed. This is not in harmony with facts. When God said, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," He placed Adam under probation—that is a proving or testing, of his obedience. Two issues were placed

before him—a continuance of life, or the infliction of death. He chose that which led to death. After this, God, in mercy, permitted him to enter upon a second probation—the result of which is not revealed.

NAMING OF THE ANIMALS.

On this point L. thinks that Adam received Divine aid. So do we. For this event took place on the day of his creation, before Eve was made (Gen. ii. 19); and it is not likely that in such a short space of time Adam could have acquired the necessary information for giving a suitable name to each animal.

CHRIST CLEANSED BY HIS OWN BLOOD.

L. cannot understand what we mean by saying that Christ shed His blood to cleanse His own sin nature; he says that "if there was any real value in Christ's literal blood He ought to have retained it, and not have poured it out as useless and valueless." Misapprehension must be the basis of these remarks. The blood of Christ had no cleansing efficacy except by being shed or poured out. Blood "is the life of all flesh" (Lev. xvii. 14), and He was required to give up that life as an atonement for sin. Hence the giving up of His life is often spoken of as the shedding of His blood. "By His own blood He . . . obtained eternal redemption" (i.e., for Himself, Heb. ix. 12). "The patterns of things in the heavens" had to be "purified" with animal sacrifices, "but the heavenly things themselves—of which Christ was one—must be purified "with better sacrifices," even the sacrifice of the Lamb of God (ver. 23).

(To be concluded in next number.)

Within the Holy Place.

LONDON (NORTH,
BARNSBURY HALL, Barnsbury Street,
Islington; Sundays, 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.;
Wednesdays and Fridays, 8 p.m.

I have pleasure in stating that since

our last intengence we have immersed into the Saving Name, on December 1st, Miss Florence Hammond (formerly Church of England), and, on January 5th, Miss Marian Ruth Elliott (formerly

neutral). Unfortunately, Sister Hammond has not been able to remain long with us, having recently left England to join her relatives in New York. On February 23rd we immersed Miss Charlotte Willis (formerly Salvation Army), who resides at Hadleigh, Suffolk.

We have also had our number increased by the removal to London of Brother Money, late of High Wycombe, and Brother Whiteley, from Sowerby Bridge. Brother Charles Burridge, late of Hull, has also been received into our fellowship; and Sister Olive Benton, who has returned to London from Southampton, will in future meet with us.

We regret to have lost, by removal, Sister Annie Monday, who is now living at Southampton, and Sister Simmons, who now resides at Hastings, and will meet with the brethren at New Romney, when possible. Brother R. H. Ford and Sister Julia Throssell were united in marriage on December 24th.

On December 26th our usual Christmas tea meeting was held, when several brethren from Camberwell Ecclesia, and Bro. and Sister White, of Northampton, were present. Several profitable addresses were delivered on the subject of the Messages to the Seven Churches (Rev. ii. and iii.).

The lectures for the three months have been as follow: "Salvation is of the Jews" (J. Owler); "The Promises to the Fathers" (C. Balls); "The Good Time Coming" (J. J. Andrew); "The Survival of the Jews" (W. H. Clifford); "The Desire of all Nations" (W. Owler); "Daniel's Vision of the Night" (G. F. Guest); "The Third Heaven" (R. H. Ford); "Distress of Nations; how will it end?" (J. J. Andrew); "The Messiah" (C. Balls); "The Faith once delivered to the Saints" (W. Deane); "A King's Wonderful Dream" (J. Owler); "The Deliverance of Israel from Egypt a type of the Redemption of God's people from among the Nations" (W. Owler); "The Teaching of the Writers of the Bible opposed to the imaginary heaven and hell of the Clergy" (R. H. Ford).

R. OVERTON, Recording Brother.

LONDON (SOUTH).

SURREY MASONIC HALL, Camberwell New Road, S.E.: Sundays, 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.

We are pleased to report that obedience to the truth has been rendered by Miss Ethel Alice Richards (daughter of our

Brother and Sister Richards), who was immersed on Sunday morning, December 20th, in the presence of a number of brethren and sisters. Our new sister was formerly a scholar in the Sunday School.

During the month of January we held a special course of Sunday afternoon lectures, which were well attended by the alien. The first afternoon the hall was almost full, the audience listening with rapt attention to a lecture delivered by Brother Wm. Whitehead, of New Romney, entitled, "The Second Coming of the Lord Jesus Christ—the bearing which current events have upon it." The next Sunday afternoon Brother J. J. Andrew lectured on "Turkey's Collapse—long foretold in the Prophetic Word." The following Sunday Brother G. F. Guest gave a discourse dealing with the judgments overhanging the nations, entitled, "The Coming Storm, and the Refuge from its Dangers"; and the concluding lecture, "Calm after Storm," was delivered by Brother R. H. Ford. The brethren were well pleased and satisfied with the effort and trust that it may bring forth fruit to the honour and praise of Jehovah.

Our Sister Osborn has been plunged into grief owing to her husband being robbed and thrown out of a railway carriage, near Deptford, in the south-east of London, on the evening of February 4th. He was cut and bruised in different parts of his body, the injuries to his left arm necessitating its amputation. We pray that she may be sustained in her affliction.

Sister Sarah Kirsh has removed to Aldershot owing to her being united in marriage with Brother Jones of that place.

The quarterly business meeting was held on January 12th.

Our annual tea meeting will be held, if the Lord will, on Good Friday, April 3rd, and we invite members of other ecclesias to favour us with their presence, if convenient.

The lectures during the past quarter have been as follows:—"The Promises made to Abraham" (C. Balls); "The Blindness of Israel" (J. J. Andrew); "The Gospel of the Kingdom" (W. Owler); "Repent ye, and believe the Gospel" (G. F. Guest); "Who are the people of God?" (W. Deane); "The Broad Road and the Narrow Way" (C. F. Bore); "The Time of the End"

(G. F. Guest); "The Nations Angry" (W. Owlser); "The Faith which was once delivered to the Saints" (W. Deane); "The Messiah" (C. Balls); "Popular Teaching at variance with the Scriptures" (W. H. Clifford); "Prophecies relating to Christ" (T. B. Clifford).
Tros. B. CLIFFORD,
Recording Brother.

NORTHAMPTON.

TEMPERANCE HALL, Newlands:—Sunday 11 a.m. and 6.30 p.m.

We have little to report this time in the way of change: our only alteration has been in having the company of Bro. Judd (late of Barnsbury Hall Ecclesia), two or three months; but he has now removed to Leeds.

We are still doing our best on Sunday evenings to make known the glorious "covenants of promise," if there should yet be any Gentiles to be "taken out for His Name."

The annual business meeting, held Jan. 2nd, gave great satisfaction, both financially and numerically.

The Registrar reported that the brethren and sisters had increased from 10 to 20 during the year.

The lectures for December, January, and February have been as follows:—

"A Change of Government for all Nations—one universal Commonwealth and one Supreme King" (G. Handley); "What is it to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ in order to be saved? Is there anything for us to do in the matter?" (B. H. Ford); "The Second Coming of Christ: the Manner of His Coming and the Work He will accomplish" (T. E. Boddington); "The Gradual Development of the Gospel of Salvation as Revealed in the Scriptures. How the Gentiles may become fellow-heirs" (J. Owlser, London); "Equal unto the Angels" (A. E. Thorncroft); "Supposed Bible Strongholds for the Immortality of the Soul" (G. Handley); "Sin: its Banishment from the Earth" (J. Money, London); "The First Principles of the Oracles of God" (T. E. Boddington); "Where is the Faith of the Prophets and Apostles?" (W. H. Clifford, London); "The Jews: their Persecuted Condition about to end, the speedy Advent of Messiah to Save them, an event of world-wide importance" (G. Handley); "Distress of Nations with Perplexity: What does it mean, and how to be relieved?" (J. J. Andrew, London).

G. HANDLEY.

NEW ROMNEY.

Since our last report we have kept the sight of the truth before the public, and have arranged to deliver a course of special lectures chiefly bearing upon the coming of our Lord. We have had cards printed for the course—which extends to the end of March—and these have been circulated in the country districts around, with the result that we have had people from four and five miles drive over in their carts, and some on foot, and our attendance has thus been augmented. So far this is encouraging, and we are trustful and prayerful that God may turn this door of utterance to the glory of Himself and Jesus Christ by the obedience of some.

W. WHITEHEAD.

SYDNEY.—LEICHHARDT TOWN HALL ECCLESIA.

It gives us pleasure to report that, during the past month, two have yielded obedience to truth, by being immersed into the death of Christ, in whom—according to the Scriptures—they have been delivered from the "Adamic Condemnation;" and all things held against them:—Mrs. White, of Auburn, a township about 10 miles from here, the former residence of Brother and Sister Young, who were the means of conveying the Truth to our Sister; and William White, son of Bro. White of our ecclesia (but who, on account of the depression here in his trade, has been temporarily removed to Brisbane); our young brother was a diligent member of the school. We have also to report that we have been compelled to withdraw our fellowship from Bro. T. Whitten, for forsaking the fellowship of his brethren and sisters without a just cause; and for refusing to meet them (as Christ commands) to reason together on any misunderstanding which may have arisen. This unexpected trouble arose from the legitimate action of the serving brethren in not appointing our brother to exhort and lecture. He apparently had a fair grasp of the truth regarding "justification from the Adamic condemnation" and Resurrection in relation to the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus; but upon learning the decision of the serving brethren, he suddenly discovered that he was at one with those who are partisans of the "Albert Hall."

M. WYLLIE.