

THE  
SANCTUARY-KEEPER:

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

EDITED BY  
J. J. ANDREW.



VOLUME IV

JUNE, 1897  
SEPTEMBER, 1897  
DECEMBER, 1897  
MARCH, 1898

---

PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR,

26, DOUGLAS ROAD, CANONBURY, LONDON.

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

13  
177

THE  
SANCTUARY-KEEPER:

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

EDITED BY

J. J. ANDREW

---

VOL. IV., 1897-8.

---

PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR,

26, DOUGLAS ROAD, CANONBURY, LONDON, N.

PRICE—GREAT BRITAIN, UNITED STATES, AND THE COLONIES, 6D. PER COPY,  
OR 3S. (OR HALF DOLLAR) PER ANNUM, POST FREE.

# 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. 13.

JUNE, 1897.

VOL. IV.

---

## "In the Spirit."

Writing to the brethren at Rome the Apostle says, "They that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you" (Rom. viii. 8, 9). Two classes are here mentioned; one "in the flesh," and the other "in the Spirit." The phrases by which they are described cannot define a difference in bodily organisation; for the Roman brethren were the same, in this respect, as before becoming "Saints" (ch. i. 7). The expressions must, therefore, refer to a difference in relationship. "They that are in the flesh" are destitute of the faith without which "it is impossible to please God" (Heb. xi. 6); and therefore nothing that they do in respect to a future life can obtain Divine approval. But the "Saints" in Rome were not in this position; they had exhibited faith in "the promises made unto the fathers" (ch. xv. 8), and had submitted to "the obedience of faith" (ch. xvi. 25). By this means they had become "dead to sin" (ch. vi. 2); in other words they had died to the flesh, and in this sense had ceased to be "in the flesh." Their past life, and its origin, had been, in God's sight, blotted out; and they were henceforth accounted by Him as being "in the Spirit," or "new creatures" in "the Lord the Spirit."

The Roman brethren had not only been "buried with Christ" (ch. vi. 4); they had also "risen with Christ" (Col. iii. 1). The immediate object of this was, that they "might walk in newness of life" (Rom. vi. 4). It is a prevalent idea that this expression merely describes a righteous course; but a little consideration will show that it has a more comprehensive meaning. It is parallel to the phrase "walk in the truth" (Jno. iii. 4). The "walk" is righteous conduct, and the phrase "in the truth" describes the position in which that "walk" is to be taken; all in Christ are "in the truth," but all do not "walk" in it. In like manner baptism into Christ introduces each one into "newness of life," and in this position he is able to, and is required to, "walk" uprightly.

This distinction is expressed even more clearly in an exhortation to the Galatian brethren:—"If we live in the Spirit, let us walk in the Spirit"

(Gal. v. 25). To "live in the Spirit" was the privilege of all, and this imposed on them the obligation to "walk in the Spirit." The use of the word "If" does not imply a doubt. It is a mode of appeal to the reasoning faculties sometimes adopted by the inspired penmen. Thus: "If there be any virtue, if their be any praise, think on these things" (Phil. iv. 8). The "things" here referred to are described as "true," "honest," "just," "pure," "lovely," and of "good report"; and there can be no doubt of their "virtue" and of their meriting "praise."

The Revised Version renders Gal. v. 25, "If we live by the Spirit, by the Spirit let us also walk." But the only alteration is to substitute "by" for "in," which makes no material difference; the fact and the argument embodied in the exhortation remain the same. It cannot be said of those in Adam that they live either "in the Spirit" or "by the Spirit," in the sense in which the words are here used. The statement does not refer to the "spirit" or "breath" necessary to creatures which live by breathing (Ps. civ. 29, 30; Isa. ii. 22); for it could not be addressed to such as are still "in the flesh" (Rom. viii. 8). It has a higher and more limited application. It is confined to those who are related to a "life" superior to that which is described as "a vapour" (Jas. iv. 14). It is a "life" which has its root, not in sinful flesh, but in the Spirit. It is, therefore, a life free from condemnation. It does not add anything to the constituents of the physical constitution, and, therefore, cannot be realised by the five senses; and yet it is more enduring than the life which depends on the "breath" in the "nostrils" (Isa. ii. 22). It is "hid with Christ in God" (Col. iii. 3); and consequently its existence can only be realised "by faith." Hence the declaration of Paul in Gal. ii. 20:—"I have been crucified with Christ; yet I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ, liveth in me: and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God." Knowing that he was a "member of Christ's body, of His flesh, and of His bones" (Eph. v. 30), the Apostle realised by faith the life which has its source in the Head of the "One Body"; his "vapour" life was to him nothing, but the life "hid with Christ" was everything.

In writing to the Colossians the Apostle styles this life "your life"—an expression analogous to "thy crown" (Rev. iii. 11). The "life" and "crown" were theirs by title, right, or heirship, in the same sense that "all things" were theirs: "the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours" (I. Cor. iii. 22). The retention of the "life," "crown," and other "things" was, however, dependent on their probationary faithfulness; disobedience would certainly at the Judgment-seat terminate the ownership thereof, whereas obedience would transform their possession from a matter of "faith" to one of "sight" (II. Cor. v. 7).

The reality of the "life" under consideration is shown by the fact that men cannot destroy it; and they who realise this are able to act on the injunction of Christ: "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul (or life)." Christ will "destroy" it when He destroys the "body," as the result of condemnation at the Judgment-seat (Matt. x. 28). Herein lies the difference between this "life" and immortality; the former can be destroyed by God, but the latter, when once given, will never be taken away.

When the "eleven disciples" received their commission to "teach (or disciple) all nations," they were instructed to "baptise them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit" (Matt. xxviii. 19). This is not three names, but one name with a three-fold aspect. It originated with the Father, it was, after "the death of the Cross," embodied in the Son (Phil. ii. 9), and it has been revealed and developed through the agency of the Holy Spirit. It is the Name of Salvation, and induction therein necessarily gives to baptised believers a relationship to its three constituent

elements. It places them "in God the Father and in the Lord Jesus Christ" (I. Thess. i. 1); and also "in the Spirit" (Rom. viii. 9). They are then in a position to "worship God *in the Spirit*" (Phil. iii. 3) in accordance with the prediction of Christ that "the true worshippers shall worship the Father *in spirit* and in truth" (Jno. iv. 23).

The Galatian believers despised this relationship; "having begun *in the Spirit*," they subsequently sought to be "made perfect by the flesh" (Gal. iii. 3). They were not satisfied with "justification of life" by "the righteousness of one" (Rom. v. 18); they sought also to be "justified by the law" (Gal. v. 4.) Although "circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ" (Col. ii. 11), they insisted on the necessity of "every man" in Christ being "circumcised" (Gal. v. 2, 3). In adding the abrogated shadow to the substance they made void the substance. In effect they despised the work of the Spirit in the begetting of Christ (Luke i. 35), in the circumcision of His heart (Col. ii. 11), in the offering up of His body as a sacrifice (Heb. ix. 14), and in His resurrection to immortality (Rom. i. 4); and hence they are condemned as having "fallen from grace" (Gal. v. 4). In this there is a lesson for those who *deny their justification from Adamic condemnation* by baptism into Christ; they give to their own "*well-doing*" the same efficacy which the Galatian brethren gave to *circumcision*.

There is another sense in which a man of God can be "in the Spirit." It is expressed by the Apostle John: "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day" (Rev. i. 10). Through the Holy Spirit he was able to look forward and see in vision the glories of the future day of the Lord Jesus Christ. This is a privilege which has been vouchsafed to but few of God's sons, and to this few for but a comparatively brief period; during this period they remained the same in constitution, thus showing that the expression "in the Spirit" is quite compatible with the retention of a corruptible body.

By being introduced into the name of Salvation a believer is "quickeneth" or made alive (Eph. ii. 1, 5; Col. ii. 13). He was previously "dead," and consequently "alienated from the life of God" (Eph. iv. 18); but now he is in a state of oneness with that "life." He was dead because of sin, but being justified from sin He has become related to a "life" free from condemnation. "This life is in God's Son;" and consequently, "He that hath the Son hath life" (I. Jno. v. 11, 12). During probation this "life" is possessed in a mental or moral sense; its corporeal aspect is beyond the Judgment-seat. Exaltation from one to the other is dependent on continued adherence to the teaching of the Spirit:—"The thinking of the Spirit is *life and peace*" (Rom. viii. 6). Association with this "life" is due to Christ who brought "*life and incorruptibility to light*" (II. Tim. i. 10), and who also "hath given unto us all things that pertain unto *life and godliness*" (II. Pet. i. 3). A "life" which precedes "peace," "incorruptibility," and "godliness" necessarily has an application to the probationary period. It is, in relation to "eternal life," as the vestibule is to the palace; or as the admission-card of a subject is to an audience with his Ruler; or, to use a Scriptural illustration, as espousal (II. Cor. xi. 2) is to "marriage" (Rev. xix. 7).

They who are "in God" and "in Christ" receive a name in harmony therewith; they are "called the Sons of God" (I. Jno. iii. 1) and "brethren" of Christ (Heb. ii. 11). Being also "in the Spirit" their relationship to the Spirit must be of a similar character. They are "the children of promise, as Isaac was" (Gal. iv. 28). As a child of promise Isaac "was born after the Spirit" (ver. 29): therefore they, as "children of promise," must be "born after the Spirit." Ishmael who "was born after the flesh persecuted him (Isaac) who was born after the Spirit." This was part of "an allegory" which has its parallel in the things pertaining to Christ; for, says the

Apostle, "*even so it is now*" (ver. 29). There can be no question as to the present existence of those who are "born after the flesh;" there must, therefore, exist those also who are "born after the Spirit." Otherwise there would be none to persecute, and in that case the "allegory" would not receive its fulfilment.

Those who have received "the right to become children of God" are described as having been "born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God" (John i. 12, 13, r.v.) This statement conjoined with the testimony that "God is Spirit" (John vii. 24) would suffice to show that "the children of God" are likewise children of the Spirit, and that being "born of God" they are also born of the Spirit. This is, indeed, what Christ stated when explaining what it was to be "born again," or "born from above" (John iii. 3.) It consists of being "born of water and the Spirit"—not two births, but two elements or agents in producing the one birth. "Water" cannot effect it without "Spirit"; neither can "Spirit" without "water." "By one Spirit are we all baptised into one body" (I. Cor. xii. 13), "being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever." (I. Pet. i. 23). The "Spirit" has given the promise in the Word, "the Spirit is truth" (I. Jno. v. 6), and the "Spirit" is an element of the name of salvation. The work of the truth is God's work, and His sons "are labourers together with" Him. "He that planteth and he that watereth" are nothing in themselves; for it is "God that giveth the increase" (I. Cor. iii. 7-9). This is illustrated by two facts in Apostolic days. On one occasion Paul and Timothy "assayed to go into Bithynia; but the Spirit suffered them not" (Acts xvi. 7); and on another, Paul was instructed to "speak," for, said the Lord, "I have much people in this city" (Acts xviii. 9, 10). The unseen power which accompanied the work of the first century is as necessary and as operative in the work of the nineteenth; and a recognition of this fact is essential to a right view of the events by which the truth has been disentangled from the corruptions of the apostacy.

To be introduced into the Name of Him who is "the firstborn from the dead" (Col. i. 18) is to enter "the general assembly and ecclesia of first-borns" (Heb. xii. 23), and thereby to obtain the "birthright" pertaining to the firstborn, viz., priesthood and rulership. Without such a birth there can be no "birthright," and if no birthright, no right which can be "sold." When the time comes to "inherit the blessing" (ver. 16, 17) the term "right" is no longer required; title will then have been superseded by enjoyment.

The expression, "that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit" (Jno. iii. 6) is considered to preclude the idea of a present Spirit-birth. Through being placed in antithesis to the statement, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," it is viewed as describing the change from mortality to immortality (I. Cor. xv. 53); and if this be its meaning there can, of course, be no such thing now as being "born of the Spirit." But the reasons for what may be called a literal interpretation are insufficient. The language used is very similar to that of Rom. viii. 9, "Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit." And it is not unlike Christ's statement, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you" (Jno. vi. 53). In neither of these cases would a literal interpretation be admissible. Much misapprehension exists, through taking a surface view of Scriptural phrases, of which the most notable is the Papal application of Christ's words, "This is my body" (Matt. xxvi. 26). It was due to this cause that the Jews thought Christ referred to Herod's "temple," when "He spoke of the temple of His body" (Jno. ii. 19, 21); and it was for a similar method of understanding His discourses that he said, "Ye judge after the flesh" (Jno. viii. 15).

Isaac was "born after the Spirit" (Gal. iv. 29), and yet he partook of the

nature of Abraham and Sarah. Christ was begotten by the Spirit (Luke i. 35) and yet he was "made of a woman" (Gal. iv. 4), "in all things like unto His brethren" (Heb. ii. 17.) In like manner a believer, by baptism "into the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit" can be "born of the Spirit" without any change of physical constitution. It is certain that he then begins to "live in the Spirit" (Gal. v. 25), and this beginning could not be better described than by the words "born" and "created" (Eph. ii. 10), words perfectly appropriate as the sequel to an event which is described as a death. The life and actions before baptism into Christ are, in God's sight, blotted out, and "all things become new." The subject of the change puts on "the new man" (Col. iii. 10), becomes "a new creature" (II. Cor. v. 17), or a "new born babe" (I. Pet. ii. 2) and enters on "newness of life" (Rom. vi. 4). The idea that the physical constitution then receives a germ of immortality or eternal life is subversive of the fundamental teaching of the New Testament. The body is certainly accounted a holy "temple" (I. Cor. vi. 19), but its transformation to immortality awaits approval at the judgment-seat; this event is the full fruition of the "birth" or creation at baptism—the physical result of that which was previously mental and moral.

The fear of associating "the Spirit" with the birth that takes place at baptism, because of the errors to which it might lead, is commendable as evidence of a desire to maintain the purity of the Truth, but possible consequences do not justify it. The birth of the Spirit is not the only Scriptural truth which has been perverted by the Apostasy. Indeed, every revealed truth has been thus treated. The truth concerning the mortality of man's nature has been carried by some to rank materialism; the conjunction of the Father with the Son and the Holy Spirit is the foundation for the Athanasian Creed, and Christ's sacrificial death has been transformed into a mere moral example. If, therefore, one truth is to be rejected because of possible consequences, the same reason would justify the rejection of every truth. The aim of the children of wisdom should be to attain to the fully revealed "knowledge" of Him that hath called them to "glory and virtue" (II. Peter i. 3) in order that they may be "filled with the knowledge of His will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding" (Col. i. 9). Especially should they aim to know exactly their present position, because it has a practical bearing on their probationary conduct. If their estimate of it be too low, they will be liable to imitate Esau by selling their *birthright* for a mess of pottage (Heb. xii. 16); and if it be too high, they may become presumptuous, like those who claimed superiority over the Apostles (II. Cor. xi. 13; III. Jno. 10).

When a man is born in a high position he is expected to uphold the honour and traditions of his ancestors. The same principle applies to those who, through being "born of God" are raised up to the "heavenlies in Christ Jesus" (Eph. ii. 6). The terms in which they are described in the Scriptures reveal the light in which they are viewed by God, and indicate what is required of them. It is, therefore, of the highest importance that they possess this part of "the knowledge of God's will" (Col. i. 9). As sons of God they are exhorted to be perfect as their Father (Matt. v. 48); as brethren of Christ they are called upon to imitate their Elder Brother; and as children of the Spirit they are enjoined to walk in strict accord with the Spirit's teaching (Gal. v. 16, 22, 25). What this involves cannot now be elaborated. It is briefly stated in the Apostolic injunction, "Be ye transformed by the *renewing of your mind*, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God" (Rom. xii. 2). Transformation of mind is a pre-requisite to transformation of body; but neither of these transformations can take place without a previous complete change of position, described as turning from the power of Satan under God (Acts xxvi. 18); as dying to sin and rising to righteousness (Rom. vi. 2;

Col. iii. 1); as passing from a state of alienation to one of reconciliation (Eph. iv. 18; Rom. v. 10); as giving up a life in the flesh for a life in the Spirit (Rom. viii. 9; Gal. v. 25); as being "born from above" (Jno. iii. 3); or "created in Christ Jesus" (Eph. ii. 10); and as "purchased" from "the law of sin and death" by "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" (I. Cor. vi. 20; Rom. viii. 2).

EDITOR.

## Things New and Old.—No. 12.

### "THE DEVELOPMENT AND MANIFESTATION OF THE SONS OF ALL."

#### Section II. — PHYSICAL.

There is much truth in the following words which were uttered in England's greatest "Abbey" the other day by Canon Gore when he contended that the teaching of the Apostle Paul's "view of Christian living was founded on the Church being a brotherhood. They had," said the Canon "suffered much in every part of Christendom from a desire that all men should be nominally Christians rather than that a few should, by self-sacrifice and discipline, be real followers of the Crucified. They had, in short, sacrificed reality to numbers. . . ." (The italics are mine.) This principle of "brotherhood" is, indeed, one which, to us, is of the greatest importance; whence its source? It is of God; by and through whom? "The Lord from heaven." Let us carefully ponder the sixth chapter of John, wherein we may learn of this beginning of Him in whom we are. That beginning is clearly shown to be of the Father. Now, as Jesus Christ had not, as a person, been in heaven, the great fact which He desired His hearers to grasp was, that He was born from above, and that all that His Father had to give to men was to be obtained through Him. Whilst realising that the Father has had only One such Son in the manner of begetting, anointing, character, and power, we must remember that we are "born from above," in the sense "that we have been constituted 'children of God' by 'the law of the spirit of life,' which is from above;" nor must we forget that "we are compelled by the facts in the case to confine the 'birth' to the production of a 'new creature,' MENTALLY and MORALLY. This

new mental and moral creature is *not of the flesh, but of the Spirit.*" (Editor of *The Christadelphian Advocate*, January, 1897.)

Had the Jews to whom Jesus Christ spoke, realised the Spiritual sense in which He spake to them of Himself, they would not have gone "back and walked no more with Him" (John vi. 66). "But, as then, he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now" (Gal. iv. 29).

Our beginning in the "brotherhood" is not reckoned from our natural birth, but as our brethren in Galatia began "in the Spirit" so have we; although adults, and having arrived at such years as enabled us to give a confession of the things concerning the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, we are styled "new-born babes" (I. Pet. ii. 2). This is of God as set forth by these words: "But as many as received Him, to them gave He power (margin, the right or privilege) to become the sons of God even to them that believe on His name; which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God" (Jno. i. 12, 13). That the Apostle conveyed this same idea is indisputable, "For we are His (God's) workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them" (Eph. ii. 10). If this is not a beginning in the Spirit, there is no force in the following testimonies:—"If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit" (Gal. v. 25); "Therefore 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 is by continuing in *this way*—in which

God has through His grace and mercy placed us—"That in the ages to come (now near) He might show the exceeding riches of His grace, in His kindness toward us through Jesus Christ" (Eph. ii. 7).

Those "exceeding riches," brethren, cannot be realised now except "by faith;" for they comprise our physical change into Spirit Nature, or "Divine Nature" (II. Peter i. 4). A beginning has been made; for there is one member of our race, our Elder Brother, who now partakes physically of this divine nature. In His first nature "He was crucified through weakness;" in His present nature "He liveth by the power of God" (II. Cor. xiii. 4). He is now made "after the power of an endless life" (Heb. vii. 16), and has become the Author of eternal salvation to all them that obey Him. Never let us forget this one thing, brethren, viz., that we are "created in Christ Jesus" for God's good pleasure, and that He is not willing that any of us should perish. It will be our deserting the path in which we are placed if we do not attain to the physical change; for know ye not that it is written unto us as unto children "In the way of righteousness is life; and in the pathway thereof there is no death" (Prov. xii. 28). We may "sleep in the dust," but, if so, we shall "sleep in Christ"—a death very different from the "perpetual sleep" of the wicked.

The masses are not created to this eternal salvation; their present condition of ignorance and corruptibility cannot give them any claim to the title of "Sons of God," "babes in Christ," "born of incorruptible seed," "spirituals," "in the heavens in Christ Jesus," "temple of God," "spiritual house," "holy nation," "a royal priesthood," or "a chosen generation" (or seed). Such claim belongs only to those who "are created in Christ Jesus."

Beautiful, indeed, are the many appellations which abound in the Scriptures concerning the latter class—"Through wisdom is a house builded; and by understanding it is established: and by knowledge shall the chambers be filled with all precious and pleasant riches. A wise man is strong; yea, a man of knowledge increaseth strength" (Prov. xxiv. 3-6). It is our relationship to the Spirit, and that only, that enables us to discern what are the precious and pleasant riches of the Spirit; they are

foreign to the merely natural man, as clearly shown by the Apostle Paul (see I. Cor. ii. 14, 15). The effect on the character of the brethren of Christ who love Him is truly marvellous; and we hesitate not to say that they are moulded or impressed, stamped, or engraved by Him who "engraves the graving thereof" (Zech. iii. 9). They are now impressed morally through His word; they have yet to be impressed with the exact similitude of the One who has already received the glorious change to the co-substantiality of the Deity. Dr. Thomas, writing on this subject, says, "Now, it matters not whether it be one man to be made 'the Lord from heaven,' or a countless multitude of earthborns to be made the Holy Jerusalem descending from the Deity out of heaven," the operation is the same. "Every individual is subjected to a like polishing, embroidering, and adorning, as saith the Spirit, who will do the work. 'Him that overcometh,' saith he, 'I will make a pillar in the Nave of my Deity, and the name of the City of my Deity, New Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my Deity; and my New Name (Rev. iii. 12). To have the Name of Deity, the Name of the City, and the New Name, engraved or written upon one is for such an one first to come into existence, and then, to become a constituent of the things engraved. He becomes one of the City of the Deity, New Jerusalem; and, in the operation, is married to the Spirit in so close and intimate a union that he becomes one body, flesh, and bones with the Spirit, so that all the earthiness and corruptibility of his grave body is 'swallowed up of life'; it loses its similitude to the nature of the first Adam, and acquires 'the heavenly image' of the 'Lord from heaven'" (Eureka, vol. iii. p. 687).

It may be answered that the Doctor only referred to those who had returned to the dust and been raised from the dead; but this limitation would exclude from the glories of this physical change those who did not sleep; and it is certain that these were not excluded in the Doctor's mind. Resurrection is the factor in the Divine plan of operation employed on those Sons of God who through physical weakness die and return to dust. No one has shown more clearly than Dr. Thomas that all God's faithful Sons, whether dead or alive at Christ's Coming, will receive this glorious phy-

sical change. Another writer, whom I once read, says, "What are we to understand by Christ's 'new name' ? It cannot mean that He has received a new designation, that He is not any longer called Jesus the Christ. The word 'name' in Scripture is often used to indicate all that appertains to a person; his nature, and rank, and all of honour and authority and power that belongs to him. When speaking of the Angels, the Apostle affirms that Christ hath, by inheritance, obtained a more excellent 'name' than they—the meaning cannot be that Christ's nature is superior to that of the Angels—for it is the Divine nature in both cases, which is immortal and incorruptible by whomsoever possessed. The word 'name' in that particular case evidently stands for rank, and the passage finds its significance in the fact that Christ has been exalted far above every name that is named—Angels and authorities and powers being made subject to him. When, however, Christ promises to write upon him that overcometh His 'new name,' the promise is specially a guarantee of a new nature. He promises to give His friends immortality—to cause them to have life in themselves, besides admitting them to a share in all the glory which the Father has given unto Him. Christ's former name is referred to in such places as those where He is declared to have been 'made of a woman'—'of the seed of David according to the flesh.' And His 'new name' comes out in those passages where He is designated 'the first born of every creature' (Col. i. 15); that is—of every immortal creature from Adam's race—or as Paul has it in ver. 18 of the same chapter—'the beginning of the first born from the dead.' The sense in which Christ is 'the beginning' is indicated in His own words recorded in Rev. iii. 14, 'the beginning of the creation of God.'"

In our present condition we do not possess eternal life in ourselves, nor did Christ always have it in Himself. He has it now, and has possessed the same ever since his change to the Father's nature, but we most assuredly shall possess eternal life in ourselves if we pay due regard to the obligations which we are under as Sons of God. This is expressed by the following:—"Be ye therefore followers of God as dear children." "For ye were sometimes darkness, but now are ye light in the

Lord: walk as children of light: for the fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness and righteousness and truth" (Eph. v. 1, 8, 9.)

Yes, brethren, yes, reflect the light now, in your moral relationship, and you will have the glory of reflecting it in and through an immortal, incorruptible body by-and-by. All the expressions and appellations (and they are many and varied) which are used in the Scriptures concerning the saints tend to this glorious physical change for all who render obedience to His commands.

Not the least interesting and beautiful in connection with this physical manifestation of the Sons of God is the disposing of the stones or gems in the breastplate of Aaron, the high priest, and in their arrangement as foundations for the wall of the city. As the ingredients of the holy confection and ointment represent the moral perfection of the saints, so the stones represent the glorious change to Spirit substance. It will be observed that there is a change as to the order of arrangement in these two positions. In the first arrangement (Exod. xxviii.) the first stone is Sardius (*odem*), from the root Adam, he was ruddy; and the last stone is Jasper—a stone of cerulean green, beautiful and bright, with perhaps more varieties than any other. In the second arrangement we have the Jasper stone placed first, and in the fourth chap. of Rev. we have both the Jasper and Sardius "selected by the Spirit to represent the appearance of the man enthroned"; and, says Dr. Thomas, "the reason why two are indicated rather than one is because the King is Spirit and Flesh in combination" (*Eureka*, vol. ii., p. 21).

Do we not thus see that in the wisdom of the Spirit, as indicated by the arrangement of the stones, there were to be children of God who should first have a moral relationship to Him, and then a physical identity by exaltation to the glorious Spirit nature?

"Ye are the building of the Deity." Yes, but how? Not unless ye have been constituted "living stones" (I. Pet. ii. 5). Naturally all men are crude elements, separate, like unconnected stones for building purposes. As such they are neither wall nor temple. First comes selection of the stones, then cutting, carving, and polishing, and building in by the Spirit. Apart from being "constituted the righteousness of the Deity in Christ Jesus" who has

become to us "wisdom and righteousness and sanctification and redemption" there is no cutting, or polishing, no building into the wall of the city.

Many stones were no doubt left in the quarry, untouched in the building of the first temple, many no doubt were cast away as worthless through defects, &c.; while others were perfected and noiselessly fitted into their appointed places.

Great are the quarries, and many stones will break in the operation of cutting and carving and polishing. Some will stand, and, having done all, *still stand* and become one wall, Jasper like, one temple, one building with, and inseparable from, Christ. Let us each strive, brethren, to attain unto this perfection, minding not to sacrifice our reality as brethren in Christ, for any man or anything.

"Come, Thou long-expected Jesus,  
Born to set Thy people free;  
From our fears and sins release us,  
Let us find our rest with Thee.

By Thine own transforming Spirit,  
Make our bodies like Thine own;  
By Thine all-sufficient merit,  
Raise us to Thy glorious throne."

W. W.

New Romney.

P.S.—The subject of the precious stones being of more than passing interest, I hope to deal with it further in my next article.

[Bro. Whitehead wishes us to state that the phrase, "condition of life," which he used in his last article in quoting II. Tim. i. 10, was not intended as a translation, but a paraphrase, and should not have been included in quotation marks. The Greek word, we may remark, may be translated *lifetime* or *way of life*, but the simple meaning is *life*, irrespective of the kind or length of life.—Ed.]

## Reflections.—No. 4.

### ON SPIRITUAL EDUCATION.

"Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit." Christ to the disciples.—John xv. 8.

These words occur in the record of one of Christ's discourses to His disciples. To such, in our day, as lay claim to a similar relationship to Him they are of very encouraging import. A verbal expression of faith is not a sufficient test of fidelity; it is a "patient continuance in well doing" and an endurance of hardships like a good soldier, that prove the strength of our character. Christ's remarks indicate that the design of the Gospel is to lead His brethren and sisters to "delight themselves in the Lord," and to excite them to use their strength, time, and talents in His work.

The opening words of this chapter (John xv.) are a specific declaration.

Christ is "the true vine," the only source of spiritual nourishment, the only "name under Heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." His brethren and sisters are related to Him as branches. God Himself is "the husbandman," or vinedresser, an appellation which implies that He bestows upon the vine and its branches great thought and attention.

The next verse is very significant. When we become Christ's we are united to Him in all our interests; weakness derives strength from the union; imperfection is covered as with a robe of righteousness; a son of Adam or a daughter of Eve finds in Christ a Redeemer and Friend, one who having been "tempted in all points like as we are," is "able to succour those that are tempted." Now

as the vinedresser removes all branches that are dead, or that bear no fruit, so our Heavenly Father will reject such as give not the required evidence that they appreciate their privileges. This may occur in a variety of ways: temptation may prove too strong for one; tribulation may overthrow the faith of another; or the deceitfulness of riches may cause a third to stumble. On the other hand, every branch that "beareth fruit" is purged or pruned so that it may become more fruitful. By removing such obstacles as keep them inactive, by making them feel their dependence upon Him, by exciting their love and desire to render unto God the things that are God's, does He cause their usefulness and their energy to be increasingly devoted to His service.

"As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself except it abide in the vine, no more can ye except ye abide in Me." This, in effect, is parallel to, "If ye love Me, keep My commandments." We are required to follow in the footsteps of our Elder Brother, and constantly exercise faith in Him and in His work, not only as "the sacrifice for sin," but also as "the Lion of the Tribe of Judah." So long as we are united to Him by a living faith we receive strength and nourishment from Him; if, on the other hand, our attachment to Him is not as close as that of branches to the parent stock our spiritual life will lose its strength and we shall eventually be cast away as useless.

The next three verses enforce the same idea. As a severed branch withers and droops, so those who lose their zeal, neglect prayer, forget their dependence on God, and forsake the assembling of themselves together: such will reap nothing but contumely and death.

"Herein is My Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit" By "glorified" we understand honoured, and if by striving after perfection, if by straining every faculty, every nerve, in our endeavour to work out our salvation we thereby glorify or honour God, should not the great things which He has done for us supply the motive power for thus "bearing much fruit?" We know that at best we are "unprofitable servants," having done only what it was "our duty to do." It is our "reasonable service," in view of the mercies of God toward us, that we "present our bodies as a living sacrifice" to Him. Thus it is that we

exhibit the power of the Truth to overcome, and to mortify the desires of the flesh and to produce the "works of the spirit."

"Bearing much fruit" is a work of great labour. It is not an easy task. True it may be made a pleasure, because the closer we keep to the vine the more nourishment we shall receive, and thus obtain that assistance which will lighten our burden—indeed, we shall not consider it a burden. "My yoke is easy, and my burden is light" to those who "learn of me," says Christ (Matt. xi. 29, 30). Nevertheless, the responsibility is ever present, and it is for us to use such means as will enable us to comply with all the requirements of our probation. And since we do not, on first entering the Truth, arrive at the full knowledge and keen appreciation of the Word which we have or should have in after years, diligent attention should be paid to our "spiritual education." We should value "understanding" as a noble faculty, and at all times be engaged in enriching it with a variety of knowledge. We enter the Truth as "babes in Christ," able only to digest the "milk of the word," and not until we are of "full age" can we hope to receive "strong meat"; hence we should use all diligence to acquire and treasure up a large store of divine truths. Let us begin with the most simple and obvious truths, then by degrees join two, as it were, and obtain a logical conclusion: thus shall we be edified and instructed when listening to the exhortation of our brethren, or when reading our daily Bible portions. A teacher has to study, in order that he may impart knowledge to his pupils. We all must study so as to be able to recognise truth from error. "Take care how ye hear," said Christ on one occasion, and on another He added, "Take care what ye hear." Likewise, John, the Apostle, admonished the brethren to "try the spirits (or teachers) whether they be of God." The principle on which we shall receive the glory and immortality of the age to come is laid down by the Apostle Peter (II. Epis. i. 5-7), after enumerating certain comprehensive virtues: "For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall be neither barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Editorial Flyleaf.

We tender our thanks to the many who have renewed their subscriptions for the coming twelve months. There are still a few from whom we hope to hear; if any of them cannot afford the amount we will send them THE SANCTUARY KEEPER free.

*The Coming Nation* (published at Dallas, Texas, U.S.A.) for February—received since the issue of our last number—contains an article in which reference is made to a controversy in that part of the Christadelphian community on the priesthood of Christ. One section contend that "Christ is now actually officiating in the capacity of High Priest," and the other view this as a part of "the wine of orthodoxy." The basis for the latter view is apparently the two facts that Christ is "not called after the order of Aaron" (Heb. vii. 11), and that as "a priest after the order of Melchizedec" (Heb. v. 6) He is to sit "a priest on His throne" (Heb. vii. 2; Zech. vi. 13). The argument runs thus:—Not being now a Melchizedec king, Christ cannot as yet be a Melchizedec priest; He is not an Aaronic priest, therefore He is not a priest at all. If there were no other element in the case this reasoning might have force. But it ignores the fact that Christ, although not a member of the Aaronic priesthood, is the antitype of it. He is the antitype of the Mosaic "temple" (Jno. ii. 21), the "altar" (Heb. xii. 10; Rev. viii. 5), the "veil" (Heb. x. 20), the mercy seat (Rom. iii. 25, "propitiation"), and the "ark" (Rev. xi. 19); and, therefore, He must be the antitype of the priesthood connected with these "patterns of things in the heavens" (Heb. ix. 23). He is a "high priest . . . by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands" (Heb. ix. 11), of which the

Mosaic tabernacle "was a figure" (ver. 9). In this capacity "He entered in once into the holy place" (ver. 12) even "heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us" (ver. 24). The force of these testimonies cannot be resisted, and we must express surprise and regret that any should deny them. It would be contrary to the Divine order of things for Christ's brethren to be a "holy priesthood" (I. Pet. ii. 5), without having a high priest; and no one can fill this position but their Elder Brother. To deny this is to deprive themselves of a Mediator essential to their salvation. Christ's relationship to the Aaronic and Melchizedec priesthoods is not the same; He could not be a member of the Aaronic order, but He can be, and is, its antitype. The Melchizedec order will have no antitype; Christ has become a member of it, but, as yet, has only entered upon a part of its functions; the full exercise of its privileges is, of course, reserved for the age to come. There is a very good article bearing on this subject, entitled "Aaron and Christ," by Dr. Thomas, in the *Herald of the Kingdom* for 1855 (page 49), reproduced in *The Christadelphian* for 1873 (page 490).

*The Christadelphian* continues to deny that a believer is justified from Adamic sin by baptism into Christ. In the March number the Editor ridicules it in the following manner:—

"Whoever heard of 'Repent and be baptised for the remission of Adamic sin'? 'Through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of Adam's sin'? 'Forgotten that he was purged from his Adamic sin'? 'Hath washed us from Adamic sin'? Nay, nay: this is the old theological smoke. Come out into the clear air. Adam's mortal nature we

have, but the sins that want forgiving are our own" (page 110).

This completely nullifies the statements from the same writer in *The Christadelphian* for January and December, to which we called attention in our last number (page 76). It is self-stultifying to contend that Christ needed sacrifice for Himself by reason of "ancestral sin" or "inherited condemnation," and to deny that His brethren need sacrifice for the same; and logical minds will not be slow to see the contradictory position. If there was in Christ something requiring sacrificial purification there is the same in His brethren; and if there be nothing of the kind in them there was nothing in Christ. The testimonies which prove that Christ's nature needed at-one-ment proved the need of at-one-ment for the nature of any other of Adam's descendants. The death of the Cross was the means of cleansing Christ's body, and therefore the "bodies" of those who are baptised into that death are then in the sight of God "washed" (Heb. x. 22) from the defilement of inherited sin. Between the literal death of Christ and the symbolic death of his brethren there must be a parallel; on this point the Editor of *The Christadelphian* makes the following statements:—

"They (the brethren of Christ) become identified with the sin-offering stage in being baptised into the death of Christ" (Jan., 1897, p. 8). "He (the believer) becomes identified with the burnt-offering, 'sweet savour' stage, when he rises from baptism to present his body a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God through Christ" (Jan., 1897, p. 8.)

It is but necessary to apply the truth here set forth to the admitted facts concerning Christ, to prove that baptism into Him justifies the believer from Adam's sin. The "sweet savour" attending a believer "when he rises from baptism" is incompatible with condemnation for inherited sin, and a "body" which is then accounted "holy" cannot

at the same time be reckoned unclean. It is marvellous that this simple conclusion should be so strenuously opposed by those who professed to have the whole of Bible truth.

Writing in *The Christadelphian* for March the Editor says:—

"There is no reason why justified men should die if the time had come to glorify them. 'God hath appointed a day' for this as for all His works; but until that time arrive, believers must die as other men, because they are still physically associated with the first Adam: whose sentence they inherit by physical derivation, as Paul phrases it, 'the body is dead because of sin'—Rom. viii. 10" (page 109).

The statement that "justified men" need not necessarily die is the reverse of what was taught in the same magazine at a comparatively recent date. When it was said that Adam's sin was not atoned for by baptism, but had to be "paid for by literal death" (1893, page 301), an abode in the grave by Christ's brethren was, in effect, held to be a necessity. If the death of "justified men" be not a necessity there is nothing to "be paid for by (their) literal death." Moreover, if "there is no reason why justified men should die," it necessarily follows that those who have died must rise by virtue of their justification—a truth for which we have been contending for the last four or five years.

The phrase, "The body is dead because of sin," in Rom. viii. 10, is a favourite quotation with the Editor of *The Christadelphian* and some other brethren, to prove that inherited sin is not the subject of a justification at baptism. This use of the phrase is an illustration of Scriptural perversion through ignoring the context. The whole verse reads, "And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the spirit is life because of righteousness." The verse, it will be observed, begins with an "If"; and the subsequent statement about

the body is dependent upon this "If." Take away the phrase beginning with "If," or put it in a negative form, and the condition of body here described has no existence. Thus, "If Christ be not in you, the body is not dead because of sin." Deadness of body is due to a connection with Adam, not Christ. Hence it is obvious that the Apostle is not writing about the physical aspect of the body, but about some other aspect. To ascertain what this is we must go a little deeper. And in so doing let us ask ourselves the question, What kind of deadness arises from Christ dwelling in a man? Is it not a deadness to sin? This is expressed in the sentences, "Crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts" (Gal. v. 24) and "Mortify (or make dead) your members" (Col. iii. 5). On the basis of this Scriptural truth a suggestion arises, Does not the translation of Rom. viii. 10 need improving? The word "because" gives it the present anomalous complexion. The Greek word which it represents is of varied meaning and use. Its primary sense is undoubtedly *through* or *because*; but when the context will not admit of the primary meaning, a secondary one must be looked for. In this case it is found in the word "concerning," which is given as one meaning in Professor E. A. Sophocles's "Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Period, B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100," 1893 edition. Substitute *concerning* for "because" and the verse becomes quite clear:—"If Christ be in you, the body is dead [concerning sin; but the spirit (or mind) is life concerning righteousness." As thus amended, the sentence can be reversed without any incongruity:—"If Christ be not in you, the body is not dead concerning sin; and the spirit is not life concerning righteousness." That is to say, when Christ is supreme in a saint, the affections and lusts of the body are dead, and the new man is in a state of healthy spiritual life; when Christ is not supreme these results do not ensue.

In answering the question, "Who was the tempter that came to Christ in the wilderness?" the Editor of *The Fraternal Visitor*, without taking up positive ground, says, "The view we favour is that the account of the temptation is a narrative in dramatic form, representing the conflict in the mind of Christ himself." Very good; if Bro. J. J. Hadley only adheres to this, and reasons consistently, he will have to accept some things which he now condemns. If the temptation in the wilderness was a mental conflict (of which we are convinced), "the tempter" must have been in Christ's mind. This "tempter" is styled "the devil;" there was, therefore, something called "the devil" in the mind of Christ. It is written (Heb. ii. 14), that the destruction of "the devil" required the death of Christ: *that* death was sacrificial; therefore a sacrificial death was necessary to destroy "the devil." Christ had in Him that which is called "the devil;" therefore His own sacrificial death was necessary to destroy "the devil" in Himself. Again, a sacrificial death is only required where there is sin in some form; the destruction of "the devil" required a sacrificial death; therefore, "the devil" in Christ was one form of sin—"sin in the flesh." Furthermore, a sacrificial death and an atoning sacrifice are synonymous; their effect is an at-one-ment, or reconciliation. Christ had in Him that which required a sacrificial death: therefore, by His death an at-one-ment was effected for Himself—not for anything He had done, but for what He had inherited. In this reasoning we can see no flaw. If Bro. Hadley can see any by all means let him point it out. If he cannot, we trust that he will frankly admit that which follows from the premises he favours.

The anxiety in political circles, to which we referred in our last number, in respect to the Cretan difficulty, has not lessened but increased. The six great Powers of Europe have been unable to

prevent war between Turkey and Greece; their action—whatever their intentions—has, indeed, helped to bring it about. In attempting to coerce Greece they did not fully estimate the force of the national feeling; they had to deal not merely with a Government, but with an enthusiastic people. And now that Turkey—through their practical encouragement—has proved victorious, they are faced with another difficulty. "The Concert of Europe"—as one newspaper remarks—"has raised the Devil and it has now to lay him." The attitude of the Sultan is well expressed by the words, "Who says 'Sick Man' now?" Whatever be the immediate consequences of the embroglio, one thing is certain; the success of Turkey will not be a permanent benefit to the political Euphrates. It may, indeed, expedite the

drying-up process. And the defeat of Greece may bring her under the control of Russia. This is a necessity for the latter-day construction of the Metallic Imago. The modern representatives of the four great empires of Daniel's prophecy must stand up as *one man* before the little Stone can smite the Image on its feet and grind its component parts into powder. Persia is already, to a considerable extent, under the influence of Russia, and it is necessary for Greece to be placed in a position of complete dependence on the successor to the golden Head. If the Greco-Turk War does nothing more than prepare the way for this it will prove an important link in the chain of events by which the kingdoms of this world are to become Christ's kingdom.

## The Image of God.

In writing about the God of their salvation the sons of God are, of necessity, obliged to confine their remarks within very narrow limits. Brethren accustomed to think for themselves upon the grand truths of the word of God know well the greatness, the awfulness, and the grandeur that surrounds and pervades the subject of God. It is when they begin to tread with shoeless feet the holy ground that they realise their own unholiness and their ignorance of their Heavenly Father—they are conscious of much they cannot understand, so meagre is their knowledge.

Now, so far as we know, man is the only mortal creature created to know the Creator, and for this reason and purpose he was made in the image of his Creator. This is true with respect not only to outward shape, but also to the rational thinking powers with which man is endowed. The thinking powers of man are the same as those of his Creator, only in a very much smaller capacity; hence man is able to understand God's revealed thoughts, and God man's thoughts. Isaiah records God's

willingness to *reason* with man, "Come, now, let us reason together, saith the Lord" (Is. i. 18), and Samuel, through the Spirit, reasoned with the people about the righteous acts which the Lord had done for them and their fathers (1. Sam. xii. 7), so that intellectually, as well as morphologically, man bears the impressed image of his Maker.

Adam possessed reasoning powers before he came to know the difference between good and evil, for he held communion with God as a man holds communion with His friend. There was a union of minds, an exchange of thoughts between man and God. Man was then "upright" (Eccles. vii. 29), the *beau ideal* of godliness, innocence, and purity—a representative and reflection of the glory of God. The Spirit seems to attach significant importance to the fact that man is made in the image of God (see Gen. ix. 6), Acts xvii. 28-9 *x.v.* and marg.; 1. Cor. xi. 7; Jas. iii. 9). So long as man preserved himself in his uprightness, the image was perfect. The introduction, however, of a new element—lust and sin—defaced

the image and rendered it unfit for the presence of the Most High. The heart of man then became deceitful and desperately wicked; the reasoning powers were corrupted and turned into channels contrary to their original tendency, and from that day to this the world has been lying in wickedness—a black spot upon God's handiwork. It was not the intention of God, however, to let the image remain in its mutilated state; He purposed to restore it to its former perfection that it might stand once more in His presence.

The first step towards this end was the formation of a new image—a new man; a man who should not only manifest all the perfect characteristics of the first image, but go beyond them in manifesting righteousness not visible in the first. The new image is the second Adam declared by the Spirit through Paul to be the "image of the invisible God" (Col. i. 15). It is necessary to a good understanding of the truth embodied in this article to confine the thoughts to Christ in His divine capacity. The character and mission of Jesus Christ has many sides, and each may be admired individually without doing injustice to the whole. Christ was the image of the invisible God in that which was deficient in the defaced image, viz., character. The character of Christ is the character of God. By a universal rule in creation, children bear the perfections or imperfections of their parents. Jesus was the begotten Son of God, and for this reason we expect him to manifest the character of His Father. Our Saviour's own words are, "I came out from God; I came forth from the Father" (Jno. xvi. 27, 28); "I am in the Father, and the Father (is) in me" (Jno. xiv. 10). We are subsequently told that "in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead, bodily" (Col. ii. 9); that He was (and is) "the brightness—or reflection—of His glory and the express image of His person" (Heb. i. 3). With these testimonies before us we can understand that one of the first objects of the mission of Christ was to reveal the character of the Father. The Father's character was manifested through the medium of the character of the Son. After He had faithfully performed this office He could say with truth, "I have manifested Thy name unto the men which Thou gavest me out of the world." "I have declared

unto them Thy name, and will declare it" (Jno. xvii. 6, 26; Ps. xxii. 22). It is evident from these last quotations that the image of the invisible God is seen only by the few. "He that hath My commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth Me; and he that loveth Me shall be loved of My Father, and I will love him and will manifest Myself unto Him" (Jno. xiv. 21). So said the anointed Jesus. The words called forth a question from Judas (not Iscariot), "Lord, how is it that Thou wilt manifest Thyself to us and not unto the world?" Jesus then replied that the sight of the manifestation of the Deity was only for a privileged few. It is only a few who have the eyes to see God in manifestation. Many said they saw when they did not; they were, therefore, allowed to remain in their blindness: others who were blind and confessed their blindness were made to see (Jno. ix. 39, 40). On behalf of this class the Apostle John writes, "And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us (and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father) full of grace and truth" (Jno. i. 14). The "glory" that they saw in Christ was the glory of the Father. In gazing upon Christ they gazed upon God. The disciple, Philip, was anxious to see the Father of Jesus; if only Jesus would show him the Father he would be satisfied. Jesus, in answer, said to him, "Have I been so long time with you and yet hast thou not known Me, Philip? He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father" (Jno. xiv. 8, 9). Sometime previous to this Jesus had cried openly, "He that believeth on Me believeth not on Me but on Him that sent Me, and he that seeth Me seeth Him that sent Me" (Jno. xii. 44, 45). But this wonderful sight is vouchsafed only to those who have "clean hands and a pure heart." "If our Gospel be hid it is hid to them who are lost in whom the God of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not lest the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ, who is the image of God should shine unto them" (II. Cor. iv. 3, 4). "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God" (Matt. v. 8)—(first in reflection, afterwards in substance); but "He that doeth evil hath not seen God" (in reflection, neither can he) (Jno. iii. 3). The Father is made visible by the Son, because the Father

dwells in the Son and the Son in the Father (Jno. xiv. 10), and no man can know the Father except he know the Son first; for it is given to the Son, by the Father, to reveal Him unto those who come to the Son (Matt. xi. 27).

Such is, in brief, a general outline of the character of the new image. Its purpose was, as before stated, to restore the perfection of the defaced image. The method of doing this is hinted at in II. Cor. iv. 3, 4; see above. It is by transmitting and fixing its radiance upon the heart of man. Before this can be done, however, the person operated upon must regard the Son of God with the eye of an enlightened intelligence: he must open the windows of his inward vision; and, while gazing upon the Image of God, allow the glory of the Father to enter and permeate his own being. The effect of such an action is that the receiver of the glory becomes a mirror reflecting the glory of the invisible God. A great change has taken place; a "new heart" has been created within the person, a heart of the same nature as that of Jesus. This "new heart," or the "new man," "cannot sin" (I. Jno. iii. 9) because it is of God. It is in perpetual antagonism with the old heart which is nothing but evil.

An instance of the visible reflection of Divine glory by a mortal man is seen in the case of Moses, who, after a period of forty days in the immediate presence of the Most High, went out from that presence, bearing upon his countenance an impression of the glory of God. His face shone so that the people could not steadfastly look upon it. The incident is a good one to illustrate the way in which the brethren of Christ do and will reflect the glory of God. The purpose of the Father is that they might "be conformed to the image of His Son" (Rom. viii. 29). The Son is, therefore, made to shine upon them. "God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness hath shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (II. Cor. iv. 4, 6). "And so we all with open face, beholding as in a glass, the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory" (II. Cor. iii. 18).

All this takes place in the present life, but is the image now complete? We cannot say with truth that it is. The change in the present is only one of

heart or character. Before the restoration is complete the cause of the evil character must be actually removed. This means eternal death to the lusts of the flesh. These, of course are crucified by all true brethren at the moment they come to a knowledge of the truth and behold the glory of God through Jesus Christ, and, in virtue of this, they are reckoned as dead to them by God (Rom. vi. 11.) But the day is coming when the lusts will be substantially dead. Kept in subjection by the faithful during probation their faithfulness will be ultimately rewarded by having every evil desire banished from their being. That change which has already taken place in shadow will be confirmed in the substance. Called unto glory and virtue there is given them "exceeding great and precious promises that by these they might be partakers of the Divine nature (after), having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust" (II. Peter i. 4). On the strength of these promises their "conversation" or citizenship has been "in heaven from whence" they "look for the Saviour, who will change" their "vile bodies" that they may be "fashioned like unto His glorious body" (Phil. iii. 20, 21). This is to possess the likeness of God in the highest degree, and involves not only the complete restoration of the disfigured image but the further glorification of it. This being the hope held out to all the household they will not, as a consequence, be satisfied with anything short of it. It is the "righteousness" for which they "hunger and thirst" (Matt. v. 6). As the change in the heart is produced by the inward vision affectionately contemplating the revealed glory of the Father through the Son, so the change in the person is effected by a rapturous gaze upon the visible glory of the glorified Son of God. It is when the sons of God see their God that they are made like Him; for to see Him acceptably, to behold His face in righteousness, is to be changed into His image (I. John iii. 2). Happy are they who shall realise this blessed change.

Dear brethren and sisters, this is the end of your hope; do not be moved away from that hope, but love it more and more. You belong to Christ; therefore "glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are God's" (I. Cor. vi. 20).

T. J. CARLOW.

Cowden, Kent.

## Things Hard to be Understood.

### 52.—ALL IN ADAM; ALL IN CHRIST.

1. Cor. 15-22. "As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." What does this verse mean?

It is parallel to the preceding verse:—"Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead." By Adam "came death," therefore all who remain in him must die. By Christ "came the resurrection of the dead"; therefore all who enter Him and die, must be raised from the dead. The two *alls* are not the same, but distinct; there are the "all" who never pass out of Adam, and the "all" who, after entering the Name of Christ, "fall asleep in Him." The word rendered "made alive" is the same as that which, in other parts of the New Testament, is rendered "quicken." It is used both literally and figuratively—to describe the passing from death to life at baptism, the raising of the dead, and also the immortalization of the righteous. It means the giving of life in some sense or other, but the kind of life must be determined by the context. In this case it is defined by "the resurrection of the dead" which "came" by the "Man" Christ Jesus.

### 53.—JUDGMENT AFTER DEATH.

Heb. 9-27. "As it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment." What is the meaning of this verse?

It does not apply to all men; if it did, all men would be raised to judgment. The inspired writer is speaking about things Mosaic, and therefore we must look to the law of Moses for a solution. A parallel is drawn between a certain class of men and Christ. The nature of the parallel defines who the men are. As in their case judgment follows death, "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for Him shall He appear the second time without sin unto salvation." The expression "once offered" is parallel to death in the case of the "men," and the phrase "appear . . . unto salvation," is parallel to the "judgment" to which they are related. The offering of Christ was a sacrificial and priestly act, and

therefore we must look for something analogous to this event in the Mosaic ceremonies. And as the verse under consideration is part of an argument, we must examine the context. The 24th and 25th verses teach us that Christ in entering "into heaven" "to appear in the presence of God for us," fulfilled the anti-type of the High Priest entering "the holy places made with hands"—that is, in the Mosaic tabernacle. In both type and antitype the offering of sacrifice was a necessary preliminary—in the type it was "often," or "every year," but in the antitype "once" only. It is in connection with this annual ceremony, in the type, that the death and judgment take place. It is worthy of note that the word "men" should read "the men." This shows that reference is being made to a specific class of men; and as the only men mentioned in the context are the Aaronic high priests, they are "the men" "appointed to die." How was this effected? Not literally, but symbolically. In passing, on the annual day of atonement, from the holy place to the most holy, they went beyond "the veil," which represented Christ's "flesh" (Heb. x. 20). The most holy and its contents symbolised the spirit nature, or eternal life; it was illuminated solely by the Spirit of God, styled by the Jews "the Shekinah Glory." When, therefore, the high priest went "alone, once every year," with the blood of animals, "which he offered for himself and for the errors of the people" (Heb. ix. 7), he passed in symbol from flesh and blood life to spirit life, and thus symbolically died. "After this" followed "the judgment." Of whom? The nation of Israel. How? In the acceptance or rejection of the blood carried by the high priest into the most holy place. If accepted, the sins for which they had offered sacrifice during the previous year were blotted out, as far as possible, by means of shadow-offerings. If rejected, they knew that the punishment due for those sins would be inflicted. The result of the blood-offering was communicated to the people when the high

priest came forth from "the holy places." In like manner, Christ, when he comes forth from the antitypical most holy, will communicate to His brethren the result of his priestly intercession, as to whether their sins are forgiven or not. The literal death of the animal offered for the annual atonement, and the symbolic death of the high priest "once every year," prefigured the sacrificial death of Christ, and a "judgment" follows in both cases (Heb. ix. 7, 27).

Writing on this subject in *Anastasis*, Dr. Thomas says:—"In this (the Mosaic 'parable') the Deity shows that, while the High Priest, or Advocate, is in the most holy place, the people are without, engaged in confession and prayer, waiting and looking for the appearing. They knew not whether their confession of sins and supplication for forgiveness were favourably responded to or not, until the advocate came forth to bless them in the appointed form (Num. vi. 23). Upon the pronouncement of the benediction, which was the judgment in the case, they were relieved of all anxiety, and were now prepared to rejoice before Jehovah in the ensuing feast of tabernacles. Thus, "As it was appointed for the men (or Aaronic High Priests) once to die (symbolically, in entering through the Veil with sacrificial blood) but after this, judgment (in coming forth to bless): so the Christ, who was once led forth to bear the sins of many, shall appear unto them who are looking for Him a second time without sin unto salvation.—Heb. ix., 27, 28." (Page 28.)

It is obvious that the expression, "them who are looking for Him," must be understood Scripturally; it refers to those who have, by entering the bond of the covenant, embraced the "one hope." The Aaronic high priest appeared for judgment to those only who were in the Mosaic covenant, and in like manner Christ, the antitypical high priest, "appears" only to those who have entered the Abrahamic covenant. He has no message arising out of His priestly office for those outside the covenant and therefore does not "appear" to them.

#### 54.—A SON OF ADAM DEFINED.

*What is a son of Adam? Does the mere possession of flesh and blood constitute the possessor a child of Adam?*

A son of Adam is a descendant of Adam. It is written that "when the

Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when He separated the sons of Adam, He set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel" (Dent. xxxii. 8). The expression "sons of Adam" is here used as synonymous with "nations" and "people"; therefore the nations and peoples of the earth are composed of sons of Adam. The phrase, "possession of flesh and blood," is not a sufficient definition. There might be beings "of flesh and blood" not descended from Adam. Indeed quadrupeds possess flesh and blood. The possession of human flesh and blood, from the birth of Cain onwards, does certainly "constitute the possessor a child of Adam." Perhaps the simplest definition of a son of Adam is, One born of woman. This is the obvious purport of the expression "all men" in Rom. v. 12, where "men" is used in a racial sense without regard to sex or age. The term "all men" is synonymous with the "many" of ver. 15 who are accounted "dead," with the "all men" of ver. 18, who are under "condemnation," and with the "many" of ver. 19, who have been "made sinners." Descent from Adam is the basis on which the condemnation to death has been passed for his "offence."

#### 55.—JESUS IN ADAM.

*Was Jesus ever in Adam? If so, when did He get out of Adam into Himself?*

Jesus was in Adam when he was born; for his genealogy is traced through "Heli," the father of Mary, to Adam (Luke iii. 23, 38). The appellations, "Son of David" and "Son of Abraham," are evidence of His being a Son of Adam; and is not also the oft-applied name, "Son of Man"? Jesus Christ was taken out of Adam, in the first stage, when he was circumcised; in the second stage when He was baptised by John; and in the final stage when He was immortalised. Circumcision justified Him, provisionally, from condemnation in Adam for life in a corruptible nature in the land of Canaan; baptism justified Him, provisionally, for life in an incorruptible nature; His sacrificial death justified Him permanently; and the change from mortality to immortality followed as a consequence. He did not at His baptism enter into Himself, but He entered the Name of the Lord; and when He had fulfilled the righteousness of that Name by "the death of the

Cross," "the Name" was "given" to Him (Phil. ii. 8, 9). He became, in fact, the first personal embodiment of the Name of the Lord.

#### 56.—A CHILD OF THE DEVIL.

*If Jesus was a Son of Adam, was He not then a child of the devil?*

Yes, in regard to descent, or nature, but *not character*. To be under "the power of death" is, in one sense, to be a child of the devil, because the devil has the power of death. Circumcision freed Jesus from this power in a shadow sense, and resurrection—the result of blood-shedding—freed him in a substantial sense. If there had been nothing in His nature called "devil" He could

not have destroyed it by His death (Heb. ii. 14).

#### 57.—BORN OF A VIRGIN.

*For what reason did God require that Jesus should be born of a pure virgin?*

To show that His existence was due to God, not to man. This was one item in the process of providing "the arm of the Lord" (Isa. liii. 1) for the salvation of man. "Beside Me there is no Saviour," says Jehovah (Isa. xliii. 11). God is the only Saviour in the sense of providing One by whom salvation can be obtained. All that man has done, or can do, is to conform to the plan which God has laid down.

## Our Letter Box.

#### THE NEW CREATION.

N. thinks that the expressions "bestowal of life" and "obtain" life in our article on the above subject (Sept., 1896; p. 26) are calculated to convey a wrong impression. If disconnected from their context they may; but in conjunction with explicit statements before and after, there should be no misunderstanding. "The New Creation" in its present phase is described as a "changed position," and those who are made "new creatures" in Christ as "commencing their probation"; the life pertaining to it is defined to be a matter of "heirship," "in the keeping of Christ," to be retained by living "righteously," and to "be taken away as the result of unworthiness."

The words "bestow" and "obtain" may be used in two senses—one as a matter of title or right, and the other as a matter of actual possession or enjoyment. The eldest son of a Peer obtains a right to the family title and estate as soon as his father dies, but he does not enter upon their inalienable possession until he has fulfilled the requirements of the law.

The word "saved" is used in the New Testament in both a present and a future sense. The following are illustrations:—

Present sense:—"Who hath saved us" (II. Tim. i. 9); "According to His

mercy He saved us" (Tit. iii. 5); "Baptism doth also now save us" (I. Pet. iii. 21).

Future sense:—"He Himself shall be saved" (I. Cor. iii. 15); "We shall be saved by His life" (Rom. v. 10); "That the spirit may be saved" (I. Cor. v. 6).

To be "saved" now is to be justified from sins as children of Adam, and so freed from the power of "the law of sin and death"; to be "saved" in the future is to be made immortal as the result of salvation at baptism, and forgiveness of sins subsequently. Salvation has thus two clearly defined stages, the second of which cannot be attained without the first; and only a portion of those who pass the first reach the second. The New Creation is precisely the same; it begins *now* with a new relationship to God, Christ, the Spirit, Life, and the Kingdom, and it is consummated, after approval at the judgment-seat, by the bestowal of a new or incorruptible body. Disapproval will be due to the New Creation having been marred, in the case of individual members, by disobedience; and these will never attain to the second, or highest, stage of the New Creation.

#### JUSTIFICATION.

O. (Bro. J. T. Browning, of Kansas City), who dissents from us on the

Responsibility question, expresses surprise that true Justification is so little understood, and makes the following remarks:—

"If a man is righteous, and will never die, he does not need salvation, but Christ did not come to call that class. A man appearing in court for trial wants remission or clearance from every charge. Justification is the just decision of the judge. The man is already condemned to death before he appears in court. But he has incurred a new penalty by personal disobedience. He cannot satisfy the penalty without dying, and he must not live without obedience. A sinner, in the prime of life, wanting life, and wanting perfect obedience, but already condemned to death, can only be justified in the death of another, and in the perfect obedience of another; for the obedience is as necessary as the death; death comes through disobedience and life must come through obedience. The man has nothing within himself to justify him but his belief, and that belief is from God. He must, therefore, borrow from Him in whom he believes the necessary obedience and the death, and God counts it or reckons it to him. The lamb, the shed blood, the death, and the smoke of its consuming ascend to God as the expression of the man's faith, and God accepts the offering. In the Roberts-Williams correspondence I was astounded to see Bro. R. speak lightly of the 'merits of our Blessed Redeemer'—One upon whom our salvation depends, and who is clothed with Omnipotent power. One who, by His perfect obedience unto death, has become the *Tried Stone*—the *tested foundation rock* upon whom is built man's salvation. He cried, 'It is finished;' and the death-blood that flowed from His side bore record. Into His death and His perfected obedient work I am baptised. Into His resurrection and into His glorification I am carried up to the throne in the person of Christ by the same faith, the same baptism, and the same justification. 'For whom He called them He also justified, and whom He justified them He also glorified.' His merit is all sufficient.

"But being, through the grace of God, and the love of Christ, baptised into His merits, I must not continue in sin that grace may abound; by the same faith I must press upward, for am I not baptised into obedience? Yes, and His

love constrains to its perfection in me. And my advocate is at the throne for necessary continual remission in the life of faith, till faith and hope are crowned with actuality."

If the foregoing definition of Justification through Christ had been understood by the brotherhood as a whole the Responsibility question would not have led to the friction and division of the last three years.

#### THE CREATION WEEK—ITS DURATION.

P., writing on Adam and Eve before they sinned, expresses the belief that the first seven days—the Creation week—were 7,000 years long. If that were so they would not be a type of the subsequent 7,000 years, but a parallel. Adam being "a figure" (Rom. v. 14), it is but reasonable to conclude that the Creation of which he formed a part, was also a figure, of things then future. One of these was the "seventh day," which God "blessed" and "sanctified" (Gen. ii. 3). If this day was a thousand years long it could not have preceded the disobedience of Adam and Eve. For they were both created on the "sixth day" (Gen. i. 27, 31), and Adam only lived 930 years (Gen. v. 5). When 130 years old, Seth was born (ver. 3), but this was after Cain and Abel had grown to manhood and Abel had been slain. The number of years that elapsed between the slaying of Abel and the birth of Seth we know not. But, obviously Adam could not have lived long when he was expelled from Eden. If the day of his creation was 1,000 years long he must have sinned and been condemned before that day came to an end; and in that case there was no seventh day of holiness, or freedom from sin. To represent Adam as created on a sixth day of 1,000 years, and as sinning after a seventh day of 1,000 years, would involve a life of 1,200 to 2,000 years in Eden—which is an impossibility, in the recorded circumstances. The only day permissible is one of twenty-four hours; it is so defined in the reason assigned for incorporating the Sabbath into the law of Moses: "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it" (Exod. xx. 11.) The day which God blessed was the day on which He rested, and the day He rested was the same length as the six days occupied in the Creation.

## ADAM AND CHRIST; WHAT THEY BRING.

Q. (Bro. James Brown, of Cupar Fife), writing to endorse Scriptural teaching on condemnation in Adam and justification in Christ, says:—

"There was a lack of firmness and a want of clearness on the true position of the brethren in their relationship to Adam and to Christ. I am thoroughly convinced that this controversy will be the means of bringing many to look more at the doctrines connected with the Name than Prophecy and History. And as all things work for good, such might be the case with this controversy. I have been over twenty-five years in the Truth, and have great love for Bro. Roberts for the work he has done for the Truth, but I am thoroughly convinced that he is in error. I could never see

any other way than that taught by Bro. Andrew; I taught and spoke in accordance with it twenty years ago. Anyone can see that the quotations made by Bro. Roberts, both from the law of Moses and the New Testament are not in harmony with true teaching; he uses passages which have no connection with the doctrines for which they are quoted. I agree entirely with those who believe that there is no resurrection out of Christ. Death is in Adam, life is in Christ. Paul's letter to the Ephesians distinctly shows that the sons of Adam must change their relationship by coming out of their Adamic state into Christ. The Doctor teaches such in *Elpis Israel*; it is one of the first principles of the doctrine of Christ."

## Sips from "The Brook in the Way."

## THE ALTAR AS A SANCTIFIER.

Matt. xxiii. 17 and 19.—"Ye fools and blind, for whether is greater, the gold, or the temple that sanctifieth the gold?"

"The gift or the altar that sanctifieth the gift?"

Is it possible for spiritual Israel to be guilty of foolishness such as this? Let us consider. Gold is a symbol of faith; it was a metal much used in the beautifying of the Temple. The Temple represented Christ's body (John ii. 21). From this we learn that our faith in God is made valuable or sanctified by the believer being incorporated into the "One Body" or Temple (I. Cor. xii. 12, 13).

This can only be done by baptism into the death of Christ (Rom. vi. 3); "by which offering we are sanctified" (Heb. x. 10). And yet we find some in the household describing this doctrine as a new idea when it is applied to Abraham and his justification (see "Resurrection to Condemnation," page 10).

Again, the gift required of a brother or sister, by God, is faithful service or good works (Rom. xii. 1). But unless this gift is laid upon the Altar, viz., Christ (Heb. xiii. 10) it is un sanctified, and therefore useless (Gal. ii. 20). And yet there are to be found those who contend that freedom from Adamic condem-

nation is to be obtained by good works (*Christadelphian*, Feb., 1894, page 71).

Let us remember, brethren, that when we have done all these things we are "unprofitable servants," and that our strongest faith, or most zealous works, are incomplete without the sacrifice of Christ; and let us ever be found glorying in the Lord.

T. E. B.

## DIVINE INSPIRATION DEFINED.

Heb. i. 1, in conjunction with II. Peter i. 21, and I. Tim. iii. 16, provides a definition of Divine inspiration. The statement of Peter that "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit" is synonymous with the opening verse of Hebrews: "God . . . spake . . . by the prophets." The word *spake* is not confined to vocal utterances; it comprises writing. When the prophets *wrote* under the moving power of the Holy Spirit, God was *speaking* through them. Consequently the "All Scripture," which has been "given by inspiration of God," is God speaking through holy men. Whatever God speaks must partake of His character. The mode of speaking—whether by an audible voice or through human beings—cannot deprive God's utterances of their Divine qualities

"God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all" (I. Jno. i. 5). Therefore His speech must be "light," or wholly true, and free from "darkness," or error. To attribute error to Divinely inspired writings is either to deny that they are God-spoken, or to teach that Divine utterances combine "darkness" with "light." It is a serious thing for sons of God thus to treat that which their Father has given for their enlightenment.

J. J. A.

#### THE WRITTEN WORD.

The Word of God stands forth without its like; it presents attractions quite unequalled; it offers to men of all times, all places, and all conditions, beauties ever fresh; a charm that never grows old, that always satisfies, never palls. With it, what we find with respect to human books is reversed; for it pleases and fascinates, extends and rises in your regard the more assiduously you read it. It seems as if the book, the more it is studied and studied over again, grows and enlarges itself, and that some kind unseen being comes daily to stitch in some fresh leaves. And thus it is that the souls, alike of the learned and of the simple, who have long nourished themselves on it, keep hanging upon it as the people hung of old on the lips of Jesus Christ. They all think it incomparable; now powerful as the sound of mighty waters; now soft and gentle, like the voice of the spouse to her bridegroom; but always perfect, "always restoring the soul, and making wise the simple."

—GAUSSEN.

#### FLESH AND SPIRIT ANTAGONISTIC.

Gal. v. 17.—The expression "that ye cannot do the things that ye would," is quoted as an excuse for wrong-doing; but this is not in harmony with the context. The previous verse says, "Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh." Then comes the reminder that "the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other." These words describe a conflict, and the command shows which combatant should be the victor. It would obviously be very inconsistent to follow this command with a statement that believers could not overcome the

flesh; it would be equivalent to commanding them to do that which they were told was impossible. This the Apostle does not do, as shown by the Revised Version:—"That ye may not do the things that ye would." The Spirit and the flesh are truly contrary to each other; but the Wisdom of the Spirit has been revealed to enable the children of wisdom to overcome the flesh.—J. J. A.

#### THE INSCRIPTION ON THE CROSS.

The inscription placed upon the cross by Pilate is recorded by all the four evangelists, and by each of them in a different form. Matthew puts it (xxvii. 37), "This is Jesus, the King of the Jews"; Mark (xv. 26), "The King of the Jews"; Luke (xxiii. 38), "This is the King of the Jews"; John (xix. 19), "Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews." The question is often asked, "Whence this difference?"

The difference in these statements has often been urged against the evangelists as an inconsistency. But it is far otherwise; each statement is in harmony with truth and fact. It is to be accounted for from the fact that the inscription was in three different languages—in Hebrew, that it might be read and understood by the Jews; in Greek, for the strangers in Jerusalem at the time of the great feast, who generally spoke Greek; and in Latin, as the language of the court by which Jesus was condemned; and the evangelists give it to us as they read it in the different languages.

Matthew, formerly an officer of the Roman Government, and, therefore, familiar with Latin, plainly gives us the translation of the inscription in Latin—"Hic est Jesus, rex Judaeorum"—"This is Jesus, the King of the Jews." Mark, who wrote especially for Gentile Christians, translates also the Latin inscription, putting it briefly, as comprehending the whole, "The King of the Jews." Luke was familiar with the Greek language, and it was natural that he should translate the Greek form of the inscription, "This is the King of the Jews." John, a Hebrew by birth, gives us the inscription in Hebrew, his mother-tongue—"Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews."—*Selected.*

## Within the Holy Place.

### BRISTOL.

The communication from this place in our last number led to an announcement in *The Christadelphian* for April that some of the brethren named had been withdrawn from the Ecclesia. On making inquiry from both sides we find that, as regards Bro. and Sis. Palmer, they had previously sent in their resignation on the ground that the Ecclesia had endorsed what they deemed to be unscriptural action. Their resignation was dated March 11th 1894, and the Ecclesial withdrawal—a work of supererogation—took place March 14th. Their attitude, they inform us, was one with which some others, who had not formally resigned, were in sympathy.

Bro. Palmer reports that on the 21st March Hilda Wharton, daughter of Sis. Wharton, was added to their number by immersion into Christ.

### JERSEY (CHANNEL ISLES).

Two Thursday evening meetings have recently been specially devoted to the consideration of the Apostolic method of proclaiming the truth. We then noted: (1) That the commission given to the Apostles was confined to teaching or preaching. (2) That the Apostles, understanding this, approached neither Jewish nor Gentile assemblies with an addition of prayer or song, but when visiting (a) Jewish synagogues they awaited that point of a Jewish service when opportunity was afforded them to speak, and then they boldly declared (with both eyes open) that Jesus is the Christ, the Messiah. (b) When visiting the house of Cornelius or speaking on Mar's Hill, &c., no preliminaries of prayer or song were exercised, but the simple declaration of Divine truth. (3) That worship was in no way exercised saving in the midst of the brotherhood where prayer and song might be freely exercised. We conclude, therefore, that these etceteras at meetings for the declaration of the truth to mixed companies instead of being Divine or Apostolic in their origin are the fag end of a Papal inheritance from which we have been obliged (by obedience to the truth)

to free ourselves. This is necessarily a piecemeal process as such matters are only discovered by our attention being called to them by those who may be first to recognise their importance. The above considerations have seriously affected the position of those presiding brethren (at least) as have been conducting this inquiry so that while willing to serve the truth in every possible way they can no longer pray with the alien as part of a public service on their behalf. Under these circumstances they free themselves from what they consider an unscriptural practice, leaving it open to the brotherhood to discover if others can be found to conscientiously perform this item or to decide whether it is not wiser to abolish this etcetera from the evening meeting.

No opposition being offered to above the meetings have since been conducted without prayer or song.

N. J. FRIGG,

Recording Brother.

### LIVERPOOL.

An ecclesia has been formed here on a basis which includes Scriptural teaching concerning Condemnation in Adam and Justification in Christ; it consists of the following:—Bro. and Sis. Thos. Burton; their son, Bro. Clement Arthur Burton, and their daughter, Sister Eva Jane Burton; Bro. and Sis. Mackintosh, Sis. Sarah Bell and Bro. H. Kostrovitzki. Sis. Eva J. Burton and Sis. Sarah Bell put on the Saving Name of Christ April 21st. They commence to meet the first Sunday in June at Montpelier Hall (late Granby Hall), Granby Street, near Princess Park; breaking of bread 3.30 p.m., lecture at 6.30 p.m. The Editor has undertaken to deliver the Lecture on June 6th.

### LONDON (NORTH).

BARNSEBURY HALL, Barnsbury Street, Islington, N.

During the quarter no additions have been made to our numbers by immersion, but on April 11th we had the pleasure of immersing Clement Arthur Burton, of Birkenhead. We have suffered loss by the death of Bro. Darnell, and of Sis.

Welham, who fell asleep in Christ on Wednesday, 19th May. Our sympathies are with Bro. Welham in his bereavement.

Bro. Dyer and Sis. Willett have been united in marriage.

The lectures have been on a series of subjects dealing with prophecies of coming events, or on the current political disturbances which foretell the near return of Our Master to the earth.

The lecturers have been Brn. J. J. Andrew, Chas. Bore, R. H. Ford, G. Handley (Northampton), R. Overton, W. Owler, and J. Owler. A scheme of pamphlet distribution has been inaugurated, and we hope for beneficial results.

JNO. OWLER,

Recording Brother.

#### NEW ROMNEY.

We are still keeping an open door, although during the summer months in country places there is the prevailing disposition of people generally to prefer outdoor rambles rather than an indoor lecture on the Truth. We are not, however, discouraged; we "rejoice in the Truth," and as an Ecclesia we know we are growing in the things of the Lord Jesus Christ. We are also pleased at the efforts made by our Bro. Fife in my own enforced absence, which has rendered it unnecessary to have a brother from a distance. We, however, shall be glad if any of the brethren will make New Romney their holiday resort this summer; we will assure them a loving welcome.

W. WHITEHEAD.

#### NORTHAMPTON.

TEMPERANCE HALL, Lodge Room: Sundays at 11 and 6.30.

On May 6th we had the pleasure of assisting Mr. William Perkins and Mr. Alfred Franey to put on Christ in the appointed way. Our new brethren have both been won by the power of the Word, and are just at that age when intelligence and energy are at their best.

We hope they will henceforth rejoice with us to "spend and be spent" in the service of the Truth.

Lectures during the quarter have been by Brethren W. H. Clifford, R. H. Ford, C. Bore, R. Overton, and J. J. Andrew, of London; and Bro. W. Whitehead, of Romney; Brethren Handley, Helms, and Boddington of this Ecclesia taking the other dates.

Bro. Whitehead having kindly consented to stay over Monday (April 26) to lecture, the Ecclesia engaged the large hall at our place of meeting and thoroughly advertised the lecture, the subject being "The Return of Christ to the Earth." The result was very gratifying. A large audience assembled to listen to the Truth expounded. Our hope is that our Heavenly Father will give some increase to the seed sown.

A. E. THORNELOE.

#### PORTSMOUTH.

Four Brethren and Sisters, viz., Bro. and Sis. Wyatt, Bro. Kerby, and Sis. Harrington, have deemed it their duty to stand apart from the ecclesia at this town, and as the efforts to effect re-union have been unsuccessful, they have come to the following decision:—

"That we constitute ourselves an ecclesia of Christadelphians, taking for our doctrinal basis of fellowship the 'Statement of the First Principles of Scripture Truth' issued by and in use at Barnsbury Hall Ecclesia, London."

Meetings for breaking of bread and worship are held at 11 a.m., each Sunday at 149, Sultan Road.

Bro. F. W. Wyatt, writing May 4th, says, "Sis. Kate Richards, hitherto meeting at Camberwell, has removed here and, by her marriage to Bro. Kerby, has settled amongst us. We have commenced open-air lecturing on Sunday afternoons and should be pleased to have the assistance of any brother visiting the neighbourhood."

[Communications for this section should be received not later than the 15th of February, May, August, and November, and for other sections on the 1st of these months. An Index of Vol. III. is enclosed with this number.—ED. S.-K.]

# 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. 14.

SEPTEMBER, 1897.

Vol. IV.

---

## The Firstborn of the Dead.

It is not without significance that this expression should constitute one of the opening notes of the Apocalypse, commonly called the Book of Revelation. It is the centre of a threefold designation of Jesus Christ, viz.: "The faithful witness, the firstborn of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth" (ch. i. 5). As "the faithful witness" He testified against the wickedness of the Jews, and declared the righteousness of God, sealing His testimony with His blood. For this reason he became "the firstborn of the dead"—a necessary preliminary to His becoming "the prince of the kings of the earth."

Without Christ's resurrection the Apocalypse would never have been written; for the events which it portrays are dependent on His deliverance from the death-state. In it He is recorded as saying, "I am He that liveth and was dead; and behold I am alive for evermore" (ch. i. 18). This is a statement of such an exceptional character that its truthfulness should be capable of the most complete demonstration. Is this obtainable? It is; and from the same book in which the statement is made.

Among "the things," which John was told to write, were those "which shall come to pass hereafter" (ch. i. 19). Have any of these been fulfilled? And, if so, is it possible to identify them? The fact that they are predicted in symbol leads some to give a negative answer. But this is the reply of superficiality or ignorance. To meet the requirements of the case it is not necessary to unravel the symbols in all their details; an understanding of their main features will suffice.

For the present purpose we will briefly consider four prominent events which are symbolically predicted.

### I.—THE DOWNFALL OF PAGANISM.

This is presented at the close of the sixth chapter, and also in the twelfth. It is a well-known fact that the horse and the dragon were used as emblems of the Roman Empire, and both are introduced into these two chapters. As

the horse, the Empire passes through various phases, and then it is depicted as a heaven rolled up like a scroll—its sun becoming black, its moon becoming blood, and its stars being cast forth into the earth. This style of language having been used in reference to the overthrow of Babylon (Isa. 13th ch.) there can be no difficulty in applying it to Rome. As a "great red dragon" it is represented as having seven crowned heads, which answer not only to the seven hills on which the city of Rome is built (ch. xvii. 9), but to the seven forms of government by which the Empire was ruled, viz., Kings, Consuls, Dictators, Decemvirs, Military Tribunes, Emperors, and absolute Monarchs. Of these, five had "fallen," or passed away when the Apocalypse was given, the sixth was in power, and the seventh was "not yet come" (ch. xvii. 10). It is recorded in history that Roman Paganism persecuted Christianity, and that in the end it was overcome. This conflict is depicted as a "war" in the Roman "heaven," in which the "dragon" is replaced by its opponent. As a symbolic prophecy it is an accurate representation of the transformation which the Empire underwent during the time of Constantine.

#### 2.—THE RISE OF MOHAMMEDANISM.

It cannot be denied that this system had its origin in Arabia—a country known as the home of the locusts—and that no other powerful organisation can be traced to the same locality. And it must be admitted that there is a striking parallel between the fierceness of Mahomet's early followers and the devastating character of the locusts, which are used to symbolise them. Moreover, their persistent attack on the Eastern half of the Apostasy exactly accords with the fiery plagues with which the symbolic locusts visited the worshippers of "demons and idols of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and of wood" (ch. ix. 20).

#### 3.—THE ASCENDANCY OF THE PAPACY.

An ecclesiastical organisation which calls itself the "Mother Church" is fittingly portrayed by a woman possessing daughters. And by its alliance with the "kings of the earth" it is convicted, on its own confession, of figurative "fornication" (ch. xvii. 2). The superstitious thralldom in which it has for centuries held Europe could not be better described than that of having "made the inhabitants of the (Roman) earth drunk with the wine of her fornication." And its persecution of those who have repudiated its religious claims is well represented as being "drunken with the blood of the saints" (ver. 6).

#### 4.—THE DECAY OF TURKEY.

This notable event—which has been proceeding for 77 years—illustrates the force of the Apostolic statement that Prophecy is "a light in a dark place" (II. Pet. i. 19). For, the meaning of the expression in the sixth vial, "the great river Euphrates was dried up" (Rev. xvi. 12), was understood long before its fulfilment commenced. Tillinghurst, writing in the seventeenth century, interpreted the "river Euphrates" to be the "Ottoman or Turkish Empire" (Eureka, vol. ii., p. 546); a Protestant writer in 1802 said that to fulfil this prophecy it was "certain" the "Turkish Empire" would be "reduced" to a "helpless state" (Eureka, vol. ii., p. 546); and Robert Fleming, a Presbyterian clergyman, who died in 1716, wrote as follows:—"The sixth vial will be poured out upon the Mohammedan Antichrist, as the former was on the Papacy; and seeing the sixth trumpet brought the Turks from beyond the Euphrates, from the crossing of which river they date their rise, this sixth vial dries up their waves and exhausts their power" (The Rise and Fall of the Papacy, p. 70). Two generations have now witnessed the fulfilling of this prophecy, which, when completed,

prepares the way for Christ to come (ver. xv.). The Newspaper Press in recording the progress of "the Sick Man's" disease is, unconsciously, testifying to the resurrection of Christ on the one hand and to His Second Appearing on the other.

In these four events we have a prophetic quadrilateral which is impregnable. Paganism during the first century covered the Roman Empire; now it is dead. The Papacy for the first three centuries, at least, had no existence; now it dominates nearly all Europe. Mohammedanism in John's day was unknown; it subsequently became a scourge to the Eastern half of the Apostasy, and a terror to the countries bordering the Mediterranean; now its political embodiment on the Bosphorus is dying. Any one of these events would have been sufficient to have proved the statement in the first chapter of the Apocalypse, that Christ who was once dead is again alive; but collectively they constitute a demonstration as clear and complete as anything which can be produced by mathematics. And yet they form but a tithe of the evidence. Indeed, it may safely be said, that to those who have eyes to see and ears to hear, there is no historical event attested by so many "infallible proofs" (Acts i. 3) as is the resurrection of Christ. The reason for this is, to the reflective mind, apparent; no other event can compare with it in importance. To deny it is to deny the truth of the Bible. To take up this position is to treat all that is recorded of God's action in the past as a fable, and all that is predicted of Him in the future as a dream. Reject the resurrection of Christ, and we have no evidence of the existence of a "true God;" accept it, and logically a belief in the Divine authorship of the Old and New Testaments must follow: for it is the central point of all that has been written by men of God under the influence of the Holy Spirit. An absolute conviction of its truthfulness is a necessary preliminary to belief in the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and an understanding of the things concerning the name of Jesus Christ. And the continuance of such conviction is essential to overcoming the world by faith, and the consequent realization of the Divine promises.

The book containing the four "infallible proofs" already enumerated, is prolific in promises to those who are engaged in the effort to overcome. They are assured, if they succeed, that they shall eat of the Tree of Life in the Paradise of God (ch. ii. 7); that they shall not be hurt of the second death (ver. 11); that they shall eat of the hidden manna, and receive a white stone of acquittal (ver. 17); that they shall rule the nations with a rod of iron, and receive the morning star (ver. 27); that they shall be clothed in white garments and have their names confessed before the Father and his angels (ch. iii. 5); that they shall be made pillars in the temple of God, and have written upon them the name of God and the name of the New Jerusalem City (ver. 12); that they shall be permitted to sup with Christ, and to sit on His throne (vers. 20, 21). None of these promises could be fulfilled if Christ had not been raised from the dead. Consider, then, ye who have embraced the One Hope, the fulness with which God has provided you with evidence that He will not fail in regard to any of "the things prepared for them that love Him" (I. Cor. ii. 9).

The abundant provision which God has made for producing and maintaining conviction in the restored life of His crucified Son suggests a question:—Is it likely that He has not given any explanation of an event of such momentous issues? If His action was merely the exercise of discretionary power no explanation would be called for. But if it had a moral basis, and was dependent on conditions, a declaration of that moral basis and a record of the fulfilment of the conditions would but accord with the character of Him who has said, "I will be inquired of" (Ezek. xxxvi. 37). There is no question as to our having been provided with the record; it is presented in a four-fold form in what are known as the "Gospels," and it is

reiterated in every other book of the New Testament. Surely then there must be something to show on what principle those conditions were imposed. If there is, it can be found, and it is written for the purpose of exercising the minds of such as will seek for it.

In describing Christ as "the firstborn of the dead" (Rev. i. 5; Col. i. 18), the Spirit gives to His resurrection a pre-eminence, and, indeed, a priority over the resurrection of every other being, past or present. It is equivalent to saying that it rests on a foundation totally different from that of the few instances of raising the dead recorded in Old and New Testaments. The suggestion that this pre-eminence consists in the bestowal of immortality appears at first to constitute a sufficient explanation. But further reflection leads to the conclusion that this is not satisfactory. Restoration to life is one thing, the impartation of endless life another; and the two events are separately described. Thus Christ is spoken of as "the first that should rise from the dead" (Acts xxvi. 23), and also as "the beginning of the creation of God" (Rev. iii. 14). That the two events are closely related to each other is obvious; for without resurrection there could not have been immortalisation; but such relationship must not cause us to ignore their distinctive character.

We have a clue to the significance of Christ's resurrection in the statement that God "loosed" Him from "the pains of death because it was not possible that He should be holden of it" (Acts ii. 24). Why "not possible"? This expression implies that in the case of others it is possible for death to hold them. But is not God all-powerful? Certainly. And can he not, therefore, raise from the dead for every purpose according to His discretion? If resurrection were dependent solely on the exercise of Divine power, this question could only be answered in the affirmative. But God has Himself placed it on another basis. He has made it dependent on conditions. The principles which regulate it are the counterpart of those under which death reigned. As disobedience brought death, so obedience brings resurrection. This, in brief, explains why "it was not possible" for the grave to hold Christ. "The obedience of one" took away the penalty inflicted for "one man's disobedience." The righteous One was "obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross" (Phil. ii. 8), that "through the death he might destroy him that had the power of the death, that is, the devil" (Heb. ii. 14). Having destroyed that which had the power of death in relation to Himself, the resurrection of Christ was not dependent on Divine discretion; it was a necessity in order to fulfil Divine justice. God's faithfulness required it. He had imposed the conditions; the conditions had been fulfilled; and therefore it was "not possible" for the grave to retain Jesus Christ without God denying Himself. Hence the statement that He "brought our Lord Jesus again from the dead through the blood of the everlasting covenant" (Heb. xiii. 20).

The appellation "first-born" implies some after-borns; or, to put the matter in another and more Scriptural form, the *individual* first-born involves a *multitude* of first-borns. The principle on which the one and the many become first-borns is identical, though its application is different. Both are crucified and both die; though in the one case it is literal, and in the other figurative. The many, by a water-burial, are inducted into the death of the one, and so "crucified with Him" (Rom. vi. 4); and by being raised therefrom they partake of His resurrection (ver. v.). As by the literal death the power of death was destroyed in relation to the one, so by the literal and figurative deaths combined, the power of death is destroyed in relation to the many. Henceforth it is "not possible" for death to hold them. They may die—as thousands have—but they are certain to rise. They rise because they are in Him who is "the first-born of the dead." The character they exhibit after becoming first-borns does not affect the question

of their resurrection; for, however wicked they may be, they cannot return to the condition in which they were before dying out of Adam and being born into Christ. The difficulty of such a return in a natural sense was clearly seen by Nicodemus when he said, "How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb and be born?" (Jno. iii. 4). The same difficulty exists in regard to birth in a spiritual sense. A first-born in Christ cannot get back into Adam, because he has been freed from the power of the death incurred by the disobedience of Adam. But he can, and will, come under the power of another death, if, like Esau, he sells his "birthright" (Heb. xii. 16). This is a death to be pronounced by the "Last Adam," or "second man" (I. Cor. xv. 45-47), and therefore called "the second death" (Rev. ii. 11.)

The principle on which it is "not possible" for dead first-borns in Christ to be held in the grave necessarily keeps in the grave those who are not first-borns. It is "not possible," according to Divine arrangements, to release the first-borns and the non-first-borns for the same object. In past cases of release—which have not comprised more than one or two in Adam—the object has not been to judge, much less to punish. It has been for the benefit of others—to attest the authority of God's messengers. Such raised ones returned to the grave without any change in their relationship to sin or death.

Every sound principle operates in two directions, a positive and a negative. This is readily recognised in every-day matters. Thus it is a sound principle that a man who breaks the laws of his country should be punished; and where the law is administered efficiently and justly this is done. The counterpart of this principle is, that a man who keeps the laws of his country is not punished; and where justice rules, he is not. It is also a sound principle that a criminal who is pardoned shall be set free. The obvious counterpart to this is, that a prisoner who is not pardoned shall complete his term of imprisonment.

The Scriptures supply many similar illustrations, but one will suffice. It is written, "Be baptised into the name of Jesus Christ, and ye shall receive remission of sins" (Acts ii. 38). The counterpart of this is, "If ye are not so baptised ye shall not receive remission of sins." The simplest mind, freed from tradition and prejudice, can see the force of this. Only where darkness reigns do we find it taught that remission of sins is obtainable either with or without baptism into Christ; and the contradictory character of such contention is a matter of astonishment to the youngest "babes in Christ."

Suppose we take this point a step further. What does "remission of sins" involve? A certain freedom from the consequences of sin. This cannot but be admitted. The next question is, what is the greatest and final consequence of sin? The answer is, Death. There is no other cause for death than sin; therefore, remission of sin means release from the power of death. If, then, any who receive such "remission" enter the grave, what does the application of a sound principle require? That they be released. And what is the counterpart in regard to those who do not receive such "remission?" That they shall not be released. If it be "not possible," according to God's arrangement, for those whose sins have been remitted to be kept in the grave, it must also be "not possible," according to God's arrangement, for those whose sins have not been remitted, to be released—that is, for the same object. To say that they will be raised is to destroy the force of a sound principle. It is not a question of God's power in what may be called a physical sense, but of His power to depart from conditions which He Himself has laid down. It is wholly a question of Divine arrangement, the recognition of which is one item in "the knowledge of God" (Col. i. 10).

The belief that Christ's resurrection is the foundation for the resurrection of His brethren has been expressed in a variety of verse:—

*Jesus lives! no longer now  
Can thy terrors, Death, appal us.  
Jesus lives! by this we know  
Thou, O Grave, canst not enthrall us.*

*Sing praise! the tomb is void  
Where the Redeemer lay;  
Sing of our bonds destroyed,  
Our darkness turned to-day!*

*The first-begotten from the dead,  
Lo! Jesus risen, His peoples' Head,  
To make their life secure:  
Though they, like Him, may yield their breath,  
Like Him, they'll burst the bands of death;  
Their resurrection sure.*

On what principle can these verses consistently be embraced in the Saints' "Sacrifice of Praise"? Not with the impression that their resurrection is simply the result of discretionary power. The language clearly teaches that without Christ's resurrection the grave would have enthralled them; and that because he was raised, their bondage to death is "destroyed." Such only as recognise this can, with a full measure of enlightenment, include the above verses in their musical contribution to the Christ-Altar.

EDITOR.

## Reflections.—No. 5.

### PRAYER.

"And this is the confidence that we have in Him, that, if we ask any thing according to His will, He heareth us: And if we know that He hear us, whatsoever we ask, we know that we have the petitions that we desired of Him" (I. John v. 14, 15).

A thoughtful consideration of the words above quoted will no doubt convince us that there is no power which we, as sons and daughters of God, can wield for a moment to compare with that of Prayer. Do we desire benefits for ourselves or for our brethren? They may be beyond our own material resources, but by the aid of Prayer we can ask our Father to pour down showers of blessing upon the suppliant or his friend!

Such is prayer. Can we imagine any

greater privilege? What could express more earnestly the perfect oneness which should exist between the sons and daughters of God and their Father? To have in Him a friend, a confidant, a counsellor, a guide, an instructor, a patient, long-suffering and merciful Lord, is surely one of the greatest honours we could possibly wish for.

Perhaps we can better appreciate it by comparison. In Paul's day polytheism was prevalent. In Athens he found men praying and sacrificing to even an "unknown" god—lest their ignorance of some deity should imperil their present or anticipated well-being. Did they desire victory over their enemies, or success in their invasion of neighbouring states?—then to Ares or Mars must sacrifice be offered. Did the

pleasures of the chase engross their thoughts?—Artemis or Diana required propitiation. Did their harvests exceed expectations?—then libations should be poured out to Demeter or Ceres; and so on, with an almost bewildering variety. They lived in a thralldom from which, happily, we are entirely free. A too servile allegiance to one god might excite the jealousy and hatred of another, to the supposed inevitable misfortune of the misguided Greek or Roman who rendered it.

There are many incentives to have communion with our Heavenly Father through the medium of prayer. "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you: For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened" (Matt. vii. 7, 8). "The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much" (Jas. v. 16). "When thou prayest, thou shalt not be as the hypocrites, for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men. . . . But thou, when thou prayest, . . . pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly" (Matt. vi. 5, 6).

The Scriptures abound in instances which afford us an insight into the practical side of the subject. The several prayers of Moses to God to remove the plagues were expressions of confidence in Him and acknowledgments of His mercy. Job had the privilege of offering prayer on behalf of his discomfited friends (Job xlii.). On the other hand, owing to Judah's wickedness, Jeremiah received from Jehovah this command: "Pray not for this people, neither lift up cry nor prayer for them, neither make intercession to Me: for I will not hear thee" (Jer. vii. 16). Hezekiah prayed, and as a result, fifteen years were added to his life. Elijah prayed and rain was held back for three years; he prayed again and rain was granted (Jas. v. 18, 17).

But there are two very striking incidents, a reference to which will be both interesting and instructive. It will be remembered that when Israel desired a king, God said to Samuel, "They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected Me that I should not reign over them." The prophet was instructed to explain to

them that their king would require the best of their lands, crops, herds, and even their persons; but nothing would deter them from persisting in their demand. We know the dire results following the granting of their request. They went from bad to worse, and have for many years reaped the results of their folly.

On another occasion, Christ was accosted by a woman of strong faith whose heart's desire was that her daughter might be healed. "It is not good to take the children's meat, and cast it to the dogs," said He. Her answer was an expression of unmistakable confidence: "Yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their masters' table" (Matt. xv. 27). Christ recognised that the woman understood, to some extent at least, that He could dispense material, temporal blessings, as well as spiritual mercies and gave utterance to sublime, yet solemn words: "O woman, great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt," and the narrative tells us "her daughter was made whole from that very hour."

The lesson to be learned from a consideration of these two incidents is easily perceived. Sincerity in prayer must ever be our first concern. Not only must we look upon Our Heavenly Father as a bountiful benefactor—as One who has power to grant whatsoever we ask—but we must also add the proviso, as Christ did, "not as I will but as Thou wilt." By this qualification we recognise that our petitions, however pleasant or reasonable to the natural man, may not always be for our benefit, and if granted, might prove a stumbling-block to our salvation instead of an assistance.

James, in his Epistle, points out that many in his day were disappointed in not receiving the desired answer to their prayers. The reason was clear: "Ye ask amiss." They desired things which were contrary to the will of God, probably opposed to the principles of the "One faith,"—things which, if granted, would have led them astray instead of building them up in the Truth.

Let us then, brethren and sisters, approach the throne of grace in the full assurance of faith asking only for such mercies as will enable us the better to render our "reasonable service" to Him, who has, in the person of Christ, done such great things for us.

JNO. OWLER.

## Editorial Flyleaf.

In a note "To the American Brethren," in the June *Christadelphian*, the Editor intimates that, when crossing the American Continent from Australia to England, next year, he will be prepared to co-operate only with those who "hold marriage with the stranger to be unlawful, and believe that knowing rebels against God are responsible to resurrectional judgment" (p. 247). If this action be sound in the United States and Canada, it should be equally applicable to Great Britain. And yet all with whom Bro. Roberts is in fellowship in this country are not at one with him on these two points. In 1893 it was with the greatest difficulty, and in face of fierce opposition, that we obtained the vote of a majority in the Barnsbury Hall ecclesia in support of the simple proposition, "That marriage out of the Lord by one in Christ is an offence against the law of God." This was before the division on resurrectional responsibility, and nearly all those who opposed it went out in support of the enlightened rejector theory. Similar dissent, we have reason to believe, exists elsewhere. As a rule, it will be found that the brethren who confine resurrection to those in Christ are more Scriptural on marriage than are those who extend resurrection to children of Adam. The reason for this is apparent: the line of demarcation, in their minds, between the two classes, is more clearly drawn. When they realise that one is "holy flesh" and the other unholy flesh, they have little, if any, difficulty in perceiving that it is unlawful for the two to become "one flesh." We have, therefore, no adverse comment to make on Bro. Roberts' attitude on the marriage question beyond pointing out that it belies his repeated claim to abide only by the teaching of Dr. Thomas, who held marriage with the alien to be quite

lawful. (See our quotation in No. 12, page 89.)

The other part of what the Editor of *The Christadelphian* calls "the flag" under which he sails, refers, of course, to the question on which we are at variance with him. It clearly implies that all who henceforth seek his aid in any way in the work of the Truth are accounted as being at one with him on this point. This, of course, embraces the sending of ecclesial intelligence to *The Christadelphian*. However much some who differ from him may desire to maintain fellowship with Bro. Roberts they are, in effect, told by him that they can only do so by stultifying their convictions. "We are at anybody's command," he says, "who fly the right flag."

The term "rebels"—of late so persistently used—is nowhere in the Bible applied to unbaptised Gentile believers. It is applied to Jews who had become custodians of God's written oracles, because they rejected some truths which those oracles contained. In so doing they rebelled against One to whom they had vowed allegiance. Gentiles out of Christ have never been constituted servants of God, and, therefore, they have no stewardship to report to the Judge. This is an essential feature of the Judgment-seat which is forgotten by some.

It is also forgotten that the Judgment-seat is the place where the results of Christ's mediatorship will be made known—an aspect illustrated under the Mosaic law. On the annual day of Atonement all the sins for which sacrifices had been offered during the preceding year again came into remembrance. (Heb. x. 3). The only way by which they could again be atoned for was by the High Priest taking blood into the Most Holy Place and sprinkling the

**Mercy Seat.** The acceptance or rejection of this blood was God's method of showing His approval or condemnation of Israel. It is, therefore, described as a "judgment." (Heb. ix. 27). The High Priest was the medium through whom the Divine decree was communicated, and in this capacity he foreshadowed Christ on the Judgment-seat. As the only living High Priest, Christ is now interceding for His brethren, but when He ascends the Judgment-Seat His priestly relationship to them will cease. All that He will then do will be to make known whether or not their sins during probation have been forgiven. This is a feature which has, obviously, no application to any out of Christ. Hence the incongruity of introducing to the Judgment-gathering a class who never were related to Christ's priestly office.

According to the August *Christadelphian*, a division has occurred among those at Kilmarnock who believe in the resurrection of enlightened rejectors. The point of divergence is as to who should be fellowshiped. One section "require a belief in the resurrection of enlightened rejectors as a condition of fellowship," and they insist on equal strictness on the part of all who seek their fellowship. The other section were "prepared to refuse fellowship to those who oppose that truth, but they could not consent to refuse those believing the truth in the matter who might not be prepared to withdraw from those who were uncertain on the subject." The strict section have issued, in a printed form, some correspondence they have had with an ecclesia in Glasgow on the fellowship aspect; they have been led to do this because the correspondence was mutilated in *The Christadelphian*. Their action evidently goes too far for the Editor, although logically it is in harmony with some things he has written. Some brethren at Plymouth, of the same mind as those at Kilmarnock, have issued a circular entitled "Seven

Reasons why a belief in the resurrectional responsibility of enlightened rejectors of God's truth should be made a test of fellowship." On this we may have something to say in our next number.

Referring to our remarks in the last number (p. 13) the Editor of *The Fraternal Visitor* writes as follows in the number published June 15th:—

"We note the syllogistic chain the Editor commends to us, wherein he seeks to extract from our note on the temptation of Christ the conclusion that 'there was something called the devil in the mind of Christ,' and that the devil in Christ was 'sin in the flesh.' Bro. Andrew thinks there is no flaw in his reasoning. Well, apparently flawless chains of argument are often delusive. A serious flaw in Bro. Andrew's rendering of the matter is that he has found no place for the declaration of Matt. iv. 11. 'Then the devil leaveth Him.' If the devil in Christ's mind was 'sin in the flesh,' then surely when 'the devil leaveth Him' He would cease to have 'sin in the flesh.' After all, however, plain Scripture is better than logic-chopping."

The "serious flaw" here mentioned is apparent, not real. The "devil" may be either quiescent or active; it became active, in the case of Christ, when it tempted Him to make stones into bread, to throw Himself from the pinnacle of the temple, and to take forcible possession of the kingdoms of the world; and it resumed its quiescent state when the temptation ceased. The "devil" which then left Him was the activity of "sin in the flesh"; and the "season" for which the devil "departed" (Luke iv. 13) lasted until Christ, in the garden of Gethsemane, said, "If it be possible, let this cup pass from Me" (Matt. xxvi. 39).

We cannot do better than commend to the Editor of *The Fraternal Visitor* the excellent article entitled "The Doctrine of Christ's Substitutionary Sacrifice, by C. Smith," which he has inserted in his June number. In that article it is clearly shown that Christ's death was an act of Divine justice; that justice precedes

and is distinct from mercy; and that justice demands the complete destruction of the old creation, or Adamic nature. The obvious import of this is, that the nature which Christ inherited from His mother required to be destroyed because it was bad. In other words, He was

"made sin" (II. Cor. v. 21), and so possessed a "body of sin" (Rom. vi. 6); therefore this was the "sin" which He "put away" by the sacrifice of Himself" (Heb. ix. 26). This is "plain Scripture," which only requires a child-like humility for its acceptance.

## Sacrifice under the Mosaic Law.

The Editor of *The Christadelphian*, in his articles on the Law of Moses, continues to set forth that which we have advocated, but which three years ago he denied, viz., that the flesh-nature, as well as its deeds, requires atonement by sacrifice. This will be seen by the following extracts taken from the July number:—

"What are burnt offerings as distinguished from sin offerings and trespass offerings? And why should there be a trespass-offering in addition to a sin-offering, seeing that trespass is sin? . . .

They represent gradations of the same subject. All were for atonement, but atonement for different degrees of sin . . . sin of natural state, sin of ignorance, and sin of weakness; the first, the constitutional uncleanness that has come into the world by sin, which is, 'no more I, but sin that dwelleth in me' (Rom. vii. 20); the second, where men do wrong without knowing it, as in 'sin of ignorance'; and third, acts of known disobedience, but not deliberate or intentional, but the result of infirmity deplored."

"That burnt-offering should be required in the absence of particular offence shows that our unclean state as the death-doomed children of Adam itself unfit us for approach to the Deity, apart from the recognition and acknowledgment of which the burnt-offering was the form required and supplied. It was 'because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel,' as well as 'because of their transgres-

sions in all their sins that atonement was required for even the tabernacle of the congregation' (Lev. xvi. 16) (pp. 260-1).

"The type involved in complete burning is self-manifest: it is *consumption* of sin-nature. This is the great promise and prophecy and requirement of every form of the truth: the destruction of the body of sin (Rom. vi. 6). It was destroyed in Christ's Crucifixion—the one great offering—we ceremonially share that in our baptism: 'crucified with Christ,' baptised unto his death.' We morally participate in it in putting the old man to death in 'denying ungodliness and worldly lusts' (p. 261).

"It was a beautiful requirement of the wisdom of God in the beginning of things that He should require an act of worship that typified the repudiation of sinful nature as the basis of divine fellowship and acceptability. Those who deny Christ's participation thereof deny its removal by His sacrifice, and therefore deny the fundamental testimony of the gospel, that He is 'the Lamb of God, taking away the sin of the world.' They think they honour Him by saying His flesh nature was a clean nature. In reality they deny His qualification for the work He *was sent* to do. They mistake holiness of character for holiness of nature, and, by a wrong use of truth, destroy it" (p. 261).

It will be observed that not only is "sin of natural state" described as one of "different degrees of sin" requiring "atonement," but furthermore

that "our unclean state as the death-doomed children of Adam itself unfits us for approach to the Deity apart from" sacrifice. This is equivalent to saying that there is a breach or alienation between God and man by reason of man's "natural state." Three years ago the writer of these extracts—both in the *Responsibility Debate* and in *The Christadelphian*—denied that men were alienated from God by reason of their birth or descent from Adam. His contention at that time was hailed with delight by many who ought to have known better. What have such to say now? Has this change of front transformed "black" into white?

The repeated references of late to this Bible truth convey the impression that the Editor of *The Christadelphian* is attempting to rectify the widespread havoc which he produced three or four years ago. But in this he will fail unless he adopts a more thorough-going course by withdrawing his previous false teaching as openly as it was made. At present brethren of diverse beliefs can each quote from his writings to prove agreement with him; and his contention that he has never changed is an encouragement to them to do so.

The statement in the last of the above extracts—that the body of sin "was destroyed in Christ's crucifixion," and "we ceremonially share that in our baptism"—involves more than is expressed. The destruction on the Cross of Christ's body of sin justified, or freed, Him therefrom. If, therefore, we, at baptism, ceremonially share in that destruction, our body of sin is then the subject of a ceremonial justification—the very thing which we have been defending and the Editor of *The Christadelphian* has been denying.

This matter has also a bearing on Christ's baptism; for it was an anticipatory symbol of his own death. When requesting John to baptise Him, He said that it was necessary to "fulfil all righteousness" (Matt. iii. 15); and,

subsequently, He described His coming crucifixion as "a baptism to be baptised with" (Luke xii. 50). His death is described by the Apostle as a declaration of God's righteousness (Rom. iii. 25), and this is afterwards defined to be a "just" action by God (ver. 26). Connecting these several testimonies together, their combined teaching is obvious. A "just" act necessarily constitutes a justification, and a ceremony which symbolises it must also be a justification. The difference between the two is this: the justification effected by the reality is a permanency, whereas the justification effected by the shadow is temporary or provisional. If these items of Divine truth had been clearly established in the mind of the Editor of *The Christadelphian*, he would not have commended in the August number the contribution from Bro. G. C. Harvey containing the following statements:—

"It is argued by some that Christ was justified at His baptism from the condemnation ruling upon His flesh-nature before He could go on probation, but the type (Lev. xii. 4) emphatically teaches that He was not justified or cleansed from His physical uncleanness until the end of His life, or after the thirty-third day. Christ required no justification morally, and the only other justification which the Scriptures teach He did require was justification by Spirit from the condemnation of mortality resting upon His flesh-nature, and this could not be effected until He had made reconciliation for iniquity in death and resurrection."

If this view be correct, the baptism of Christ was a meaningless ceremony. He certainly "required no justification morally," but He possessed a sin-nature which, as the Editor of *The Christadelphian* rightly says, was a barrier to "divine fellowship and acceptability." To this, His act of righteousness, in the Jordan, was obviously related; it justified Him from His sin-nature until He was hung upon the Cross, and then the shedding of His blood provided an everlasting justification. To describe His change from corruptible to incorruptible

nature as His justification is to confound things which differ. His change of nature, after resurrection, was the consequence of His justification by sacrificial death.

"Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness," said Christ. In saying "us" instead of *me* Christ identified Himself with His brethren, and, in effect, declared that as they needed a ceremonial justification so did He—but with this difference: in His case it applied only to the sin-nature, whereas in theirs it applies to the conscience as well as the nature. Moreover He was baptised into a righteousness in process of development, not then "finished," but they are immersed into a righteousness which is "complete."

In a previous number the Editor of *The Christadelphian* makes the following pertinent observation:—

"For the offerer to 'put his hand upon the head of the burnt offering' was to transfer himself to the sacrifice, as it were, and to acknowledge himself justly dealt with in whatever should befall the animal. He was then to 'kill the bullock,' and the priests were to sprinkle the blood upon the altar" (May, p. 178.)

This extract can have but one meaning. The animal selected for a burnt-offering was slain; consequently the offerer acknowledged that if justly dealt

with he would have been slain. Three years ago the same writer pooh-poohed this aspect of Mosaic sacrifice. Now, however, he repeats it in the following form:—

"If the burnt sacrifice were to be of feathered creatures, a turtle dove or young pigeon might be brought (Lev. i. 14)—fitting type in their harmlessness of the Son of God—'holy, harmless, and undefiled'—which a vulture, or an eagle, or an owl would not have been. Death (the appointed necessity in the case) was to be inflicted instantaneously in the wringing off of the head—a violent wrench, but succeeded in a moment by the healing balm of unconsciousness" (p. 179).

"A violent wrench," which produces death, is necessarily a violent death. If, therefore, this form of death was due to the sinner under the Mosaic Law, why not under the Edenic Law? The law given through Moses being "the form of knowledge and of the truth" (Rom. ii. 20), was a representation of the sin and death brought by the First Adam and of the salvation wrought by the Last Adam. If the violent death inflicted on the sin-bearing animal originated in the violent death due to the Mosaic sinner, does it not logically follow that the violent death inflicted on the Lamb of God was based upon the violent death due to the sinners in Eden? EDITOR.

## Britain Divinely Blessed.

The celebration of Queen Victoria's sixty-years reign is one of the most remarkable events of modern times. To the children of darkness it means simply a grand pageant and a wonderful display of power. But to the children of light it has a higher meaning. It brings before their minds the varied manner in which Britain has been blessed by God

to fit her for her mission as (1) protector of the Jews, (2) antagonist to the Gogian confederacy, and (3) the leading Gentile nation in restoring to Canaan the twelve Tribes of Israel. In raising the British nation to such a pinnacle of power God has acted on His revealed principle of choosing the weak things of the world to confound the mighty. It is

not a matter of choice that an "Empire on which the sun never sets" should have its seat of government on a seagirt piece of land which, when compared with the vast territories of Empires and Republics in both Hemispheres, is very insignificant. Neither is it an accident that Britain has, for nearly one hundred years, both in naval and mercantile marine, been mistress of the seas. Why does not France, Spain or Holland—each in past times superior to England—occupy this position? Because God did not choose them for it. Having selected Britain, Jehovah prepared her in a variety of ways. By a judicious admixture of different races He gave her that physical, mental, and moral force which has enabled her to take a foremost place in all departments of human activity. By causing her to throw off the Papal yoke He gave her a position independent of the European "ten horns;" and by bringing her into closer touch with the Bible than any other nation He imparted that love for political and religious freedom which has developed a constitutional government unsurpassed, probably unequalled, in any other community. By giving her possessions—some of immense extent—in all parts of the world He has provided her with facilities for securing commercial prosperity and financial superiority. By giving success to her forces on land and sea He has caused her to be respected and feared by both savage and civilised races. And by giving her the vast territory known as India He has compelled her to take a vital interest in

the lands and seas lying between Europe and the Indian Ocean.

Britain's achievements have naturally aroused envy and hatred in the minds of other nations, and this has much to do with her present isolation among the European powers. Her very isolation, however, has contributed towards a closer union between the home country and the colonies. The Queen's "Diamond Jubilee" has given the Imperial Federation movement a greater impetus than it has ever had. The British lion has been entertaining the young lions with demonstrations of its naval and military power, and the young lions have been proffering their assistance in case of need. The Canadian young lion, by the mouth of its Premier, when at the Imperial Institute, June 17th, declared that "should she (England) ever be in danger, the colonies would do all they could—though they might not be able to do much—to help her." The principal South African lion had previously taken a practical step in this direction by proposing to make a monetary contribution to the expense of the Navy; and this has since been embodied in an offer to provide a first-class battleship. When actual danger arises—as it will when the Russian confederacy invades Palestine—not a few, but "all the young lions" (Ezek. xxxviii. 13) will put forth their utmost strength to assist the mother country. The events which are preparing for this crisis are therefore signs in the political heavens of the approaching advent of the immortal King of the whole earth. EDITOR.

### Things New and Old.—No. 13.

#### "PRECIOUS STONES."

Not the least in importance is the title of "Precious Stone," which it hath pleased the Father to confer upon our

Lord Jesus Christ. (Isa. xxviii. 16.) It will be observed that herein he is also styled "a tried stone," "a sure foundation." These terms indicate the charac-

teristics and conditions which, subsequently, were completely realised in Jesus Christ. Cut out without hands, out of the mountain of Israel—Judah's tribe being selected—he sustained the trial in the Sardius condition; and as no gem can be polished without friction Jesus himself by His suffering and adversity was perfected and constituted of the Jasper-like "precious corner," "foundation stone" of the New Creation of the Deity.

Jesus Christ, in being made this sure foundation, became such that we might by faith in His Name, and obedience unto the commands, become "precious stones," capable of rising to a higher nature, in which dominion and power can be employed and enjoyed. But ere this is attained there is something required, which may be briefly stated as: first, a beginning; second, growth; third continuance in the manhood thus developed; and fourth, the physical change to which I referred in my last article. The first three of these, God and Our Saviour Jesus Christ require from us; the fourth, They perform. The first or beginning was correctly stated in *The Christadelphian*, of September, 1873, p. 399, where it is said: "That we relinquish our connection with the condemned Adam, and put on the name of the new Adam, in whom condemnation of the old is escaped by resurrection. BAPTISM is the requirement in its ceremonial compliance." We had no relationship to the Stone cut out without hands before we answered to this requirement. We, by our faith and obedience, came, indeed, unto a living stone—disallowed, it is true, of men, but, chosen of God and precious. This preciousness Our Father in Heaven desires we shall aim to attain, "according as His divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of Him that hath called us by His own glory and virtue: whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises; that by these ye might be partakers of the Divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust" (II. Peter i. 3, 4).

The friction employed in the polishing process may be harder to bear than we imagined; it is not spoken of as friction in the Word, but as "tribulation." The term itself does not alter the effect produced on those who bear patiently the process of their polishing and refining.

We are commanded to keep Christ's works unto the end, to hold fast that which we have, to let no man take our crown, not to be lukewarm, but to be cold to the things of the world and hot to the things of Christ. Let us heed these injunctions, brethren. In the polishing process of all precious stones, heat of a proper temperature is engendered; so with us, heat of the right kind will follow, and when the process is completed there will be seen a community of sparkling gems. For not only will the multitudinous glorious congregation of that day be at peace and rest, but each will be a "vitreous" gem, clear as crystal, resting from their labours in the glorious setting which is prepared of our God. A few glimpses of this glorified nature, precious stone-like character, have been graciously given: "And the sight of the glory of the Lord was like devouring fire on the top of the mount in the eyes of the children of Israel" (Exodus xxiv. 17). "And it came to pass when Moses came down from the mount that Moses wist not that the skin of his face shone, and they were afraid to come nigh him" (Exodus xxxiv. 29, 30). Of an angel it is said, "His countenance was like lightning and his raiment white as snow" (Matthew xxviii. 3). Of Christ we read, "And in the midst of the seven candlesticks one like unto the Son of Man clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt about the paps with a golden girdle. His head and His hair were white like wool, as white as snow; and His eyes were as a flame of fire; and His feet like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace; and His voice as the sound of many waters; and He had in His right hand seven stars; and out of His mouth went a sharp two-edged sword, and His aspect was as the sun shining in his strength" (Rev. i. 13-16).

As the "Servants" of Christ, all these have a grand significance to us, and their effect should be to stimulate us and encourage us to go on to the perfection thus described. Not only was Christ's sacrificial offering pre-arranged, but all the grandeur and glory of the perfect multitudinous Man in Christ were foreshadowed by the precious stones in the breastplate which Aaron first wore: each stone was to represent a tribe of Israel, and, collectively, they became the symbol which represented exclusively the Four-

square Community, or Israel of God; each stone was a precious stone, vitreous, or lively, polished to perfection. The stones represented those who from each tribe should be "the heirs of the kingdom of God." The foundation of the Four-square Community is the foundation stone as it is in Jesus, who, saith the Apostle, in "of God made unto us wisdom and righteousness and sanctification and redemption" (I. Cor. i. 30). Here are four aspects of saints in probation, answering to the Four-square of the breastplate; each stone is separately set or planted in Him, and this is described by the same Apostle in the same letter (oh. vi. 11)—"washed, sanctified and justified."

It is worthy of note, not only that Moses, Jacob, Ezekiel, and the Apocalypss specify the tribes of Israel, but, also that a variation of arrangement is made by them; Ephraim and Dan are omitted from the Apocalyptic specification, but Levi and Joseph are included. There is a further variation in the list of stones which formed the breastplate, and the list of stones which constituted the foundations of the wall of the city, thus:—

Exodus xxviii. 17-20. Rev. xxi. 19, 20.

1 {	Sardius*	Jasper*
	Topas*	Sapphire*
	Carbuncle	Chalcedony
2 {	Emerald*	Emerald*
	Sapphire*	Sardonyx
	Diamond	Sardius*
3 {	Ligure	Chrysolite
	Agate	Beryl*
	Amethyst*	Topaz*
4 {	Beryl*	Chryoprasus
	Onyx	Jacinth
	Jasper*	Amethyst*

It will be observed that only the seven stones marked with a \* appear in both lists. May not these represent the complete number from each tribe who have realised that they constituted the temple of God upon earth, that "He dwelt in them and walked in them by the truth believed, which is His moral power or Spirit?" The Spirit in Jesus said, 'I am the way, the truth, and the life.' Hence, in the individual, or community, in which the truth dwells, the Deity dwells. It is a body anointed with the truth, and therefore the body of the anointed, or Christ. Being founded upon the square root—upon the Root and Offspring of

Israel—it is regarded as consisting of twelve tribes, though no fleshly, territorial, or political, divisions among the faithful exist; for 'they are all one in Christ Jesus' (Dr. Thomas's *Eureka*, Vol. II., p. 322).

There being seven identical stones embodied in each list, what do the other five signify?

Perhaps they are connected with the "five brethren" in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus; the five being duplicated, possibly, representing those of the tribes who were disobedient and unbelieving; Ephraim and Dan, omitted from the Apocalyptic specification, added to the ten would give the completion of the unworthy ones—from the twelve tribes. On these points, however, I should be glad of any suggestions from the brethren which will throw further light hereon.

Dr. Thomas says, "It was because of the darkness, or 'strong delusion Deity had sent' the apocalyptic twelve Tribes of Israel, 'that they should believe a lie; and all be damned who believed not the Truth'—sent by Him as a punishment upon them for not continuing in the love of the Truth He had given; because of this He commissioned the sealers to make proclamation among them, that, if there were any disposed to return to first principles, they might be sealed with those principles 'in their foreheads'; and thus, polished and filled in, might shine as the Apocalyptic Urim and Thammim—as the Lights and Fulness of the Body of Christ" (*Eureka*, Vol. II., p. 320).

Now, my dear brethren, what will you do? Will you continue in the love of the Truth? Will you read and meditate? Will you, as clean creatures, "chew the cud"? Will you make a vigorous effort to receive the impress of your Master? As precious stones are cut and polished, will you seek to be cut and polished? Having been called for this purpose, neglect not the means so freely given whereby you can attain to the promised shining perfection. Christ desires it, and your Heavenly Father also desires it—They are not willing that any should perish.

It is worthy of note that all the precious stones named have specific degrees of hardness, and that the colours reflected by them have collectively the same hues as the rainbow. "The Lord hath done great things for us; whereof

we are glad" (Ps. cxxvi. 3). To Israel, Jehovah says, "I will lay thy stones with fair colours, and lay thy foundations with sapphires and I will make thy windows of agates, and thy gates of carbuncles, and all thy borders of pleasant stones" (Isaiah liv. 11, 12).

Brethren, let these gracious promises stimulate and encourage you to press forward toward the mark of the high calling you have received in Jesus Christ and to endure *hardness* as good soldiers of His.

Another grand feature in connection with the precious stones of the Deity is that they are all impressed with a seal; this sealing process is an integral part of our *birthright*. Upon all that is involved in the Divine seal, I cannot now dwell. To relegate it wholly to the glorification and change to the "Divine nature," is not to interpret the Scriptures by the right rule. There is a present sealing, or, the Apostle would not have been inspired to write to the brethren at Ephesus, these words:—"That we should be to the praise of His glory, who first trusted in Christ, in whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation; in whom also, after that ye be loved, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of His glory" (Eph. i. 12-14). The moral impress thus made at our second birth, when we entered into the tribe of Judah, should be sacredly esteemed by us unto the end; when, if so esteemed, we shall receive

the Spirit's *new name*. This, as I pointed out in my last article, will be the impress of Christ's new nature, a glorious one as herein shown. Then will the fulness of the things belonging to our birthright be *wholly* accomplished in us, and we shall rejoice for evermore in the presence of the Lord our King whom we shall then know as the precious stone in the perfect state, through whom we have the privilege and right to become likewise precious stones in the Father's sight. The Lord will have commanded, the Angels will have executed the command, and we shall realise the literal force and beauty of the words, "And they shall be Mine, saith the Lord of hosts, in that day when I make up My jewels (margin, special treasure); and, will spare them as a man spareth his own son that serveth him" (Malachi iii. 17).

Oh! brethren, let us delight in the Lord and thank Him for all that He has revealed for our guidance, encouragement, and consolation. These things are like flowers and springs by the roadside in our pilgrimage. Let us, therefore, refresh ourselves with them every day. The end of the journey will one day come; it may be near; so, be comforted, "For surely there is an end (margin, reward), and thine expectation shall not be cut off" (Prov. xxiii. 18).

"The beams that shine from Zion's hill  
Shall lighten every land,  
The King who reigns in Salem's Towers  
Shall all the world command."

WM. WHITEHEAD.

New Romney.

## Our Letter Box.

### THE EDENIC LAW NOT A FICTION.

R., writing to condemn our teaching, says, "I can't find your Edenic Law. I can find the Law of Moses (which if a man do be shall live in); I can read it and know it. I can find the law of Christ and read therein, but your Edenic Law I find not. Can it not be copied out as other law? You put me under a legal enactment. I find it not. Where should we look for it but in Genesis? It is in your hands as an Act of Parliament that ought to be nailed over every tree on earth to every man. Now if you are

under that law I am not. I have never broken it. If so, I am a transgressor; Christ is also a transgressor. There is no help for you. You say He is guilty—'not morally' is no help to you. He broke law, and therefore is punished—guilty and yet not guilty—innocent yet punished."

There is no difficulty in copying out the Edenic Law. Here it is:—"Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou

shalt surely die" (Gen. ii. 17). We were not under this law in the same sense that Adam was—before it was broken; no one has said that we were; but we are under its operation since it was broken. We were in Adam's loins at the time that he sinned, and we have inherited the nature which he defiled; therefore we are born under the power of death. Adam violated this law by his own act; we did not. But because he sinned we have, by descent from him, been "made (or constituted) sinners" (Rom. v. 19). He was blameworthy; we are not. Nevertheless we are accounted as having fallen with him; and from that fall we need to be rescued.

The condemnation pronounced upon Adam (Gen. iii. 17-19) clearly affects his descendants. They suffer from the ground being cursed, and they eat of it in sorrow—all because of his sin. For the same cause, therefore, they return to the dust. Consequently they cannot be delivered from the dust without being cleansed from the sin inherited from Adam.

The infliction of punishment on children for the sin of their ancestors is embodied in the Mosaic law:—"Visiting 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). A practical illustration of this is to be found in the punishment decreed for the iniquity of Gehazi, to whom it was said, "The leprosy therefore of Naaman shall cleave unto thee, and unto thy seed for ever" (II. Kings v. 27). Although this form of words is not used in reference to the punishment for Adam's transgression, the substance of it has been recorded in Gen. iii. 17-19, and Rom. v. 12-21. Between punishing the fourth generation and punishing the one hundredth there is practically no difference. Adam developed mental leprosy, and, as a consequence, all his descendants are born with a leprous taint, from which they cannot be cured without the sacrifice of Christ.

R. says that he was never under the Edenic law. But Paul—in reference to himself—writes the reverse. Paul does not use this name, but his phrase is not difficult to identify:—"The law of the spirit of life hath made me free from the law of sin and death" (Rom. viii. 2). A law which said, 'Sin and thou shalt die,' is clearly a "law of sin and death"; and

to be born after its violation is to be legally under its condemnation. Furthermore, to be freed from this law by a law of righteousness and life is to pass from a state of legal condemnation to one of legal freedom. Through the sin of Gehazi his posterity were made lepers, and through the sin of Adam, his descendants have been "made sinners"—without their own volition in either the one case or the other.

To deny our relationship to the Edenic "law of sin and death," is to leave unexplained the death of millions who, through infancy or ignorance of Divine law, are destitute of moral guilt. If death cannot visit such, through any transgression of their own, it must come through the transgression of another; and there is no transgression but that of Adam, which can cause it. To deny this is, in effect, to repudiate the Bible axiom that sin is the sole cause of death, and to attribute death to arbitrary action on the part of God.

R. further says, "I am satisfied that Paul, in Rom., chap. v., is dealing with men and women, and not babies; the key is in chap. iii. 10-23."

This appears to be a prevalent idea, but it is untenable. Rom. v. 12 to 21 explains, in a variety of language, the cause of death. Thus,—

Ver. 12. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin."

Ver. 15. "Through the offence of one many be dead."

Ver. 16. "The judgment was by one to condemnation."

Ver. 17. "By one man's offence death reigned by one."

Ver. 18. "By the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation."

Ver. 19. "By one man's disobedience many were made sinners."

Ver. 12. "And so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned," or "in whom all sinned." Margin.

The word rendered "men" (*anthropos*), means, "men in general, mankind"; it has no limitation in regard to age or sex. There is no warrant for confining it to adults.

By "men and women," does R. mean all adults? If he says Yes, for what are they condemned? For their wicked deeds? The great bulk of them sin ignorantly. R. must therefore admit the principle of condemning the ignorant. What is the difference between

this and condemning babes for the sin of an ancestor? In both cases they are helpless and without moral guilt.

If only adults who know God's will come under Divine condemnation, on what principle do ignorant adults and babes die? *If not for Adam's sin, and not for any sinful acts of their own, for what other cause?* The Bible plainly teaches that death is inflicted only for sin. We are bound, therefore, to identify the sin which is the cause of death in infancy and in ignorance. To say that it is due to mortality in the nature does not meet the difficulty. It is a surface answer, and does not go deep enough. Why does mortality exist in the nature? It was not there when the nature was first made; or God would not have said 'If thou sinnest thou shalt die.'

To say that the death of babes and others is due to inherited sin in the flesh, is a little nearer, but it does not bring us to the first cause. Why is there mortality in the nature, and what is the origin of sin in the flesh? *The only answer is,* The transgression of the first man. Consequently the sin and mortality which he has transmitted cannot be got rid of unless that transgression be washed away. Christ has washed it away, by His death, for Himself; and it is washed away for all others who partake of that death.

#### UNLEAVENED BREAD.

S., in writing about the bread to be used at the Lord's Supper, says that the Scriptures require us to use unleavened bread. His first reason is, that the use of leaven was prohibited at the Jewish Passover Feast; his second, that the Gospel narratives of Christ's last Passover mention unleavened bread "five times"; his third, that the Apostle Paul in I. Cor. xi. ch., delivers to the Corinthian brethren that which he had received of the Lord. Paul, he points out, mentions "cup" five times, but says nothing about its contents; for this information we must refer to the Gospels. We must do the same, he argues, to ascertain the kind of bread that was used.

These facts cannot be disputed, but the question is, do they make it obligatory for Christ's brethren to use unleavened bread? The Mosaic interdict concerning the Passover was given to Jews, and therefore Jesus, as a Jew, in instituting the commemorative supper

during that feast, could use only unleavened bread. This consideration precludes our saying that the same kind of bread must, of necessity, be used by baptised Jews and Gentiles after the abolition of the Mosaic law. If Christ had used unleavened bread at a time when leavened bread was permitted, the case would be different; there would then have been a clear indication that we should use only bread without leaven. But, no such restriction is mentioned in either the Acts of the Apostles or the New Testament epistles. These facts point to the conclusion that it was bread as such, apart from its qualities—white or brown, leavened or unleavened—which was intended. When Christ spoke of Himself as "the bread of life" (Jno. vi. 48), He did not qualify it with either *leavened* or *unleavened*. Bread was evidently used to represent His "flesh," or His "body," because of its life-sustaining qualities. As we eat of literal bread to maintain our "vapour" life, so we must eat of the true bread, Christ,—by mentally partaking of the truth concerning Him—that we may obtain endless life. This feature is embraced in the symbols of the Lord's Supper; for in showing forth Christ's death we renew our vow to do what is enjoined for the bestowal of an incorruptible nature.

The body of Christ from birth to crucifixion was corruptible and contained "sin"—two qualities which are fittingly represented by leaven. If, therefore, Christ had intended to represent either of these bodily qualities, unleavened bread would have been *unsuitable*. To avoid this difficulty it has been said that the bread represents Christ's character—on the ground that we read of "the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth" (I. Cor. v. 8). But this introduces another difficulty: the body represented by the bread was broken (I. Cor. xi. 24); how can this be affirmed of the character? Each of these difficulties is avoided by recognising the bread to be representative—not of inherited bad qualities, nor of imparted good qualities, but—of the life-sustaining properties resulting from the Divinely-provided combination of bad and good qualities, viz., "sinful flesh" and a perfect character.

The word "bread" in I. Cor. v. 8, being in italics, forms no part of the original; it is supplied by the translators to complete the sentence. The word

principles would do equally well:—  
“The unleavened principles of sincerity and truth.”

It is not without significance that the use of unleavened bread, or wafers, by the Papacy harmonises with its belief in the immaculateness of Christ's body.

S. writes that he “knows of no Scripture which says that leavened bread will represent Christ.” Certainly leavened bread is not mentioned, and consequently there is no obligation to use it. But, on the other hand, S. goes too far when he speaks of “God commanding the absence of leaven when His faithful children partake of a symbol of Him who was undefiled and separate from sinners.” If this command exists, it is sin to do otherwise: but *there is no such command*. All that we have is the use of unleavened bread by Christ in circumstances which precluded the use of any other. The restriction then existing is no longer in force; that restriction is not re-enacted; and therefore is not now obligatory. The main point to be borne in mind is the parallel between a life-sustaining food and “the offering of the body of Jesus Christ” (Heb. x. 10) that we might have life.

DR. THOMAS'S BELIEF.

T. asks whether our late beloved brother, Dr. Thomas, did not believe that enlightened rejectors would be raised to judgment for refusing to become connected with Christ after they had come to the knowledge of the Truth?

Yes; in *Elpis Israel* Dr. Thomas wrote as follows:—“If they prefer to eat of the world's forbidden fruit, they come under the sentence of death in their own behalf. They are . . . condemned to a resurrection to judgment for rejecting the gospel of the kingdom

of God” (p. 117). In the *Revealed Mystery* the Doctor, writing of those who “come to an understanding of the gospel, but have rejected it,” says that this class “comes forth from the grave again to encounter the burning indignation of Christ, the judge of the living and the dead” (p. 14). But, in the first volume of *Eureka*, Dr. Thomas extended Resurrection and Judgment to a much larger class. Writing of the expression “the second death,” in Rev. xxi. 8, he says, “All the clergies of Christendom, and their pietistic followers . . . Sacramentarians of all sects . . . are condemned to the fiery indignation and sore punishment of the Second Death” (p. 264). Those, therefore, who quote Dr. Thomas as an authority for their belief in the resurrection of unbaptised “enlightened rejectors,” should, to be consistent, contend for the resurrection of all the members of the Apostasy. But to do this would destroy their main argument that Light is the basis of responsibility to the judgment-seat. Dr. Thomas evidently believed that both darkness and light made men responsible; for it is unquestionable that “the clergies” and their “followers” are in darkness on the first principles of the Truth. If this two-fold basis be correct, it is obvious that a Papist or Protestant who becomes enlightened in the things of the Kingdom and the Name, does not pass from a state of non-responsibility to one of responsibility, but from one state of responsibility to another; and, in that case, the terrors of the Second Death cannot legitimately be used to induce submission to baptism. This wide application of the Second Death is, however, due to misapprehension concerning the scope of Rev. xxi. 8, as we hope to show in a future number.

Things Hard to be Understood.

THE WORD MADE FLESH.

We received the following observations from “Philologus” in response to Question, No. 82, but they have been held over through pressure of other matters:—

THE FIRST VERSE OF JOHN VIEWED IN THE LIGHT OF HIS GOSPEL AND EPISTLES.

“In the Beginning was the Word, and

the Word was with God, and the Word was God” (John i. 1).

Many pages have been written on these opening statements of John, and much more to mystify and render difficult of understanding than to clear up the writer's true meaning.

An acceptance of these words in their plain and ordinary meaning will best

harmonise with other Scriptures and the teaching of the Lord Jesus. They are a condensation of what John has afterwards written, and each statement is in line with the utterances of Christ.

The manifestation of God in Christ is the burden and re-iterated theme of John's Gospel—the Almighty Father exhibited and made known to the sons of men in His Son, the Word of God—amplified in the Gospel narrative, condensed in the prologue.

"The Word," three times repeated in this first verse, is, we cannot but think, The Lord Jesus Christ in His proper person—the manifestation and the expression of the Divine and Almighty Father. God was in him.

[To apply "The Word" in the first verse to Christ destroys the meaning of the statement in ver. 14 that "The Word was made flesh." Whatever "The Word" was, it existed before it was "made flesh." This cannot be affirmed of Jesus Christ in His proper person. "The Word" existed in two conditions, (1) Before embodiment in flesh and (2) After such embodiment. It is necessary to keep this clearly in view in order to understand John's meaning. The Apostasy applies "The Word" in the first verse to Jesus Christ because it believes in His personal pre-existence—a belief which makes void the Truth as it is in Jesus.—Ed. S.-K.]

There are four statements in this verse:

1. The *existence* of the Word.
2. The *beginning* of that existence.
3. That the Word was *with* God.
4. That the Word *was* God.

These four statements the New Testament repeatedly support.

Look at them *seriatim*.

#### 1. The Existence of the Word.

The Word of God. The Word of the Father. "That which was from the beginning, that which we have heard (words), that which we have seen (the speaker) with our eyes, that which we beheld (in mental vision) and our hands handled concerning the Word of Life." (I. John i. 1). Jesus was that word, seen, heard, and felt. The beloved Son of the Almighty Father who said, "I speak that which I have seen with My Father" (John viii. 38)—"The Words of God" (ver. 47; iii. 84); "The Word

which thou gavest me" (xvii. 8). Jesus came testifying the words of God, making known by his speech the Love, Purpose, and Will of Deity. As "the Word of God," he was "the Word of Life" handled and felt in flesh and blood existence. "In Him was Life and the Life was the Light of men" (John i. 8). "And the Life was manifested and we have seen and bear witness, and declare unto you the Life, the eternal Life, who was with the Father and was manifested unto us" in the person of the Lord. (I. John i. 2).

[These passages obviously refer to "The Word"—not *before*, but—*after* it was "made flesh."—Ed. S.-K.]

#### 2. The Beginning of that Existence.

Recognising the true signification of the Word to be the personality of the Lord Jesus Christ, no hesitation arises with regard to the Beginning referred to. To apply it to Adam and things or persons in the natural Creation, to the earth or to the sky, would be most incongruous, and still more so to refer it back yet farther to the untold ages of the formation of matter. It cannot have appropriateness apart from the New Creation of God, and the commencement of that New Creation heralded in the proclamation of the Gospel and in the announcement, "Behold, I make all things new" (Rev. xxi. 5).

["The Word made flesh" was due to the mercy of God towards sinners, and therefore "the Word," before being "made flesh," could not have had a "beginning" prior to the existence of sinners; its "beginning" must have been subsequent to the first sin.—Ed. S.-K.]

God's great purpose to form Creation anew originated in his own gracious and loving mind, to magnify his own glory and form a race of beings that would be responsive to His all-wise and abounding grace and goodness. The execution of this high purpose had a Beginning, and this Beginning was in Jesus Christ who is declared to be "the faithful and true witness, the Beginning of the Creation of God" (Rev. iii. 14); "The image of the invisible God, the first-born of all Creation" (Col. i. 15). The Beginning was with the Lord Jesus, "The Son of his love who is before all

things, and in Him all things hold together. All things have been created through Him and unto Him, who is the Beginning, the first-born from the dead, that in all things He might have pre-eminence, for in Him all things were created in the Heavens (plural) and in Earth" (Col. i. 15-18, R.V.); all this in succession and contrast to the Beginning of things natural as shown in Genesis i., when God created the Heaven (singular) and the Earth. They are two separate Beginnings constituting two separate and distinct creations. We have things *seen* on the one hand, and, on the other, things *unseen*, except by the eye of Faith. The natural Creation with its Beginning on the first day, in the one arrangement, and the New Creation with its Beginning in the personality of the Lord Jesus Christ in the other, even in the manifested Word of the Deity—The Word of Life. He who John and the Apostles had seen and heard, and felt, who existed in the Divine purpose before Abraham (John viii. 58), and in actual life through His mother, Mary, in His Spirit-originated birth, as announced by Gabriel, sent from God (Luke i. 26). In the Beginning of His days, when but 12 years old, He was about his Father's business, and, arrived at the age of 30, another stage of Beginning in the Gospel of the Kingdom was made by His messenger sent before His face to prepare His way (Mark i. 1, 2).

The Beginning of Jesus anointed, the manifested Word, may thus be seen in four stages:

1. In the purpose of the Almighty Father to form His new Creation in Jesus Christ (John xvii. 5).

2. In the entrance into existence of Jesus the Holy One, the Son of God (Luke ii. 11).

3. In the Gospel proclamation of Invitation to participation to Honour and Glory heralded by John the Baptist (Mark i. 1).

4. In the exaltation to Power "according to the Spirit of Holiness and declaration of Sonship to God by resurrection," after attainment of perfection of character by obedience unto death. (Rom. i. 4).

[It is quite true that "The Word" has reference to the New Creation, not the Old Creation, and that Jesus Christ constitutes its foundation. But when was God's purpose to form this New

Creation first revealed or spoken? When He declared that the Seed of the woman should bruise the head of the serpent (Gen. iii. 15). This was equivalent to announcing that the Old Creation—though marred by sin—should not come to an immediate end, but that out of it God would develop a New Creation freed from the power of sin. The fuller revelation of God's mind, through Moses and the Prophets, is but an amplification of this announcement. When the animals were slain in Eden to provide "skins" for a sin-covering, an illustration was given of the foundation on which the New Creation was to be built, and this was presented in greater detail and fulness in the Mosaic law. The precepts, interdicts, principles, and truths embodied in that law were "made flesh" by taking possession of the mind of Jesus. And, as a consequence of His putting the Inspired Word into practice—during His life, and finally in His sacrificial death—He was raised from the dead and immortalised. There are thus a series of stages in the development of "the Word":—

- 1st. The promise in Eden of the Seed of the Women;
- 2nd. The birth of that Seed;
- 3rd. The baptism of the Seed by John;
- 4th. The begetting of the Seed from the dead; and
- 5th. His Immortalisation.

—Ed. S.-K.]

3. That the Word was with God.

The fact that the Lord Jesus was ever with his Father, and the Father was ever with his beloved Son, is one of the plainest and most clearly taught truths. Every thoughtful reader of the Scriptures will at once accept it. Jesus in many ways, and on several occasions asserted it: "I am in the Father and the Father in Me. The Father hath not left Me alone" (John viii. 29); "I can of my own self do nothing" (John v. 30); "The Father abideth in Me; He doeth the works" (John xiv. 7-11); He was with God continually, whole nights in the mountains in constant prayer and communion with Him (Luke vi. 12; xxi. 37). The spirit of God dwelt in Him, accompanied Him, led Him. After His baptism He returned from Jordan in the spirit; He was led by the Spirit into the Wilderness (Luke vi. 1), and

by it He returned into Galilee (Luke iv. 14). God gave not the Spirit (Himself) by measure unto Him (John iii. 34). Nicodemus exclaimed that "No man could do the miracles Christ did except God be with Him" (John iii. 2). Jesus said unto Thomas, "Believe Me that I am in the Father and the Father in Me, or else believe Me for the very works' sake" (John xiv. 11). Jesus the Word was with God.

[The above statement, that "the Lord Jesus was ever with His Father"—judged by the context—means, of course, during His lifetime, not, as the Apostasy teaches, from all eternity. This is quite true, but John's statement that "the Word was with God" relates to a time anterior to Christ's existence. "The Word was with God" after it was uttered—as a purpose to be fulfilled—until that Word was "made flesh" in the person of Jesus Christ.—Ed. S.-K.]

#### 4. The Word was God.

This statement probably raises more difficulty than the other three.

But we have our Lord's clear teaching on the point, and we are wise to accept it. The Lord Jesus was the Word, and He was the manifestation of the Father.

Hence, He said, "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father"—God—(John xiv. 9). "If ye had known Me ye would have known My Father also, and (where the truth is apprehended) from henceforth ye know Him, and have seen Him."

Philip said unto Him, "Show us the Father and it sufficeth us." Jesus saith unto him, "Have I been so long time with thee and dost thou not know Me, Philip? He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father. How sayest thou, Show us the Father? Believest thou not that I am in the Father and the Father in Me? the words that I speak unto you I speak not of Myself but the Father that dwelleth in Me, He doeth the works" (John xiv. 7-10).

Are we not justified in concluding that failure to accept this truth of the indwelling Deity in Christ shows that the acquisition of that knowledge of Jesus, which is essential to Eternal Life, is yet unattained? (John xvii. 3).

Even Thomas was able to lay hold of the great fact of God manifestation in the person of Christ.

This is seen in his unrebuked exclamation before the Great Teacher, "My Lord and My God." A blessing is vouchsafed to those who believe as Thomas believed without having the assistance he was favoured with of actual sight and contact with the Lord (John x. 28, 29).

The very fact of His Sonship to God, in that He was His only begotten one, endorses His ascent to divine power and position (I. John iv. 9).

The claim was sufficient in the eyes of the Jews for them to hurl at Him the charge of blasphemy, because, said they, that being a man He thereby made Himself God (John x. 33-36).

Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill Him, because He said that God was His father, making Himself equal with God (John v. 18).

Paul teaches the same truth. "He was in the form of God, and counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God" (Phil. ii. 6).

He was the depositary of life. In Him was life—even as the Father hath life in Himself inherently and for bestowal (John v. 26); a dispenser of the prerogative of Deity. "The word was God." The manifestation of God in person, in character, and in work. "All power, said He, is given Me in Heaven and earth" (Matt. xxviii. 18).

[These passages are true in regard to the Word after it was "made flesh"; but John's statement evidently applies to a previous period—when the Word existed only in a verbal form. The Word was then a written manifestation, or revelation, of God—that is, of His mind; the personal manifestation—in flesh and blood—took place when Christ commenced His ministry; and there will be a personal manifestation, in spirit-nature, when He is "revealed from Heaven.—Ed. S.-K.]"

The words of Jesus in the beautiful prayer of John xvii. are the key and explanation of the whole matter. "I have manifested Thy name (the Father's character, power and glory) unto the men which thou gavest Me out of the world . . . now they have known that all things whatsoever Thou hast given Me are of Thee . . . and have known surely that I came out from Thee" (John xvii. 6-8). Though born of flesh and blood, and made in all

things like unto His brethren (Heb. ii. 17), we learn that through the absolute perfection of His character He was exalted to the highest pinnacle of power and glory in manifestation of the Almighty. "He that beholdeth Me beholdeth Him that sent Me" (John xii. 45). But this great light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehendeth it not.

PHILOLOGUS.

[On the principle that Jesus Christ, during His ministry, was God, in the sense of representing God—in wisdom, character, and power—it should not be difficult to understand that, in a similar way, the Divine revelation—through Moses and the Prophets—was also God.

As a man's mind cannot be separated from the man so God's mind cannot be separated from God. It is sometimes said, "You see the man in his book." In a fuller sense could it be said, in *Old Testament times*, You see God in His written Word. But now it can be further said, You see God in the personal Word—first as corruptible flesh, and then as an immortal Priest and King. "His name is called the Word of God" (Rev. xix. 13). It will be found that nearly all the qualities ascribed to the Inspired Word are applied also to the personal Word. Thus both are described as True, Faithful, Light, Life, Holy, Precious, Witnesses, Wisdom, Incorruptible, Powerful, and Spirit.—Ed. S.-K.]

## Within the Holy Place.

### BRISTOL.

Bro. Palmer reports that their address for the breaking of bread is now 56, Easton Road.

### DUNDEE.

Bro. Thos. Mitchell, writing on behalf of himself, his sister-wife, and Bro. Robert Runciman, says, "We are at one with you on the condemnation in Adam question. We think Bro. Roberts has grievously erred on this point, and we marvel that it has been hailed with so much satisfaction by so many. Whether he is blind to his error, or having made the mistake he cannot see his way to retract, God knoweth. We say God speed to you, and we wish you to make our attitude known that others of the same mind may know where we are. We three—a small number—meet in my house, 15, Belfield Lane, Hawkhill, Dundee. Truth is our motto."

### HARRIETSHAM, MAIDSTONE.

We are trying to do our little toward spreading the truth to others. On August 1st Bro. Whitehead paid us a visit and gave an exhortation in the morning and a lecture in the evening. Our room was nearly full, and some of the strangers expressed a wish to hear him again whenever he comes. We should be pleased to have similar visits from other brethren. Bro. Baker, who was immersed at New Romney in November last, meets with us. F. SITFORD.

### JERSEY (CHANNEL ISLES).

Amongst the pleasures connected with our experiences in the truth, the visit of faithful brethren is in no wise the least. In this connection we joyfully record a visit to Jersey of Bro. and Sis. Andrew, their stay with us embracing three Sundays. Although in search of much-needed rest and quiet, Bro. Andrew has publicly lectured three times and also given the brethren the benefit of exposition and exhortation on four occasions. These services, together with private and social intercourse, more than ever convince us of the necessity laid upon our brother to contend for the maintenance of truth already recognised in the body, and to give exposition of subjects relative to the Names which are little understood by many calling themselves Christadelphians. Further knowledge of the contradictory and inconsistent condition of affairs throughout the Christadelphian body reveals the wisdom of the decided attitude of the brethren in Barnsbury Hall and elsewhere in the matter of fellowship. We have to record the death of Sister Le Oras, which happened on Wednesday, July 15th. She was committed to the dust by the brethren on Sunday, July 18th.

N. J. PRICE, Recording Brother.  
16, Colombarie, St. Helier's.

## LIVERPOOL.

Since the beginning of June Bro. and Sis. Coiterell have removed from Southport to Birkenhead; and, having looked into the questions involved in our position, have united with us. We have started a Bible Class, which meets on Wednesday evenings from 7 to 8 p.m. at Bro. Burton's, 3, Hamilton Street, Birkenhead. We continue our lectures on Sunday evening; they have all been given by Bro. Burton since your visit at Whitsuntide, except two by myself.

HENRI KOSTROVITZKI.

## LONDON (NORTH).

BARNSBURY HALL, Barnsbury Street, Islington, N.

Again the hand of death has been amongst us. Bro. T. H. Williams, immersed November, 1895, fell asleep in Christ on July 19th. He died of an internal cancerous tumour, but fortunately he was mercifully preserved from lengthened suffering. Bro. and Sis. Sparkhall have been bereaved of their infant daughter. The sympathies of the brethren and sisters are with them in their loss.

We have been cheered by the introduction into Christ on July 18th of Geo. A. Beeston, through the assistance of Bro. and Sis. Dyer, of this Ecclesia. Miss Lavinia Hart was also immersed on August 15th, and will continue to meet with us.

We have been compelled to withdraw from Arthur Rose and Andrew Wingrove for continued absence from the Table.

The lectures during the quarter have been by Bre. J. J. Andrew, Chas. Bore, Chas. Blay, R. H. Ford, J. Owlser, Wm. Owlser, and W. Whitehead (of New Romney).

JNO. OWLSER, Recording Brother.

## NEW ROMNEY.

Since the last report we have been cheered by visits from our Brother and Sister Sitford, Sister Sitford, senior, and Sister Hampshire, from Harrietsham, near Maidstone; also Sister Allen, from Tenterden. We are still contending earnestly for the Faith once delivered; the glare and glamour of a fashionable world obscure from many the solidities and beauties of the Truth, but they are there all the same, and we thank our

Heavenly Father for the privilege of a door of utterance. W. WHITEHEAD.

## NORTHAMPTON.

TEMPERANCE HALL, Lodge Room. Sundays at 11 and 6.30; Thursdays at 8.

It is our pleasing duty to report that Mrs. Minnie Franey, wife of our Brother Franey, was immersed into the saving name, after a good confession, on July 14th.

We have withdrawn from Harry Thornton on account of non-attendance.

We have commenced to hold Sunday school and Thursday evening meeting in the Lodge Room, Temperance Hall. Any brother who may be passing through the town we shall be pleased to welcome. On Thursday, August 5th, most of the brethren and sisters accompanied the school children to Maidwell Dales for their annual summer outing. We started in brakes in the early morning in beautiful weather for our destination, distant about ten miles. On our arrival a hoavy downpour of rain and hail, together with thunder and lightning, marred our excursion. The storm having ceased, we were able to have a few hours' enjoyment before returning.

The following brethren have lectured during the quarter:—Brethren J. J. Andrew, R. H. Ford, R. Overton, W. Owlser, and J. Owlser, London. Brethren T. E. Boddington, G. Handley, W. Trusler, and A. E. Thorneloe, Northampton.

A. E. THORNELOE.

## PORTSMOUTH.

Although we have not the pleasure of announcing this quarter the birth of any into the Divine Family—of which family Jesus is the first-born—we are not without hope that such a result will ensue from our out-door lectures on Sunday afternoons and evenings.

Our number was augmented, July 4th, by the removal of Bro. Walter Burrigge and his wife, formerly meeting with Barnsbury Hall Ecclesia. We have been visited during the quarter by Bro. Thorneloe of Northampton, Bro. and Sis. Palmer of Bristol, and Sis. Ethel Richards of South London.

FRANCIS W. WYATT.

92, Sultan Road, Landport.

## SYDNEY (NEW SOUTH WALES).

Ecclesial intelligence received too late.

# 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. 15.

DECEMBER, 1897.

VOL. IV.

---

## Justified and Glorified.

---

Among the "things hard to be understood" written by the Apostle Paul, may be included the 30th verse of Romans viii.—"Whom he pre-destinated, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified." This is one of the strongholds of Calvinists, who contend that all whom God pre-destinates, calls, and justifies, will in the future be "glorified." When it is pointed out that some who enter Christ's Church prove unfaithful, and therefore cannot partake of future glory, their reply is that such were not pre-destinated, and consequently were not called or justified; though nominal members of Christ's Church they are not real members: they never entered the true fold of the good Shepherd; being merely "goats," "swine," and "dogs," they could not become "sheep;" God did not pre-destinate them to salvation, and therefore it is impossible for them to partake in reality of any of the qualifications for salvation.

The fallacy of this reasoning is obvious: it makes the present position to depend upon the future one; whereas the Scriptures base the future upon the present. The Calvinist says, Tell me who will ultimately be saved, and I shall then know who were called and justified. But, the Man of God says, If I knew, among those who are justified, which ones would, by faithfulness, maintain their justification, then I should be able to tell you who would realise salvation in its highest form.

Apart from the question of Divine pre-destination—which it is not our intention, on this occasion, to discuss—the Calvinist misapplies the above verse through misapprehending the meaning of the last phrase and ignoring the context. Let us consider the context first.

The chapter as a whole deals with those in Christ—verse 8 being, perhaps, the only exception. Verses 26 and 27 describe the intercessory privilege they enjoy, and this is followed by the statement, "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them that are the called according to his purpose" (ver. 28). To strengthen faith in

this known truth a reason is given:—"For whom he did foreknow he also did pre-destinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren" (ver. 29). And this is supplemented by another reason:—"Moreover, whom He did pre-destinate, them He also called: and whom He called, them He also justified: and whom He justified, them He also glorified" (ver. 30).

The argument concisely stated runs thus:—God has glorified all whom He has justified, and therefore for such as "love God" "all things work together for good," that there may be a multitude of brethren of whom Christ is the first-born. In regard to such as have been "justified" and "glorified," who do not "love God," obviously all things do not "work together" for their good.

#### THE MEANING OF "GLORIFIED."

Those who have been accustomed to apply the word "glorified" to the future life will doubtless demur to its application to the present. But a little consideration will remove this objection. The fact that it is in the same tense as "did pre-destinate," "called," and "justified," should suffice to show that, in regard to all in Christ, it has already taken place. If a future event had been intended the Spirit would have said *will glorify*—as, when it says, "will change our vile body."

It is true that "glorified" is used in John vii. 39 and Acts iii. 13 to describe Christ's change of nature and exaltation to the Father's right hand. But this is not an essential part of its meaning—as proved by its use in such passages as the following:—"They glorified God" (Luke vii. 16); "God is glorified in Him" (Jno. xiii. 32); "Herein is My Father glorified" (Jno. xv. 8); "I have glorified Thee on the earth" (Jno. xvii. 4). The sense in which Christ and others "glorified God" was in honouring Him. In the same sense, therefore, is it possible for God to glorify His sons. The word rendered "glorified" is, in the following passages, translated honoured:—"If I honour myself" (Jno. viii. 54); "It is My Father that honoureth Me" (Jno. viii. 54); "Or one member be honoured" (I. Cor. xii. 26). There is evidently no reason why Rom. viii. 30 should not have read, "Whom He justified, them He also honoured." This would have simplified the passage and prevented much misapprehension.

#### PEACE WITH GOD.

The nature of the honour which God has bestowed upon His "justified" ones has various aspects. First and foremost is the permission to approach Him. "Being therefore justified by faith we have peace with God" (Rom. v. 1). Prior to "being justified" there is no such "peace." A state of sin involves enmity on the part of man, and estrangement on the part of God. And until man recognises this gulf and its cause, and conforms to the Divine mode of healing the breach there can be no access to the Most High. Sin is so abhorrent to "the Holy One of Israel," Who is "righteous in all His ways, and holy in all His works" (Ps. cxlv. 17), that it must be the subject of an atonement—in shadow or in substance—before there can be intercourse with Him; and even then the intercourse must be conducted through the One by whom the atonement was effected:—"Christ Jesus our Lord in whom we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of Him" (Eph. iii. 12).

#### DIVINE SONSHIP.

"Peace with God" having been realised there commences a union expressed by the terms Sonship and Fatherhood:—"Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us that we should be called the sons of God" (I. Jno. iii. 1). "Children of the living God" (Rom. ix. 26), and "Brethren" of Christ (Heb. ii. 11) are the names which are bestowed upon

them. The love of God as a Father is of a different kind from His love as a wise and benevolent Creator. It does not say, *The Father* so loved the world, but, "God so loved the world that he gave His only begotten Son" (Jno. iii. 16). And we do not read, Behold what manner of love God hath bestowed upon us; but, "*The Father* hath bestowed upon us." He is a Father to such as make peace with Him, but not to those who remain estranged from Him. He is not even their God, for they are "without God," and "He is not the God of the dead (those under "the law of sin and death"), but of the living" (Luke xx. 38)—those who have passed from death unto life. God's love for a race of sinners is the outcome of pity for the unfortunate, but His love for His children is based upon their submission to His law for the removal of sin. Unjustified sinners He keeps at a distance, but the justified ones He takes into His bosom.

God's love for sinners is used by the Apostle as the basis for a simple argument:—"He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not also with Him freely give us all things?" (Rom. viii. 32.) Love for those "afar off" is a guarantee that the love for those who are "nigh"—and so continue—will be of the most bountiful character. The "all things" briefly mentioned here, are, in another epistle, somewhat elaborated:—"All things are yours; whether . . . 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. 21-23.) The Apostle evidently does not mean that the bestowal of these "all things" is wholly in the future; or he would not have added "ye are Christ's." The first fact is, that Christ belongs to God; the second, that God's sons belong to Christ; and the third, that all the things enumerated belong to Christ's brethren. The third fact is a consequence of the first and second.

How, it may be asked, can the "things" enumerated belong to the beloved of the Father, seeing that they cannot exercise control over them? The answer is, that they belong to God's sons by title, through being His "firstborn" (Heb. xii. 23); "the world," because it is Christ's inheritance; "life," because they are "in the Spirit" (Rom. viii. 9), and in Him who is the Life; "death," because they have died and been raised with Him who has "abolished death;" "things present," because the "present evil" constitution is a preparation for "the new heavens and the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness;" "things to come," because as "children of God" they are "heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ." (Rom. viii. 17.) Could greater honours than these be bestowed upon probationers for eternal life? Is it not apparent that "God hath highly exalted," not only His beloved Son, Jesus, but also His other sons?

#### HEIRS OF LIFE.

The name of every child of Adam, who becomes a child of God, is entered in "the book of life," and he thereby becomes an "heir of the grace of life." (I. Peter iii. 7.) The "life" pertaining to this "book" then becomes to him a "free gift" (Rom. v. 16), and so remains, unless for unworthy conduct Christ "blot out his name." In like manner, the "death" to which he was formerly "condemned" becomes his. Previously he was under its power—"reigned" over by it (Rom. v. 17)—but now he is able to rejoice that, through Christ, he has obtained the mastery. Such a complete change of relationship would have been impossible unless he had been "justified" from the "offence of one" who, in the first instance, brought him under the power of death.

#### HEIRS OF GOD'S KINGDOM.

As an "heir of the Kingdom" (Jas. ii. 5) every son of God obtains a right to a "crown," and he is exhorted to "hold fast" God's word, and not

to deny Christ's name, that "no man take" his "crown" (Rev. iii. 11). The only way in which he can lose his crown is by unfaithfulness, either in doctrine or practice. Hence the need of being on guard against the "smooth words and fair speeches" of false teachers (Rom. xvi. 18). The heir of one of the kingdoms of the world might lose his title to the throne occupied by his father: apart from death he might become insane or be guilty of treason, and in either case he would be disqualified to wear the crown. Is it surprising that the same principle should apply to the heirs of God's Kingdom? It is insanity to pursue a continuous course of wickedness, and it is treason to Christ to deny the things pertaining to His Name.

#### ESPOUSAL TO CHRIST.

Next to marriage, espousal is the closest relationship which can be voluntarily undertaken in this life. This is the position of all who enter the Name of Christ:—"I have espoused you to one husband that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ" (II. Cor. xi. 2). A proposal for espousal comes from the prospective husband, and it rests with the recipient simply to accept or reject. If the woman accepts, she partakes of the position—whatever it be—of the man. In like manner, they who accept of Christ's offer, partake of His exaltation; they are even now "raised up" to "sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus" (Eph. ii. 6); for in coming out of the baptismal water they "are risen with Him through the faith of the operation of God" (Col. ii. 12). It is but necessary to maintain this union in order to partake of its consummation—"the marriage of the Lamb" (Rev. xix. 7).

#### MEMBERS OF CHRIST'S BODY.

The exalted position of Christ's brethren is forcibly illustrated by the statement that they are "members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones" (Eph. v. 30). The object for which the Apostle makes the statement is to show the love which Christ must have for His brethren: "For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the Church" (ver. 29). The statement shows more than this: as "members" of the "body" of Christ His brethren necessarily partake of the exaltation of the Head. True, in nature, or physical constitution, the "members" are not identical with the "Head"; neither are they, like Him, free from temptation; but, in the sight of God, they share the honours already bestowed upon His well-beloved Son. And, if they successfully pass through their probation, the consummation of these honours is a certainty: the life to which they have a title will become a matter of experience; the crown to which they have a right will be given to them to wear; and instead of being priests for themselves only they will officiate for the subjects of God's Kingdom.

#### THE TEMPLE OF GOD.

As "the temple of God" (I. Cor. iii. 16), the brethren of Christ, individually and collectively, are a "habitation of God" (Eph. ii. 22). Before they could be so constituted they had to be sanctified, or made holy; "for the temple of God is holy" (I. Cor. iii. 17). This is in accordance with the type. In instructing Moses about the tabernacle, the Lord said, "Thou shalt take the anointing oil, and anoint the tabernacle, and all that is therein, and shalt hallow it, and all the vessels thereof: and it shall be holy" (Exod. xl. 9). The mode in which the tabernacle and its vessels was to be hallowed, or made holy, is indicated by the ceremony prescribed for the altar:—"Seven days shalt thou make an atonement for the altar, and sanctify it; and it shall be an altar most holy" (Exod. xxix. 37). The altar was made "holy" by an "atonement," and therefore the tabernacle required an atonement to make

it holy. In each case it was due to the material having come out of "cursed" ground (Gen. iii. 17); but "because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins" the sanctifying process had to be repeated once a year (Lev. xvi. 16). It is impossible to raise any question of moral guilt in regard to the inert matter of which the tabernacle and its contents were composed, and yet it required an "atonement" by sacrifice. In the antitypical tabernacle there should be something analogous: it is found in the sin-defiled flesh inherited from the first sinful pair. Everyone, therefore, who now becomes a stone in "the temple of God" has been the subject of atonement for inherited sin-nature. Without it he could not form part of God's human "habitation."

#### FREEDOM FROM INHERITED CONDEMNATION.

In the light of these facts let us recur to the 8th chapter of Romans. After the statement that the "justified" ones have been "glorified" the Apostle asks a series of significant questions:—"What shall we say, then, to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us? He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things? Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea, rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us" (Rom. viii. 31-34). This quotation is given as in the Authorised Version, but by turning to the Revised Version it will be seen from the margin that the only two positive statements may be rendered as questions; if this were done we should read, "Is it God that justifieth?" and "Is it Christ that died," &c.? The whole passage would then be a series of questions, as we find it in Dean Alford's New Testament. The force and beauty of this form is apparent. It is equivalent to saying, "Shall God that justifieth bring any charge against His justified ones?" and "Will Christ that died and maketh intercession for us condemn us?" There was a time when God did bring a charge against them: before He justified them He charged them with the possession of inherited sin; Christ recognised the charge in regard to Himself by submitting to God's condemnation on the Cross of His own inherited sin-nature. By this act Christ was justified from the charge, and therefore all who are crucified in symbol—by dying and rising with Him—are likewise justified from the charge. Will He who so died condemn those who have died with Him? Certainly not, for that which they inherited, or for sins committed before justification. The only thing for which He will condemn such will be for unfaithfulness after being justified.

#### THE LOVE OF GOD IN CHRIST.

In these facts we have a comforting guarantee. God's love in giving His Son has been so great that we may rely on His freely giving us all other things that are needful for us. And Christ's love to His Father and His neighbours in submitting to a sacrificial death was so intense that we may be certain he will not place in the path of His brethren any unnecessary barrier.

Love such as this should evoke from the recipients thereof an attachment both ardent and enduring. This is obviously the meaning of the further questions asked by the Apostle: "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword?" (Rom. viii. 35.) "Tribulation" and the other things mentioned cannot lessen the love of Christ for His brethren as long as they are faithful, but they may lessen the love of His brethren for the Father and the Son; indeed they have done so in some cases:

"When tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the Word, by and by he is offended" (Matt. xiii. 21); "Because iniquity shall abound the love of many shall wax cold" (Matt. xxiv. 12). But the Apostle was not of that class; for he proceeds to say, "Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through Him that loved us" (Rom. viii. 37). And he further elaborates his declaration in the following words: "For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (vers. 38, 39). Is this a declaration adapted only for the Apostle Paul? Has not every justified one partaken, equally with Paul, of "the love of God which is in Christ Jesus"? Should they not, then, be equally tenacious of their privileged position? If they were, what kind of a community would they be? Full of zeal, diligent in their Father's business, self-sacrificing, animated by patient endurance, ready to forgive, not easily provoked, and prepared to endure the loss of all things, and count them as dung that they might win Christ. Their love for God and Christ would lead them to think lightly of present troubles and stimulate them to undying energy for a "friend that sticketh closer than a brother" (Prov. xviii. 24). Let each one measure himself by the Apostolic standard, that, when measured by Christ, he may not be found deficient in the height, length, or breadth proscribed by the Divine Architect for the living stones which are to compose His incorruptible temple.

EDITOR.

---

## The Brazen Serpent.

---

The history of the nation of Israel, as it is recorded in the Scriptures of truth, affords much material for reflection to the "Israel of God." To those who have not the mind of Christ, and are, therefore, not able to "compare spiritual things with spiritual," there is little more in the Old Testament narratives than bare historic facts. The "oracles of God," while appealing to the reason of reasonable creatures, are, at the same time, only to be interpreted by themselves. False interpreters "wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction"; but it is incumbent on those who have been "brought forth by the word of truth" (Jas. i. 18, R.V.) to keep that word, knowing that it is practically the only means they have of ascertaining aright the ways of Providence and a knowledge of the Divine will. "Now whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning;" and so Paul, writing to the Corinthian ecclesia, after enumerating certain events that happened to Israel in the wilderness, says that "these things happened unto them for ensamples (or types), and they are written for our admonition" (I. Cor. x. 1-11). It is the intention of the writer to briefly comment upon one of these types—that of the brazen serpent.

### FEATURES OF THE NARRATIVE.

The Mosaic narrative of the brazen serpent, to many minds, contains no doctrinal signification beyond a lesson on the "look and live" system of theology. The words of Jesus to Nicodemus, however ("As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up-

that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal life," Jno. iii. 14, 15), evidently contain something more than a comparison between the two events; in fact, the crucifixion of the Lord Jesus is the antitype of the scene in the wilderness. To prove the truth of this statement, and to demonstrate the harmony existing between them is the real purport of this article.

The scene in question occurred almost immediately after God had wrought a great deliverance in Israel (Num. xxi. 1-3). He then led them by the pillars of fire and cloud towards the south near the head of the eastern arm of the Red Sea (the Gulf of Aelana, now called Akabah) in order that they might round the southern extremity of Mount Hor, and so be led into the promised land from the east. It seems that the way was rough and desolate, devoid of water springs, and generally miserable in external appearance. The barrenness of the country was distressing to the Israelites. They grew fretful and discontented. Moses says, "the soul of the people was much discouraged because of the way." In this desponding state of mind they dared to speak against their leader and against God. They found fault with the manna which had kept them alive for months, and God was despised in their eyes. Such contempt could not go unpunished. In anger, but yet in love, the scourge fell upon them. "The Lord sent fiery serpents among the people, and they bit the people; and much people of Israel died" (Num. xxi. 6). It is not known what species of desert serpent it was that attacked the camp of Israel with such disastrous effects. The Israelites had probably seen them before, as large numbers of snakes, many of them venomous, are to be met with in the Sinaitic peninsula. They were called "fiery," or "serpents of the burning bite," because their venom was as burning fire to the system.

The infliction of punishment by means of deadly serpents suggests the thought that that which calls for punishment—transgression—was introduced through the agency of a member of the serpent family. The transgression in the wilderness was the result of yielding to "the lust of the eyes," "the lust of the flesh," and "the pride of life;" and it led to their lightly esteeming their God. The transgression in the Garden of Eden consisted in yielding to the enticement of the serpent, "more subtle than any beast of the field." The lusts of the flesh, not found in man at his creation, originated in the fusion of the mind of the serpent with that of Adam. The serpent, doubtless, could disport itself, without hindrance, in the enjoyment of its own subtilty; it possessed no moral qualities, and was subject to no divine law. But when the crafty mind of the serpent was brought to bear upon that of man, who then possessed no lusts, they at once entered into a combination—thereby creating in him new thoughts and feelings. Hence the "thinking of the flesh" we may fitly call serpent nature. Such "thinking," not being an element of human nature when created, it may, in a sense, be said that the nature we inherit—using the term in a mental and not in a physical sense—we inherit from the serpent. All persons who have not been "born again" are "children of the devil" and, in the aggregate, constitute the numerical "seed of the serpent." Hence the words of Jesus to the Pharisees, "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do" (Jno. viii. 44).

The sickening feeling produced by the bite of a poisonous serpent is not always felt immediately after the bite. Death ensues within half-an-hour after a bite from some serpents; in others it is five or six hours. The bite in the first place may not be very painful; a mere scratch is sufficient to do the deadly work. It was when the serpents bit the children of Israel in the wilderness that death was passed upon them. They were all liable to it, for they had all sinned. The fact that all were not bitten does not destroy the argument. We are concerned only with those who were. The type and

antitype go no further than this. The thing must not be pushed beyond its limits. Prior to their sin the people were in a state of reconciliation with God, as shown by the fact that He worked a great work in their midst in fighting for them against the Canaanites. Their sin brought them from reconciliation into condemnation—a state in which they were as good as dead before the Almighty. Death, however, did not begin to work upon them physically until they were actually bitten. Now our first parents were, in a moral sense, bitten by the serpent at the time they obeyed the serpent's words. The mere fact of the conversation between Eve and the serpent, in which their respective minds were in close proximity, did not constitute the bite; it was when the woman completely surrendered to the deceiver that the mischief was done.

The words of the serpent were words of death. It is no uncommon figure in Scripture to compare sinful words, particularly deceitful words, to the poison of serpents. "The wicked are estranged from the womb . . . their poison is like the poison of serpents" (Ps. lvi. 3, 4). They "imagine mischief in their hearts . . . they have sharpened their tongues like a serpent; adders' poison is under their lips" (Ps. cxl. 2, 3). "Their wine is the poison of dragons and the cruel venom of asps" (Deut. xxxii. 33).

Having had injected into them the poison of the Edenic serpent, our first parents were in exactly the same state as the Israelites. They were liable to die at any moment. The Israelites repented of their fault and entreated Moses to pray for them that God would remove the plague—a most natural result. It is the desire of every unreconciled person who realises and deplors his unreconciliation that the cause thereof may be taken away. Moses prayed for the people, and God heard his prayer; but the serpents were not immediately taken away. God showed His people how they might be cured without the immediate removal of the serpents. From a philosophical point of view His plan was most unreasonable and absurd. But "the foolishness of God is wiser than the wisdom of men" (I. Cor. i. 25), and the Israelites had a practical lesson of this truth. Moses was commanded to make a fiery serpent, to hoist it on a standard, and to tell the people that, if anyone had been bitten, when he looked upon it he should live. A serpent of brass was made—a representation of a fiery serpent. What the children of Israel then saw was a representative fiery serpent. It represented to them that which had terrified them so long.

#### THE ANTOTYPE OF THE SERPENT.

Let us now apply this briefly to the Lord Jesus Christ—the antitype of the serpent. He, too, was a representative man. As the brazen serpent represented the whole family of that name, so Jesus represented human nature. The question might be suggested, why was not a real serpent fixed on the standard in the wilderness, seeing that Jesus Christ was a real man? The reason is obvious. A real serpent would not harmonise with the antitype; it would have foreshadowed a Saviour, who, by His own action, caused death. This could not be. Jesus, though a man, did not possess moral guilt. Though made of serpent nature and carrying about with Him its lusts, He never yielded to them, and therefore was not, in conduct, a biter. As the real nature could not be typified in the wilderness by a real serpent it was represented by brass, a well-known type of sinful flesh. The vessels in the court of the Tabernacle were of brass, but in the Tabernacle itself gold was the predominant feature. There is, therefore, perfect harmony between the type and the antitype.

We now come to a most important feature: the antitype of the brazen serpent was Himself bitten. In the Garden of Eden the woman was told that her seed should be bruised in the heel. The only way, practically, in which a serpent is capable of bruising the heel of a man is by its bite. We

may, therefore, safely speak of Christ as being bitten by the Edenic Serpent. He was bitten by being made of serpent-bitten nature and tasting the bitterness of that nature. "He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows" (Is. liii. 4). By being made of this nature He possessed in Himself the poisonous venom of the Edenic Serpent, which brought Him under the condemnation of death.

There is no natural medical remedy for the Edenic death; the only thing that can remove it is death—a sacrificial death; not the death of any of the biters, but the death of the nature in One who was not Himself a biter. It was, therefore, a matter of necessity for the Seed of the woman to be bruised. Being in the same state naturally as the rest of mankind, it was in His power to take away all that pertained to that state; if He had been devoid of this He could not have taken it away. A Saviour, spotless in flesh, with no desires to sin, no lusts to contend against, is a poor Saviour indeed, and may do well enough for the children of the apostacy. The Bible Saviour is quite different. He is a man, a real man, one who can feel for us; one who is in sympathy with us, being joined to the human race in such a way that they can best appreciate. A knowledge of this fact should ever preserve a sense of affinity between justified sinners and their Saviour.

#### THE CURE BY TYPE AND ANTITYPE.

We now come to the core of our subject—the way in which the Israelites were cured and the corresponding manner in relation to Jesus and His brethren. The people in the desert were cured by a look; a look based upon knowledge and belief. It was not an accidental, or casual, or careless look, but a look of intelligence, faith, and expectation. How did the Lord Jesus apply this action on the part of the Israelites to those who were to obtain salvation through His name? "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have eternal life" (Jno. iii. 14, 15). "Looking" finds its equivalent in "believing," and in a sense they are synonymous terms. We are required to recognise in the Son of God our means of eternal life. This necessitates a "look" on our part towards Him; a look accompanied with belief; a full belief in the name of Jesus, with a full assurance of what He is able to do. Believing on the Son of God is, of course, not a mere mental effort; for it is not a theoretical, but a practical belief. All who believe in Jesus are required to obey Him, and none can obey Him but those who believe in Him; likewise none can savingly believe in Him without obeying Him, for belief is obedience. It was because the Israelites obeyed Moses in looking to the brazen serpent that they were cured; and on the same principle the brethren of Christ are justified because of their obedience to Him. Inability on the part of many well-meaning persons to discern these parallelisms has led to a wrong application of the type in the wilderness, and a consequent distortion of the whole plan of salvation. The brazen serpent, though devised by God, was made with hands: hence Jesus, though begotten of God, was "made of a woman" (Gal. iv. 4). Moreover, the serpent was made especially for the Children of Israel—God's people; so, likewise, Jesus was made especially for His people. He came on behalf of sinners: The testimony concerning Him is, "He shall save His people from their sins" (Matt. i. 21).

The actual manner in which persons are completely cured from the Edenic bite is by a two-fold step. Firstly, by dying and rising with Christ, and, secondly, by overcoming the lusts of the flesh. These, though separate, in themselves, must not be separated from each other. When Paul wrote to the Galatians, "I am crucified with Christ" (Gal. ii. 20), he gave expression to this double truth. He subsequently tells the Philipians that he is "made conformable unto His (Christ's) death" (Phil. iii. 10). And

to the Corinthians he says that he and Timothy were always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus (II. Cor. iv. 10). Let the brethren at large take an example from Paul. "Be ye followers of me," he says, "even as I also am of Christ" (I. Cor. xi. 1). "That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness" (Eph. iv. 22-24).

This article would be incomplete if nothing was said about the victory gained over the serpent by the multitudinous seed of the woman. The present is a time for the deadening of the poison, and no one can, before the end of their probation, say that they are victorious over their lusts. "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall" (I. Cor. x. 12). The time of probation is a time of faithful looking, and it must continue to the end to perfect the cure. People are not cured of diseases in a moment, but they may, in a moment, under the guidance of a skilful physician, be placed in such a position as to ensure their complete recovery. After baptism into the atoning death of Christ we are expected to "grow in grace" and daily increase in that holiness without which no one can acceptably "see the Lord." While abiding in the flesh, though not walking after the flesh, we are liable to a return to the dust, but "when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, 'Death is swallowed up in victory.'" Death does, and will, visit the brethren during Christ's absence, but it is death robbed of its sting. "The sting of death is sin." But when this is removed where are its terrors? The brother or sister who daily kills sin need fear nothing from death. Its bite to them is perfectly harmless. The victory achieved by the Lord Jesus Christ for Himself is, on the resurrection morning, shared by all who have believed in Him unto eternal life. When these feel in themselves that wonderful transformation from mortality to immortality, then will they be able to exclaim, "Thanks be to God which giveth us the victory through Jesus Christ." The victory is over the serpent and all his lusts, for it is written, "The God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly" (Rom. xvi. 20). "They shall tread upon the lion and adder, the young lion and dragon shall they trample under foot" (Ps. xci. 13).

Cowden, Kent.

T. J. CARLOW.

---

## Reflections.—No. 6.

### ON THE ALMOND TREES.

... "And, behold, the rod of Aaron for the house of Levi was budded, and brought forth buds, and bloomed blossoms, and yielded almonds." Num. xvii. 8.

... "Jeremiah, what seest thou? And I said, I see a rod of an almond tree. Then said the Lord unto

me, Thou hast well seen: for I will hasten My word to perform it." Jer. i. 11-12.

The words of the Spirit are but the written expression of the wisdom of God; and since that wisdom is for our enlightenment in the "things of the Spirit" the very words employed have the impress of suitability Divinely exhibited.

Such is the case in the passage before us, and it may prove both interesting and instructive to see through the words themselves to the sentiments they express.

The Hebrew root word SHAAKAD primarily means *to wake up, be on the alert*. In the passage quoted from Jeremiah the noun might be translated *a rod woke up, or suspended over the city; ready even to strike the blow*. This, indeed, would appear to be the obvious sense of the passage, which, in effect, states that God will make ready His Word to perform it.

The noun SHAAKAD is also translated *almond tree*, because this tree wakes up first after winter and bears blossom; indeed the fruit is set before the leaves are fully grown. As a matter of fact the almond tree blossoms in Palestine in the month of January, not only before the other trees, but prior to the appearance of its own leaves. In London its bare, leafless branches are covered with blossoms in March or April.

It was customary in ancient times for those in authority to carry a rod or staff as a mark of dignity. This was the origin of the sceptres peculiar to princes, and may have suggested the use of rods by the prince of each tribe in the case before us. An interesting feature in the record concerning Aaron's rod is that the princes of Israel were expressly told that the rod of the tribe whom God chose for the priesthood should bud and blossom. This was probably to show that it was no casual event, but according to the will of God. The miracle was performed upon Aaron's rod; a dry stick became a living branch; it budded, blossomed, and yielded almonds. Such plain testimony was unimpeachable, and settled, once and for all, that Aaron was chosen to the priesthood.

This rod was preserved "as a token against the rebels." Moses' rod, though used in connection with many miracles, was not preserved, probably because it

would serve only to gratify human curiosity; on the other hand, Aaron's rod, which had in itself manifest proof of its miraculous resuscitation, would be of value as evidence of God's vindication of His own decree.

Now, Christ is described in the Scriptures as a "rod out of the stem of Jesse" (Isa. xi. 1); "a root out of a dry ground" (Isa. liii. 2); and although during His ministry, according to human appearances, there was little prospect that He would flourish, nevertheless when He "shall cause them that come of Jacob to take root, Israel shall blossom and bud and fill the face of the earth with fruit" (Isa. xxvii. 6).

In the almond tree, then, we have set before us first of all the inviolable will of our Heavenly Father to fulfil all His promises or His judgments; and then a symbol of that vigilance which we must ever exercise in connection with our stewardship.

"Our Father's business" must be our everyday concern. We are exhorted to be "always abounding in the work of the Lord;" this does not admit of spasmodic or intermittent effort; we must aim at a steady, plodding, whole-souled diligence in making ourselves acquainted with our Father's commands and rendering the service He requires. The covenant God has made with us is not a one-sided one. He can and will perform His part. He expects us to, and will not be satisfied unless we do ours; and, be it remembered, God will not condemn the agonising effort to obey His laws; it is the want of attempt, the ignoring of them that will cause His displeasure. We have continually to keep in mind our vow: "All that the Lord hath commanded will we do." How necessary, therefore, that we be always on the alert to maintain the truth in its purity, both in regard to doctrine and practice, in order to bring forth the fruits of faith rather than the leaves of an empty profession.

JNO. OWLER.

**Editorial Flyleaf.**

Editorial work necessarily brings with it some amount of correspondence. In our case it is no small part of a heavy burden. We should like, either through the post or in print, to answer all the letters we receive; but, notwithstanding the intention, and, indeed, the attempt to do so, we find it impossible. We must, therefore, bespeak the indulgence of those who have to wait rather long for a response to their epistles. A recent correspondent expresses the hope that *The Sanctuary-Keeper* will soon be enlarged, or issued more frequently. Of this there is no prospect; in existing circumstances it would be impracticable. As it is, there is no breathing time between one number and the other; and it is only by close application that we can keep up to time.

In a series of articles on "Germany and the Germans," in the *Daily Mail*, G. W. Stevens, in discussing the antipathy between Germany and England, says:—

"Germany, France and Russia! I would not say positively that is what the Kaiser is working for, but certainly it is what his warmest sympathisers believe him to be working for. For myself I believe it, too. For years now he has been trying to draw nearer to France and Russia, and the public announcement of the Franco-Russian Alliance is no real set-back to the design. The Continental Alliance against Britain—that is the dream, the daily and nightly preoccupation of all Imperialist Germans.

"The German-Franco-Russian Alliance is in the womb of time, but it may yet come to birth; if it ever does its aim will be, first, no doubt, to keep the peace on the Continent; but, secondly, to obstruct this country in every quarter of the world."

The evidence of Britain's isolation is too strong to be disputed. It was clearly seen in her impotence to act in ac-

cordance with her traditional policy in regard to the Armenian massacres and the recent Greco-Turkish War. The nation would have supported any government in vigorous action against Turkey, but those in authority felt that their hands were tied. In this we see a definite sign that Britain is being prepared for taking the side of the Jews and Christ when the time comes for the re-establishment of the throne of David.

The *Christadelphian* for November contains what is apparently a brief rejoinder to the contention embodied in the Kilmarnock-Welsh pamphlet noticed on another page of this number. As a defence of what is called "middle ground" it is weak in the extreme. Instead of enunciating a clearly defined principle, and pointing out the action required, it represents the Editor as merely retaining in fellowship "men who believe that the light of knowledge is the ground of resurrectional responsibility, though they may vary as to the application of that rule" (p. 457); or, as expressed on the cover of the same number, "those who admit that God can and will raise knowing rebels, but who hesitate as to the degree of knowledge necessary to make a man a knowing rebel." This does not correctly represent the point at issue between the Editor and that class whom he represents as saying, "Reject the company of every man who is uncertain as to the resurrection of unbaptised men who know the truth." The question as to "the degree of knowledge" among the unbaptised has not, as far as we are aware, been a bone of contention. The point is this, that if it be right to withdraw from brethren in London who decline to say that unbaptised rejectors will be raised to judgment, consistency requires with-

drawal from brethren everywhere else who likewise decline to so affirm. This principle was followed in previous controversies, viz., immortal resurrection, the free-life heresy and inspiration—and hence sincere logical brethren ask why it is not followed now? It is apparently, according to announcement, to be adopted in Canada and the United States, but not in Britain. There are ecclesias in this country which contain those who not only decline to affirm resurrection out of Christ, but who do not believe it; and yet with these *The Christadelphian* is in full co-operation.

*The Christadelphian Advocate* for September and October contains an interesting account of a Lecturing visit to Virginia by the Editor, Bro. T. Williams. Among the incidents recorded is a brief conversation on fellowship at Lanesville. Answers were given to two questions from Dr. L. Edwards, a brother old in years and of long standing in the Truth:—

"What do you consider is the present status of things as regards fellowship between you and Bro. Roberts?" Ans. "So far as I am concerned it is what it was when we last met here in Lanesville. But how it is with him I do not know." "But how about the responsibility and Adamic condemnation question?" "The responsibility question I do not regard as interfering with fellowship; and while I believed he was, under the stress of adverse circumstances, inexcusably brought on, perhaps, and by conflict with one worthy of his steel, driven off the ground of the truth on Adamic condemnation, he seems to have been trying to right himself in his writings ever since; and though he does not confess it, it is enough so far as I am concerned." (Oct. p. 295-6.)

It is quite true that Bro. Roberts has, for some months past, "been trying to right himself in his writings;" and he has succeeded in regard to Christ's sacrifice, as we have, on several occasions shown. But he has not yet righted himself on the present freedom of Christ's brethren from Adamic condem-

nation as a matter of alienation. Only in March last he ridiculed it. This means the continued denial that baptism into Christ is a justification from inherited sin. Is this a matter of little or no importance? Consider it for a moment. Christ was justified by his death and resurrection—apart from his immortalisation—from his inherited sin: believers who are baptised into that death are therefore justified from inherited sin. Baptism is the only ceremony provided for such justification. To deny that it has this efficacy is to reject God's plan for man's—to substitute a religious falsehood for a Bible truth. The use of "strange fire" by Nadab and Abihu incurred Divine wrath (Lev. x. 1, 2) and if any of the priests had used a strange "laver" God would likewise have been angry. A baptism into Christ which forgives individual "wicked works," but does not justify from inherited sin, is not in accord with Apostolic teaching, and therefore it is a "strange" baptism. How do those stand who persist in the advocacy of such a "strange doctrine?" And what is the position of those who allow themselves to be associated with it? These are questions which we trust will be carefully pondered.

*The Christadelphian* for October contains some further statements—in harmony with those quoted in previous numbers—on inherited defilement, and Christ's relationship thereto. Writing on "The law of Moses" the editor says:—

"The ashes of a slain heifer applied to a man defiled by death was a curing of death by death. This is precisely what has happened in the anti-type: Christ, "through death," destroyed that, having "the power of death, that is, the devil." (Heb. ii. 14). How could he do this if he had not in himself the power of death to destroy by dying? He has destroyed death. But in whom? In himself alone as yet. Believers will obtain the benefit of incorporation with him at the resurrection: but, at the present time, the victory is limited to himself. The

fact is plain to everyone. Some who admire Christ are horror-struck at the idea of his having been a partaker of the Adamic condemned nature—a nature defiled by death because of sin. Their horror is due wholly to too great a confinement of view. They fix their attention on the idea of “defilement,” without remembering that the defilement was undertaken expressly with a view to removal. We must have God’s revealed object in view. The power of death was there that it might be destroyed. If it was not there it could not be destroyed. This is the mischief of what may be truly called the Papal view. By denying that Jesus came in the very dying flesh of Adam, it changes the character of the death of Christ, turning it either into a martyrdom or to a punishing of the innocent for the guilty: instead of being what it is revealed to have been—a declaration of the righteousness of God that He might be just while the justifier of those who have faith in it for the forgiveness of their sins (Rom. iii. 24-26).

“The mischief of this lies in its mental effects. Reconciliation with God, with a view to worship and everlasting communion, is based on a right discernment of his ways. A wrong idea of God’s objects would unfit a man to be an acceptable worshipper, for God finds pleasure in our worship only in proportion as we recognise our mutual relations. This is in fact the difference between one class of mankind and another, as revealed in all that has been written. A man who comes to Him with the idea that he has a right to be heard and to be saved, because his sins have been compounded for substitutionally in the death of Christ, as one man may satisfy the debts of another, is not in the frame of mind that is acceptable to Him. We must recognise that “grace reigns through righteousness” (Rom. v. 21) and that we are forgiven, not because another has been punished for our sins, but because we recognise this righteousness in the operation that put the Lord to death for the declaration of that righteousness and in

condemnation of sin; in the flesh (Rom. iii. 25; viii. 3).

“It is because these principles are involved that John laid such stress on the necessity for believing that Jesus Christ had “come in the flesh.” He directed the brethren to refuse association with any man who denied this (II. John 8 to 10; I. John iv. 3). True it is that the interdict related in the apostolic age to a class who maintained that the life and suffering of Christ were apparent only, not real; but the objection that lies against that doctrine lies equally against the doctrine that it was a life and death in immaculate flesh; for, in relation to the nature of man, that would have been as much only a seeming life and death as the other, and as effectually hides the real aims of the life and death of Christ in the flesh. It is God’s object in the case that constitutes the essence of the matter, and these are as much stultified by the death of an immaculate Christ as the seeming death of a seeming Christ; for if he were what the immaculationists maintain, there could be no condemnation of sin in the flesh, and no declaration of the righteousness of God, in his death” (pp. 388-9).

The statement in the first part of these extracts, that Christ has destroyed death in himself alone, needs supplementing. It is true as regards incorruptibility of body, but there is a sense in which death is destroyed in relation to Christ’s brethren. They have already partaken of the death by which death can alone be cured. Hence it is said that they have been “made free from the law of sin and death” (Rom. viii. 2) and that “death” is theirs. “All things are yours; whether . . . the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come” (I. Cor. iii. 22). This is not a freedom which necessarily keeps them out of the grave, but, if they enter, it ensures their release.

---

## Misdirected Zeal.

---

Since our last number a further and larger pamphlet has issued from Kilmarnock. It is entitled “The Responsi-

bility Question as affecting Fellowship.” About half of it is occupied by Dr. L. B. Welsh, the other contributions being

from Bro. Samuel B. Williams, Plymouth; M'Nellie, Toronto; A. Sloop, Plymouth; Atkins, Horrabridge; Edwin J. Peline, Plymouth; Livingston, Kingseat; Robert Hossie, Hamilton; Millar, Glasgow; M'Dougall, Cumnock; and T. Haining, Cumnock.

Writing evidently of "The Blood of the Covenant," Dr. Welsh says, "The whole scheme is either true or false. It must stand or fall as a whole. No one, in all the battles waged against it thus far, has been able to convict the chief advocate of the scheme of inconsistency in the various elements, or parts, that enter into it to make up the scheme as a whole. He stands impregnable in that respect, thus far" (p. 1).

This is a candid admission. Dr. Welsh apparently perceives the consistency of confining Resurrection to those in Christ on the basis of their inherited sin being atoned for at Baptism; but, as he objects to the conclusion he rejects the basis for it. In other words he denies that inherited sin is the subject of atonement by baptism into Christ. This is regrettable.

On one point it is necessary to correct Dr. Welsh. He says that "Bro. Andrew, a few years ago, thought he saw in the types, and symbols, and shadows of the law, a form of teaching, out of which he has constructed a rule of Divine procedure, or action, respecting the responsible relations of enlightened man to a future judgment" (p. 6). In *The Blood of the Covenant* the types of the law do not constitute the main argument; they are only used to illustrate it. The main argument is, that because Christ was raised from the dead through His shed blood, therefore His brethren will be raised through that blood: before baptism they were under "the law of sin and death," and their bodies were unclean, but after baptism they are under "the law of the spirit of life," and their bodies are "holy."

"On my part," writes Dr. Welsh, "I reject the case he has constructed out of the types, and symbols, and shadows of the Law." This is not the position of the Editor of *The Christadelphian*; for in his articles on "The Law of Moses" his teaching in regard to them is substantially the same as in *The Blood of the Covenant*.

On the question of fellowship Dr. Welsh censures the Editor of *The Christadelphian*:—"I think his attitude is a

serious blunder . . . Convenience and numbers are coveted by Bro. Roberts' attitude, but is it also true as to *purity* of doctrine and fellowship? Alas, no it is not!" His attitude is subsequently described as "a miserable mix," and one which Dr. Welsh does "not understand." Some other of the contributors also attack it, and, we are bound to say, with consistent reasoning. If their premises be granted their conclusions must follow. If the resurrection of enlightened rejectors be a first principle—as some contend—it is quite clear that it should be made a test of fellowship; if it cannot be made a test of fellowship it is not a first principle. *The Christadelphian*, three years ago, defined its denial to be a departure from the Truth, and endorsed withdrawal from those in London who had declined to affirm it. This conveyed the impression that withdrawal would be recommended from all others who declined to affirm it. But, instead of this, the position of neutrals, doubters, and those afraid to be positive is palliated. We are not, therefore, surprised at a practical protest from some whose convictions and zeal are equally strong. We wish we could compliment them on knowledge equally sound. One of their sheet anchors is that they have always held their present belief, and that they obtained it from Dr. Thomas. This is substantially what the upholders of "orthodoxy" say in regard to immortal-soulism, the Trinity, and other errors: they always believed these doctrines because taught by "good men" for ages. When the Bible doctrine on the nature of man, under the name of "Life in Christ," was introduced to the Protestant world about half a century ago, it met with strenuous opposition on the ground that it prevented the eternal torment of the wicked.

And now, when the Bible teaching on Resurrection through baptism into Christ's death is presented, it is rejected because it interferes with the resurrection to judgment of enlightened rejectors. In the one case the eternal torment of the wicked was considered of more importance than immortality through Christ's death and resurrection; and in the other the supposed necessity for inflicting the "second death" on unbaptised believers blinds the mind to the Bible truth that the resurrection of just and unjust is through Christ's shed blood. We do not say that the Resurrec-

tion question is of equal importance with the bestowal of immortality; nevertheless it has its place as an essential item in the plan of redemption. If no provision had been made for Resurrection, it is obvious that the offer of immortality would have been of no use to any who die. It is quite certain that no provision was made for Resurrection by "the law of sin and death." It therefore became necessary to provide for it by means of some other law. This has been done through "the law of the spirit of life." The process of passing from the first law to the second involves the execution of the penalty—in the person of Christ—due to the violation of "the law of sin and death." Without this, the bestowal of immortality would have been impossible: in that case there could have been no tribunal related to immortality; and, as a consequence, no resurrection to appear before such a tribunal. We do not say there could have been no raising from the dead for any purpose, but none for the purpose specified. Thus the same law which provided for the bestowal of immortality provided for releasing from the grave all who, before dying, had been probationers for eternal life.

In each case the Wisdom of God is shown to be superior to that of man. Immortal-soulists represent immortality as bestowed by a mere exercise of creative skill; whereas God's method is to give it for faith and obedience. Believers in resurrection out of Christ—whether universal or limited—confine the raising of the dead to Christ's judgment-seat to an exercise of re-creative power: whereas God bases it on the execution of the penalty due to sin, and the opening of the way to immortality. Man says, God will raise the dead simply because He has the power: but God says, "I will raise the dead in Christ because they have been justified from the sin which brought death." As the moral is higher than the physical, so much superior is God's wisdom in this matter to man's.

This truth is a ray of Bible "Light," and its exposition brings to the brethren of Christ a certain amount of responsibility. They who act wisely will carefully examine the subject in all its bearings, and not allow prejudice or preconceived belief to blind their minds, as many have done in regard to other rays of Bible Light.

## Unsound Reasoning.

In our last number we intimated that we might have something to say in reference to certain "Seven Reasons" issued from Plymouth. These "Reasons"—since embodied in the Kilmarnock pamphlet on Fellowship—are as follows:—

### SEVEN REASONS

Why a belief in the resurrectional responsibility of enlightened rejectors of God's truth should be made a test of fellowship.

I. Because the entrance of God's word gives light Ps. cxix. 130, and Jesus declares that light is the ground of condemnation Jno. iii. 19. Whereas the non-responsibility theory transfers the ground of condemnation from "Light" to obedience, which is unscriptural.

II. Because the non-responsibility theory makes the restoration to mortal life depend

upon a connection with Christ, which the Scriptures clearly disprove.—I. Kings xvii. 21., II. Kings iv. 35., II. Kings xiii. 21.

III. Because the Scriptures declare that God is just and equal in all his ways Ezek. xviii. ch.; whereas the non-responsibility theory makes him unequal; for it makes God the punisher of those who attempt to obey him, while it affirms that he takes no notice of those who wilfully refuse to submit to his first command.

IV. Because the Bible teaches that Baptism is atonement and justification and not condemnation, inasmuch as Christ did not die to judge but to save men. Baptism is therefore a burial into his death unto salvation; whereas the non-responsibility theory makes this attainment of reconciliation the means for the infliction of condemnation.

V. Because the Bible declares that at

*Baptism we are forgiven our past sins Acts ii. 38. But the non-responsibility theory makes man irresponsible until he performs that act, and so it nullifies God's word: for if a man who has received the light of the Gospel be irresponsible until he is immersed—as this theory affirms—then he has nothing to be forgiven at Baptism, as nothing is held against him so long as he keeps outside the baptismal waters.*

*VI. Because Paul recognized and preached "the terror of the Lord" II. Cor. v. 11, and "Judgment to come" Acts xxiv. 25, even to those outside Christ. Whereas, if the disobedient escape responsibility by making their disobedience sufficiently thorough—as the non-responsibility theory would have us believe they do—then there is no terror in their doctrine to preach to those outside Christ, and the proclamation of the truth in these latter days would be other than Paul's.*

*VII. Because the Ecclesia of God is the pillar and stay of the truth I. Tim. iii. 15. and if the non-responsibility theory be admitted we should fellowship error and thereby cease to be the ecclesia of the living God which upholds the truth only.*

(Signed) SAMUEL R. WILLIAMS.

These "seven reasons" are plausible, but illogical. Let us briefly look at them.

I. The statement that "light is the ground of condemnation," or, to be more accurate, the ground of responsibility, is a reasonable one. But, like all sound principles, care must be taken as to its application. In the circumstances which gave rise to the words of Christ (John iii. 19) they had great force. They were spoken to a Jew who had come to Jesus "by night" (ver. 2), in reference to those Jews who "loved darkness rather than light." What was the position of such? They were "nigh" to God (Eph. ii. 17)—a relationship which implies that the breach under which they were born had been healed. This favour brought them "profit"—"because that unto them were committed the oracles of God" (Rom. iii. 1, 2). As custodians of the Divine oracles they were under an obligation to believe and defend the teaching thereof. Among other truths, those oracles taught that a Divine "law-giver" would spring from Judah (Gen. xlix. 10); that God would raise up a prophet like unto Moses, from their midst, and that whosoever—of the Jews

—did not hearken to him, God would "require it of him" (Dent. xviii. 15, 19). They further taught that a righteous one consumed with "zeal" for God would die of a "broken heart" (Ps. lxxix. 9, 20); that the "arm of the Lord" would be "bruised for" their "iniquities" (Isa. liii. 1, 5); and that at the end of "seventy weeks" of years the "Messiah" would be "cut off" (Dan. ix. 26). Upon the fulfilment of these promises depended the ratification of the many sacrifices offered up under the Mosaic Covenant (Heb. ix. 15). To reject Jesus of Nazareth was, therefore, to deny these promises and thereby make void the inspired writings of Moses and the prophets; moreover, it set aside the testimony of John the Baptist, and of the Holy Spirit at Christ's baptism. In clinging to the Mosaic law and denying the Divine Mission of Jesus Christ, the Jews substituted atonement by shadow for atonement by substance. All this from a people so highly favoured by God as to have been constituted His wife (Ezek. xvi. 8-14; Isa. l. 1; lxii. 4), merited exceptional punishment. It is the privileges enjoyed by the Jews which give such point to the condemnation pronounced by Christ for rejecting His words; *no Gentiles out of Christ were ever so privileged.*

II. It is not correct to say that "the non-responsibility theory makes the restoration to mortal life depend upon a connection with Christ"; it is resurrection to Christ's judgment-seat that "the non-responsibility theory makes" to "depend upon a connection with Christ." The two things are not synonymous. The restorations to mortal life recorded in the Books of Kings had nothing to do with judgment for a future life, and therefore have no bearing upon the question. The Spirit in Paul evidently deemed them of no value as proofs of the resurrection of the dead, or they would surely have been used in inspiring the Apostle's argumentative appeal to the Corinthians. They are not even mentioned, and the argument used expressly excludes them. In brief it is this:

- A. If Christ be not raised, those "asleep in Christ" will not be raised:
- B. Christ was raised; therefore those asleep in Him will be raised.

From this it is evident that the re-

urrection of Christ and His dead brethren—just and unjust—is based upon the same principle; and when we ask for that principle we find it in Heb. xiii. 20:—Christ was raised “through the blood of the everlasting covenant”; therefore his brethren will be raised through that blood.

III. It is a distortion to say that “the non-responsibility theory makes God the punisher of those who attempt to obey Him”; it makes Him the punisher of Christ’s judgment-seat of those only who vow to obey Him, but afterwards disobey Him. Neither is it true to say that, according to “the non-responsibility theory,” God “takes no notice of those who wilfully refuse to submit to His first command.” Not in the least does it circumscribe Divine punitive action in this life—on those either in complete darkness or more or less enlightened. And so far from attributing injustice to God it vindicates His perfect justice; for it represents Him as bringing before a tribunal arising out of “the law of the Spirit of life” those only who have been under that law. Whereas the resurrection of a third-class theory represents God as inflicting the punishment pertaining to that law on those who were never under it.

IV. *Confusion* is the best description of the fourth “Reason.” It says that “Baptism is atonement and justification, and not condemnation.” Baptism being a symbol of Christ’s death, its meaning is necessarily governed by the object of that death. It will not, we presume, be denied that God, in sparing not His Son, “condemned sin in the flesh,” and that thereby “our old man was crucified” (Rom. viii. 3; vi. 6). To be “baptised into Christ” is to be “baptised into His death”; hence, the Apostle refers to this ceremony when he says, “I have been crucified with Christ” (Gal. ii. 20, R.V.). Now, if condemnation of sin be an element of Christ’s literal crucifixion, it must also be an element of His brethren’s symbolic crucifixion. The death of Christ was the literal execution of the penalty due for sin—an event which was necessary in order that God “might be just” (Rom. iii. 26). He who is baptised into Christ’s death necessarily partakes of the execution of that penalty, and thereby God becomes “the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus” (ver. 26). The condemnation of sin is complete as

soon as death takes place; but justification from sin requires restoration to life. Hence the statement that Christ was “delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification” (Rom. iv. 25). Inasmuch as baptism includes both “the likeness of Christ’s death” and “the likeness of His resurrection” (Rom. vi. 5), it must embrace both condemnation and justification.

The concluding part of “Reason” IV. implies that those who confine the resurrection to the dead in Christ, do not believe in Baptism as a means “unto Salvation,” but only “the means for the infliction of condemnation.” The author of the “Seven Reasons” may repudiate any such intention, but no other construction can be put upon his language. It would be just as pertinent and purposeless for us to say that he makes Light the means for the infliction of condemnation, whereas the Bible teaches that Light is the means for attaining Salvation.

V. The argument that if a man be “irresponsible until he is immersed . . . he has nothing to be forgiven at Baptism,” is a fallacious one. This will be seen by following it to its logical conclusion. It implies that the only sins requiring forgiveness at baptism are sins for which a man is responsible to the judgment-seat of Christ. If this be true, one of two things necessarily follows:—

- A. That a man is responsible for sins committed in darkness; or
- B. That there are no sins committed in darkness needing to be forgiven at baptism.

The author of the “Seven Reasons” cannot consistently accept A, because it conflicts with his contention that responsibility begins with the entrance of light; and if he endorses B he places himself in conflict with Jesus Christ’s instructions to Saul of Tarsus to go to the Gentiles “to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins” (Acts xxvi. 18). The sins to be forgiven were obviously committed when the Gentiles were in “darkness” and under “the power of Satan”; and yet they were not responsible for them. Consequently non-responsibility before baptism does not “nullify God’s word” by teaching that there are no sins to be forgiven at baptism.

VI. To quote II. Cor. v. 11 as proof of Paul preaching to the unconverted the terrors of Christ's judgment-seat is to violate the context. The tenth verse reads, "We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ: that everyone may receive the things in (or through) body, according to that he hath done, whether good or bad." It is on the basis of this truth that the Apostle says in the eleventh verse, "Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord we persuade men." The "terror of the Lord" is obviously that referred to in the previous verse, and it is directed against those in Christ who do "bad things." Therefore the Apostle endeavoured to "persuade men." What men? Men out of Christ? How could the terrors in store for unfaithful ones in Christ be a reason for persuading unbaptised Gentiles to enter into Christ? The inspired Apostle was not guilty of anything so illogical. The "men" whom he endeavoured to "persuade" were the men "in Christ" (ver. 17), constituting the "we all" who are to "appear before the judgment seat of Christ."

Before Paul's speech to Felix can be adduced as evidence of the resurrection of unbaptised believers it is necessary to prove two things:

1st, That at that time there was no "judgment to come" other than Christ's judgment-seat.

2nd, That there was nothing which could make Felix "tremble," but the fear of appearing at that judgment-seat.

At present these points are assumed. The narrative is, in fact, treated in the same way as certain well-known passages by the advocates of immortal-soulism; the cherished idea is first put in and then follows an exclamation of triumph, "Behold the proof."

VII. The validity of this Reason depends upon those which have preceded it. If they embody Bible truth then its adherents would "fellowship error" in co-operating with such as deny it. But the alleged truth has not been proved, and therefore—to put it mildly—it is a false step to make it "a test of Fellowship."

---

## Our Letter Box.

---

### THE SPIRIT'S OPERATIONS.

U., referring to the article in the June number, entitled "In the Spirit," asks whether we mean on page 4, "that the Spirit operates and dictates apart from the Word as in the case of Paul and Timothy when they were going to Bithynia."

Our meaning is that the Work of the Truth is not the result only of the written Word, but that the Spirit is behind it and operates in conjunction with it and by means of it. The Spirit does not now dictate, in the sense of inspiring—as in the case of the Prophets and Apostles. But it brings the Word to bear on one and another for their enlightenment, and guides their efforts in making known the light of the Word. Acts xvi. 6 records that Paul and Timothy "were forbidden of the Holy Spirit to preach the Word in Asia," but verse 7 does not report the dictation of any such message. It simply says that "the

Spirit suffered them not"—a statement quite compatible with invisible control, without speech. Apparently the preventive act recorded by the inspired historian in verse 7 was the consequence of the interdict mentioned in verse 6. It may have been rendered necessary through Paul and Timothy not understanding Bithynia to be embraced in the forbidden district.

Although there is now no such forbidding by the Spirit there must be imperceptible control as to where the light of the Word shall shine and where not. It must be as true now as in Apostolic times that "God" gives "the increase" (I. Cor. iii. 6); for this statement implies that where He does not act there is no fruit from planting and watering by His sons. "Of his own will begat He us with the word of truth" (Jas. i. 18); and that word is not only "quick and powerful" but "a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart"

(Heb. iv. 12). The Word in a written form cannot "discern the thoughts," but the personal Word can; hence it is of this personal Word that we read in the next verse, "All things are naked and opened unto the eyes of Him with whom we have to do" (ver. 13).

The written Word is "like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces" (Jer. xxiii. 29). Why? Because there is a Divine power behind it carrying it into effect. Thus the written Word says, prophetically, that "the sixth angel poured out his vial upon the great river Euphrates, and the water thereof was dried up" (Rev. xvi. 12). Was this written because God foresaw that a conjunction of human events would bring about the drying up of the symbolic Euphrates? Certainly not. It was written because God purposed, by the unseen exercise of His power, to effect the result described. How is this done but by the Spirit and by Spirit-Messengers? If this be necessary to "prepare the way of the kings of the east," is it not equally necessary in the process of providing those "kings?"

When Paul was at Philippi, in Macedonia—to which he had been called by a vision—he was listened to by Lydia, "whose heart the Lord opened that she attended unto the things that were spoken of Paul" (Acts xvi. 14). This is an illustration of Paul planting and God giving the increase. Lydia was not enlightened by the Spirit direct, but her mind was so influenced that she listened to the Apostle's proclamation of the Spirit's word.

The Apostolic predictions that some of Christ's brethren will be "alive" at the second appearing, and "not sleep" (1. Thess. iv. 15; 1. Cor. xv. 51), require the preparation of a number from the world to be received by Christ. It cannot be that this is left to chance, or to the operation of the written Word only. When God gives a prediction He provides what is requisite for its fulfillment. The written Word is essential to the preparation of a Divine people, but it needs accompanying, or supplementing, by the unseen agency of the Spirit.

The 119th Psalm is an uninterrupted magnifying of the inspired Word:—"Thy word have I hid in mine heart, that I might not sin against thee" (ver. 11); "I have more understanding than my teachers, for thy testimonies are my meditation" (ver. 99); "Through

thy precepts I get understanding" (ver. 104); "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet" (ver. 105). And yet what do we find the righteous speaker represented as saying? "Teach me thy statutes" (ver. 12); "Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of Thy law" (ver. 18); "Teach me, O Lord, the way of Thy statutes" (ver. 33); "Give me understanding, and I shall keep Thy law" (ver. 34); "Give me understanding that I may learn Thy commandments" (ver. 73). If everything in the inspired Word could be learned without Divine aid those petitions would have no meaning. It was predicted of David's greater Son that "the Spirit of the Lord" would "make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord" (Isa. xi. 3). That which was effected in the Head of the One Body can be produced in its members. Although, in their case, "wisdom," "understanding," "counsel," and "knowledge" are not required to the same extent—for the responsibility is not so great—these qualifications are nevertheless, in a subordinate degree, both useful and necessary. Hence the exhortation, "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God that giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him" (Jas. i. 5). A direct request to God for wisdom does not supersede the necessity for "reading" and meditating on the Word as enjoined in 1. Tim. iv. 13 to 15. The two should go hand in hand. It is very easy for God to open up one portion of His Word by directing the mind to some other portion, or to give a clearer perception of the wisdom embodied in any passage. This is far from Divine inspiration, and yet may be described as the unseen operation of the Spirit in preparing the sons of God for future exaltation.

#### CHRIST'S BROKEN BODY.

Our attention has been directed by V. to the fact that the Revised Version omits the word "broken" from 1. Cor. xi. 24, rendering it, "This is My body, which is for you." True, but in the margin the Revisers say, "Many ancient authorities read, *is broken for you.*" Dean Alford says, "Some MSS. supply *given*, some *broken*, but the most ancient have no word." Some think that the word "broken" is wholly inadmissible because it is recorded that the soldiers "brake not His legs," thereby fulfilling

the Scripture, "He keepeth all His bones; not one of them is broken" (Ps. xxiv. 20). This reason is insufficient; the body may be broken though the bones be not. In the highly figurative description of death in Eccles. 12 chap. the word "broken" is used three times in reference to the vital organs (ver. 6); and was it not predicted that Christ's "heart" would be "broken" by "reproach" (Ps. lxxix. 20)? The soldier who "pierced" Christ's heart did not break it; he merely let out the "blood and water" already there as the result of the heart-breaking. The heart being the fountain, as it were, of the body's existence, the breaking of the heart is, in effect, the breaking of the body. Hence we have, in Christ's "broken" heart the foundation of the expressions "brake bread" and "breaking of bread."

CHRIST'S BAPTISM.

Referring to the remarks in our last number (p. 35), Bro. G. C. Harvey writes to say that "there is no testimony anywhere to show that the baptism of Christ was a justification ceremony; the reason of his baptism was, as John tells us, 'that He should be made manifest to Israel.' This is an all-sufficient reason."

The evidence on this point is to be found in the fact that Christ's baptism was a symbol of his death:—"I have a baptism to be baptised and how am I straitened till it be accomplished" (Luke xii. 50). To describe the Crucifixion as a "baptism" is to connect it with the ceremony in the Jordan. Consequently that which was accomplished

permanently by his death, was effected provisionally by his baptism. He was "purified" with his own "sacrifice" (Heb. ix. 23), and therefore "by his own blood" he was "brought again from the dead" and "entered in once into the holy place" (Heb. xiii. 20; ix. 12.) This shows—not that Christ was a sinner in a moral sense but—that he was so under the power of sin as to need redeeming from it by sacrifice. The baptism of John was clearly a justifying ceremony for the Jews who submitted to it, and therefore it must have been so for Christ, though not for personal acts as in their case. But, says Bro. Harvey, we have represented the declaration of the Father after Christ came out of the Water as His justification by Spirit, and so in that case He must have been justified by Spirit twice. Not so; His baptism was a ceremonial justification, but the Father's expression of approval was a spoken justification. The latter was based upon the former, and was indeed the consequence of it; they are two aspects of the same thing.

The manifestation of Christ to Israel is not given as the reason for Christ's baptism, but for John "baptising with water" (John i. 31). That is, it was one reason; but it was not the only object, for John's baptism cleansed the Jews who submitted to it. The baptism of Christ was not, in itself, sufficient to "manifest" Christ to Israel; it needed supplementing by the descent of the Holy Spirit. Hence the declaration to John, "Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is He" (Jno. i. 33).

Within the Holy Place.

BRISTOL.

The small school here had an outdoor treat September 15th.

JERSEY (CHANNEL ISLES).

The following report appeared in the *Jersey Times* of September 14th, 1897:—

"An address on the subject, 'Why the

Christadelphians abstain from singing and praying at their evening meetings, was delivered on Sunday evening in the meeting room, 21, Grove Place. The speaker said, doubtless the Christadelphians were the only community in Jersey who did not pray and sing in mixed assemblies. Their belief being

opposite to the surrounding religious systems, it followed that an invitation to participate with them in these acts *should* be resented by such as could not endorse the doctrines embodied in their songs and prayers. Apart from this, Christadelphians believed that no person, however moral and religious, could be considered a worshipper of Jehovah until he was delivered from the racial condemnation under which he was born, and became personally reconciled to God. The typical arrangements of the Tabernacle and Temple under the Mosaic dispensation taught this fact, for the Holy of Holies represented heaven, into which only the great High Priest—(Jesus)—could enter. The holy place typified the saints who alone had access to worship, while the outer court of the Gentiles pointed to the fact that those not of spiritual Israel were debarred from access. In this dispensation the items necessary to constitute a worshipper of Jehovah were (1) Belief of the things concerning the Kingdom of God; (2) Knowledge of those things which relate to Jesus anointed; (3) Induction into Christ's name by baptism in water for the remission of sins.

## LEAMINGTON.

We, the undersigned, heartily believe:

1. That Christ by His death was cleansed from His own sin-nature, which came by condemnation in Adam, and that we being buried into His death by baptism must likewise partake of that justification from the condemnation that came upon all, as well as being forgiven our own personal sins.

2. That resurrection and appearance at the judgment-seat of Christ are for the receipt of rewards and punishments by those only who have come under law to God.

3. That it is necessary to sever ourselves from those who deny or hold loosely the truth expressed in par. 1.

4. That the basis of faith published and held by the Ecclesia meeting at Barnsbury Hall, London, is in entire accordance with Divine Truth.

JOHN HUDSON,  
WM. COLLEDGE,  
WILLIAM Y. LANGLEY,  
(Brethren).  
EMMA COLLEDGE (Sister).

## LIVERPOOL.

MONTPELLIER ASSEMBLY ROOMS, 75 and 77, Granby Street.

Since our last report Bro. Lunt and Sis. Burton, of Southport, have expressed a wish to be in fellowship with us, and finding them to be of our mind doctrinally we have gladly complied.

We have also, for the same reason, extended the right hand of fellowship to the ecclesia at Preston, hitherto numbered with those who are astray on the Inspiration question. At a special meeting, at which three of our brethren were present, they decided to take up the same position as ourselves. Since then one of our number visits Preston to lecture every fortnight.

HENRI KOSTROVITZKI.

## LONDON (NORTH).

BARNSBURY HALL, Barnsbury Street, Islington, N.

During the quarter we have been cheered by the addition to the household of faith of Mr. F. Volkmann, formerly Baptist, who was immersed into Christ on September 29th.

We have just completed a special effort in the Public Hall, Wood Green, a northern suburb, where Brethren J. J. Andrew, R. H. Ford, and W. Owler delivered lectures dealing with interesting and important topics connected with the one faith. The attendance of strangers was of an encouraging character.

During the quarter the lectures have been delivered by Brethren Andrew, Blay, Bore, Ford, Overton, W. Owler, and J. Owler.

On Monday, October 18th, we held our usual tea meeting. The subject for the evening was "New Things of Great Value," and short addresses were given on New-born Babies; the New Man; the New Heavens and the New Earth; the New Song of the Redeemed; the Spirit's New Name; and the New Jerusalem. A very profitable evening was spent, and we were pleased to have with us Bro. Whitehead of New Romney.

JNO. OWLER,  
Recording Brother.

## LONDON (SOUTH), PECKHAM.

CHEPSTOW HALL, Peckham Road, S.E.,  
Sundays, 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.

We have great pleasure in reporting the immersion into Christ, on October

17th, of Miss Wilhelmina Adela Petersen (formerly neutral), daughter of our Bro. and Sis. Petersen, who are now meeting with us.

We feel it necessary to take advantage of this opportunity to explain why we have left the Camberwell Ecclesia and are now meeting in the above hall.

Early in the year the Camberwell Ecclesia condemned the Barnsbury Hall Ecclesia for false teaching, and, in August, decided by a small majority to rescind its own Basis of Fellowship and adopt the Birmingham Basis. This was avowedly to secure a wider circle of fellowship, which was not possible so long as their Basis contained the following clause:—

"That resurrection affects only those who have been justified from the condemnation arising out of Adam's sin."

This clause was adopted in October, 1894, but since then some of the presiding Brethren have changed their belief on baptism into Christ being a justification from condemnation in Adam; thus it was deemed advisable to get rid of the above clause. In these circumstances many of us had scruples about remaining. Therefore, when events came to a crisis, 24 of us decided to withdraw that we might not be implicated in such an unscriptural position. Since then our numbers have risen to 28.

The following Brethren have lectured during the quarter:—

Brethren Jones, Hookham, and Richards, and we have also had the pleasure of visits and lectures from Brethren Andrew, Ford, W. and J. Owler, Whitehead, and Wyatt.

H. C. RAMSDEN,  
Recording Brother.

#### NEW ROMNEY.

It is somewhat disheartening to have report after report to forward you without the pleasure of informing you of any increase to our numbers. But, we do not lose faith; oh no. We consider all the circumstances by which we are surrounded, and still persevere, knowing that it is always in our Heavenly Father's hands, the giving of increase. Some of the brethren who have seen and know our poor Sister Trowell, will learn with sorrow that she still lingers, suffering from a malignant open cancer, and the last sleep is earnestly desired.

If any could help with medicated lint or soft rags it would be esteemed.

I am, for the third time since our sojourn here (over 17 years), giving a course of lectures on the Apocalypse, taking the whole book. The brethren much appreciate the lectures so given, as those who realise that it is their duty as the "servants" of Jesus Christ to learn all that they possibly can concerning God's last wonderful message.

W. WHITEHEAD,  
Recording Brother.

#### NORTHAMPTON.

TEMPERANCE HALL LODGE ROOM.

Sundays, 11 and 6.30; Thursdays, 8.

Lectures during the quarter have been given by Brethren J. J. Andrew, R. Ford, W. Owler, C. Blay, and R. Overton, of London, and Brethren T. E. Boddington, G. Handley, W. Trusler, and A. E. Thorneloe of this ecclesia.

A. E. THORNELOE.

#### PORTSMOUTH.

LECTURE ROOM, Co-operative Stores, Besant Road, Fratton.

We are pleased to announce that during the quarter our ecclesia has been increased by the admission to membership of the following brethren who were formerly members of that company here represented by the *Christadelphian*, viz., Brethren Jessop, Snelgrove, Andrews, and Saunders, and Sisters Snelgrove, Harris, Cox, Welsford, and Saunders. On the other hand we have lost the company of Brother and Sister Kerby, who, in August, removed to Shanklin, Isle of Wight; and Brother Andrews, who, being a sick-berth steward in the Royal Navy, went on a voyage in October. Sister Harrington also, by removal to London this month, has lessened our number, which now stands at twelve. We hold our meetings at the above place every Sunday to bear witness to Divine Truth.

FRANCIS W. WYATT.

92, Sultan Road.

#### PRESTON.

We are only a small body, say, twenty in number, struggling with the Master's work amongst a very indifferent lot of humanity. Our light, which was nearly out, has been revived through the kindness and care of some brethren from Birkenhead and Liverpool, with whom we are now in fellowship. For such

timely help we are very thankful, and feel that it will enable us to look up and to spread more fully the glad tidings of the Kingdom. Bro. Burton has paid us frequent visits during the summer, and spoken in the Market. Many have shown themselves friendly to the Truth, but, as yet, none have become disciples. Brn. Kostrovitzki and Mackintosh have also visited us.

Lewis Davis, Secretary.  
29, Ruskin Street.

#### SHANKLIN, ISLE OF WIGHT.

Bro. and Sis. Kerby report that they have removed from Portsmouth to the above place, and that they meet every Sunday morning at eleven o'clock for breaking of bread. They will be glad to see any brethren of like faith travelling in that district. Address, W. A. Kerby, care of Messrs. Timothy, White, and Co., High Street, Shanklin.

#### SOUTHAMPTON.

Since the beginning of 1897 we have increased our number from five to ten. At the beginning of November, Sis. Goodman—sister in the flesh to Sisters Bull and Hart—came from Shrewsbury to stay here, and on November 12th Mr. and Mrs. Burgess put on Christ by baptism. Sis. Burgess is Sis. Bull's daughter. We have taken the Polytechnic Rooms, Hanover Buildings, and have commenced a Sunday school, which is progressing favourably. We shall be pleased to receive anyone of like faith.

F. HART.  
7, Craven Street.

#### SOUTHPORT.

This ecclesia need to consist of eight brethren and sisters. But owing to the removal of Brethren Prosser and

Cotterill, and Sisters Cotterill, Farrant, Hobson, and Jennings to other towns, Sis. Burton and myself are left in isolation. Wishing to be in fellowship with those who are sound on the responsibility question, we have cast in our lot with the ecclesia meeting in Montpelier Hall, Granby Street, Liverpool. It is specially deserving of mention that Bro. Burton, of Birkenhead, has laboured here continuously for two years, scattering the seeds of truth both by open-air and indoor lectures, and we are anticipating therefrom good results.

PETER LUNT.  
37, Derby Road.

#### SYDNEY (NEW SOUTH WALES).

Unfortunately there has been a division here. It does not appear to be due to any direct doctrinal issue, but to the conduct of ecclesial matters. Thirty-one brethren and sisters, including Brn. Wyllie and Davies, left the Leichhardt Town Hall in May last, and formed a separate ecclesia in Elswick Hall. They adopted the statement of faith of the Barnsbury Hall Ecclesia, and also its rules, with a few slight modifications to suit local requirements. On May 4th Mr. Hunt, a teacher in the Government schools, formerly neutral, was immersed; and subsequently, Mr. T. D. Hutchinson, of Dungog, a township about 150 miles from Sydney. Two additions have been made by the removal of Bro. and Sis. Vincent from Moss-vale to Sydney. Elswick Hall being in a populous working-class district the lectures are well attended. The number of brethren and sisters left at Leichhardt Town Hall is reported to be fourteen. We hope that a way may yet open for this breach to be healed, and have written to both parties to this effect.

---

[We have been compelled to omit, for want of space, "Things New and Old," by Bro. Whitehead; "Things Hard to be Understood"; and a part of "Our Letter Box." A further instalment from Bro. Wyllie on "The Manifestation of Deity" came to hand after everything else was in type; it will appear in the next number.—Ed. S.K.]

# 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. 16.

MARCH, 1898.

VOL. IV.

---

## The Manifestation of the Deity.

AN EXPOSITION OF JOHN'S GOSPEL—Chap. i., verses 1 to 14.

(Continued from page 75, Vol. III.)

Vers 10. "It was in the order."—That the Edenic Declaration of Promise was in the Israelitish "ORDER"—whereof the Spirit speaks—is proved beyond question in the sacred writings; yea, without it the ORDER would never have existed. Not only was it *therein*, as an abstract Declaration of the Deity's purpose, as originally expressed in Eden, "*in the beginning*," but, as amplified and confirmed in the *Promises* made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob—the Fathers of the Order—and further confirmed unto the Israelitish nation or JACOB for a law (Psalm cv. 10)—which law, we are told, served as a schoolmaster, to lead them unto, or give, an understanding of the nature and the work of, the Messiah, so that they might be justified by Faith in the SUBSTANCE of the things shadowed forth therein.

The Sanctuary, therefore, in their midst, which pertained *solely* to the Order as the Mediatory of the land covenant, in its construction, furniture, vessels, priests, ministers (attendants), anointing and ritual—all comprising the rudiments of the ORDER, and containing "*the form of Knowledge and of the Truth*" (Romans ii. 20)—demonstrated the Deity's conclusion of all under sin (Galatians iii. 22), and the utter inability of *unaided, unenlightened*, sinful man to work out for himself a righteousness pleasing to the Deity. This Sanctuary also shadowed forth the most minute details of the manner in which the Deity Himself, through the Seed promised in the Declaration—THE TRUE SANCTUARY—should fulfil the Declaration of Promise.

"And arising from it the order was brought into existence." The "Declaration" was the expression of the Deity's purpose to crush flesh and blood (*the devil*) through the Seed, and to become ALL AND IN ALL, according to the true significance of His memorial name YAHWEH. It is, therefore, most important that we should understand that the establishment of the Israelitish ORDER, on the basis of the Law Covenant, arose from the Declaration of

Promise, and, that the framing of the Law arrangement—THE ORDER—as the exponent of SIN, and the standard of RIGHTEOUSNESS, was absolutely essential to the fulfilment of the Deity's declared purpose therein; and further, that apart from the fulfilment of the Deity's expressed purpose, the ORDER would never have been founded. In confirmation of this, the reader will please refer to our exposition of verse 3 (SANCTUARY-KEEPER, Vol. III. pages 30-31).

The LAW given through Moses, being the foundation upon which the Israelitish Order was constituted, the establishment of the LAW was, necessarily, the birth of the Order. And in our apprehension of that which led to the imposition of the LAW, we realise that which necessitated the framing of the Order.

The Spirit, through Paul (Galatians iii. 19) shows that the LAW—meaning the Law covenant, or the ORDER compacted upon the LAW—was not (originally) an integral part of the Declaration of Promise, as amplified in the covenant made with Abraham; but, that it "was added (to the Declaration), because of transgressions (both inherited sin and personal transgression, as clearly shown by the ritual) till the Seed should come to whom the Promise was made."

The practical service of the Law—in exposing SIN, and in manifesting the Standard of RIGHTEOUSNESS essential to the fulfilling of the Declaration—is shown by the apostle's statements: "I had not known sin but through the Law:" "but sin, that it might be shown to be sin, by working death in me through that which is good; that through the commandment sin might become exceeding sinful" (Romans vii. 7 and 13). Thus, as a result of the Declaration, and an adjunct necessary to its fulfilment, the Order was brought into existence.

"And the Order did not understand it." This truth is evidently set forth in the written history of the Order. The attitude of the Nation towards the Declaration when embodied in Flesh—in the person of the Seed—is a fair sample of their ignorance of the Declaration of Promise as embodied in the Law; which written Declaration, represented Deity anterior to the manifestation of the Seed, to which time, the above statement of the Spirit relates. For them to have understood the Declaration, was to have known Deity as YAHWEH, or *I shall become*; but the Order (in the aggregate) lacked this knowledge: their condition of mind is exposed through the Prophet:—"The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib: but Israel doth not know" (Isaiah i. 3.)

Ever from the foundation of the Order, they—in their dense ignorance of the Declaration of Promise—sought to establish a righteousness of their own by the works of the Law, and thereby failed to recognise the Law as the Deity's appointed TUTOR to lead them up to the understanding of His Righteousness as embodied in the Promised Seed, so that they might be justified through the Faith in the same. No, as herein stated the Order "did not understand it."

Verse 11. "It came unto those who pertained to it" . . .

There are few verses of Scripture which have been subjected to more wresting at the hands of professedly religious people than has this one. We can understand men, whose minds are dwarfed by Trinitarianism and the pre-existence-of-Christ theory rendering it thus:—"He (Christ) came unto his own, and his own received Him not"; for it is the logical sequence to their reading Christ into the previous verses of the chapter. But, for brethren, whose minds have been illuminated by the Spirit's truth, to adopt this misapplication, regardless of the context, and, in their speeches and writings to perpetuate this TRINITARIAN, CHRONOLOGICAL BLUNDER, is, to say the least, most saddening and unedifying. True, the Order did not embrace the Declaration when embodied in flesh (verse 14), in the person of the Seed—the Messiah—yet as

proved by the context, the Spirit *does not allude* to the personified Declaration (the Messiah), but to the abstract Declaration of Promise—Deity's representative—long before it was made flesh.

We have often thought, when reading brethren's writings wherein this verse is applied to Christ, how astounded they would be could they but realise *by the light of the context* the logical issue of such an application. They would then see that if the Personal Word, THE CHRIST, be meant in verse eleven, the PERSONAL WORD, THE CHRIST, must be spoken of in the first verse as *having been in existence in the beginning*; which gross heathen error they will admit destroys the whole of the Deity's Truth. We have no alternative, therefore, but to read the sentence as written—"It came unto those who pertained to it."

That the Declaration of Promise—the Gospel, the Oracles of the Deity—solely pertained to and *came*, i.e., was committed to, the handful of people which comprised the Nation of Israel, is incomprehensible to Gentile minds, who—in their spiritual intoxication—set such a high value upon themselves as never-dying souls, &c.!

The sole possession of the Oracles of the Deity by the children of Israel was one of the chief advantages which accrued to the Nation through the *provisional* justification by Circumcision, which rite in itself—as incorporated in the Law—shadowed forth the basis upon which the Declaration should be fulfilled through the Circumcision not made with hands, in the putting off the body of the flesh of the Promised Seed—the Messiah. The Messiah, when refuting the charge of blasphemy preferred against Himself, because of His having said that he was the Son of God, incidentally refers to the privileged position of Israel *through the Word or Declaration of Promise having come to them* :—

"If He (Deity) called them *gods unto whom the word of God* (Declaration of Deity's purpose) *came*" . . . (John x. 35).

As supplemental to the truth set forth by John in his eleventh verse, that the DECLARATION which *came to Israel* pertained solely to the Israelitish order—which point should be well understood by everyone in Christ—the Apostle Paul, in his letter to his Roman brethren, speaking of his brethren according to the flesh, says :—"Who are Israelites, *to whom pertaineth (or to whom belongeth) the adoption, and the Glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the Law, and the service of God, and the Promises*" (Rom. ix. 4). Highly privileged as was the Order to have had the custody of the Declaration of Promise—the Divine Oracles—entrusted to it, yet, more glorious is the future in store for it, inasmuch as *it pertaineth to Israel* as a glorious polity established under the Messiah their King, in the Millennial Age, to be the agency, in the Deity's hand, through which the Deity's declared purpose shall be consummated.

"*And they who pertained to it did not lay hold of it*" with the exception of the few mentioned in verse 12. The Order, although related to the execution of the Deity's declared Purpose, were, through ignorance thereof, unable to embrace it.

The attitude of the Nation towards the Declaration of Promise is seen in their vile treatment of the Prophets whom Deity sent unto them, whose testimony referred solely to the fulfilment of the same.

As testified by the Spirit through Stephen, "Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Spirit : *as your fathers did so do ye*. Which of the Prophets have not your fathers persecuted? and they have slain them *which showed before of the coming of the Just One,*" &c. (Acts vii. 51, 52).

## Editorial Flyleaf.

The fourth volume is completed with this number. Readers, who desire volume five will please remit as early as convenient at the rate of two shillings per volume. Either postal orders, money orders, or stamps may be sent. When stamps are remitted halfpenny ones are preferable. Money orders may be made payable at the General Post Office, London. For the convenience of intending subscribers an order blank is enclosed in each copy of this number.

For the last three months the political world has been kept in a state of excitement and uncertainty respecting events in the Far East, which have had the effect, for the time being, of casting into the shade the complications connected with the Near East. What the outcome will yet be of a veritable Chinese puzzle it is impossible at present to say. That it will ultimately be connected with the "Eastern Question" is most probable. In describing the conquering career of "the King of the North" Daniel says, "But tidings out of the east and out of the north shall trouble him" (Dan. xii. 44). The "East" in relation to Turkey, Syria, and Northern Africa—the district in which "the King of the North" will operate—may be any part of Asia. And what more likely than that the "trouble" in "the east" will be connected with China or Japan, or both? This is a possibility which increases the significance of the European interference with the "Celestial Empire."

For some time past France has been in the throes of an agitation concerning "the Dreyfus affair." Its interest for Zion's watchmen lies principally in its relationship to the Jews. A few years ago Dreyfus was an officer in the French

army, but he was deprived of his position and transported to a barren isle, on the charge of having communicated some secret information to Germany. His trial took place in secret, and therefore the exact evidence is unknown. Quite lately, another French soldier—Esterhazy—has been suspected to be the real culprit; but after a trial—likewise in secret—he was acquitted. This, instead of quieting the public mind, stimulated it. Socialists and extreme Republicans saw in these secret trials a danger to every family having a father or a son in the army; and therefore they demanded publication of the evidence. On the other hand the Anti-Semites took the opportunity of stirring up the widespread antipathy to the Jews—to which race Dreyfus belongs. This antipathy has been increasingly manifested during the past ten or twelve years, and to this is attributed the treatment of Dreyfus. Someone had to be sacrificed to the Anti-Semitic feeling, and he was, apparently, the most suitable victim. The *Spectator*, in a recent article on the matter, points out how easily the present state of things may develop into revolution. If the property of the Jews be attacked the Government must defend it; for this they will require the services of the army; if the army share the popular antipathy to the Jews, it may refuse; if it does, there will be social anarchy; and if it consents to fire, its generals will be masters of the situation. From anarchy to a personal rule—military or civilian—is but a step to the restoration of the Monarchy—a form of government which would be much more acceptable to Russia than a Republic. Such a change would doubtless cement the Franco-Russian alliance, and make it easier for the two Powers to work together.

In a brief editorial in *The Christadelphian Advocate*, Brother T. Williams makes the following pertinent remarks:

"It does seem to be as reasonable in the nineteenth century as it was in the first to believe that 'whatsoever the law saith it saith to them that are under the law;' and it does seem as if this principle is as applicable to the law of the Gospel as it was to the law of Moses. Indeed, this principle is applied in the general attitude of those who know the Truth. When the Epistles are quoted by aliens and applied to themselves, they are at once corrected and shown that the law of the gospel pervading the epistles is for saints or brethren, not for aliens; not even to the extent that they can sing the songs of Zion. 'Know ye not,' the alien is asked, 'that whatsoever the law saith it saith to them that are under the law?' You must come under the law first before you can lawfully expect these benefits. Indeed, says the alien, then if I am not under the law of the gospel I may not hope for its blessings? No. May I fear for its cursings? Oh, yes. Then whatsoever the law saith about cursings it saith to them that are not under the law; but whatsoever the law saith about blessings it saith *only* to them that are under the law. Don't you think you are a little one-sided in this matter?"

In writing on the Law of Moses in the *January Christadelphian* the Editor draws a contrast between those out of Christ and those in Christ in their relationship to death. Referring to those out of Christ he says, "This (the bondage of death) is a bondage common to man." Then follows a description of the other class:—

"How different is the position of those who have been made free in Christ. Death has been robbed of its terrors. So far from being the concealed horror of their lives, as it is with unjustified sinners, it is the loophole of light in the dungeon of their present darkness" (p. 17).

These extracts, in effect, teach:—

- 1st. That all out of Christ are "unjustified sinners";
- 2nd. That all in Christ are justified sinners; and

3rd. That the latter "have been made free" from "the bondage of death."

Does this freedom exclude those in Christ from dying? Obviously not; nothing of the kind is implied. Then, when they die, what does the freedom ensure? As a first step, resurrection from the dead. Their resurrection must, consequently—whatever its results—be due to their entrance into Christ. To be "made free" from "the bondage of death" when entering the Name of Christ, would be impossible without a justification from all sin causing death. As this includes inherited sin, the above extract involves justification therefrom—the very thing which its author has persistently denied. He has also denied that all in Christ have been "made free from the law of sin and death" (Rom. viii. 2; whereas he now teaches that they are "made free in Christ" from "the bondage of death," the very thing for which we have been contending the last four years. Why this double attitude? Is it due to the difference in the style of writing—polemical at one time and expository at the other?

We observe from the February *Christadelphian* that several Ecclesias—Bristol, Bulwell, Colne, Merthyr and Pontypool—have passed fellowship resolutions on the Responsibility question—additional evidence, if such were needed, that false reasoning and erroneous conclusions die hard. On the other hand, the editor, in a long note on the cover, tries to show that a hard and fast line should not be drawn—though he does not, by any means, correctly state the issue between himself and those who contend for greater stringency in fellowship. A Toronto brother, in endorsing the resurrection of enlightened rejectors, declares "that the Deity has not tied His hands, as it were, in any case—is not limited. His Will is supreme." It is scarcely necessary to remark that no one has questioned the supremacy of the Divine Will. God is at liberty to make

any law, issue any decree, or reveal any promise which He may think fit; but having once promulgated it, He is obviously bound by it. He has Himself so declared; He "cannot lie" (Tit. i. 2); "He cannot deny Himself" (II. Tim. ii. 18). He has, for instance, "tied His hands," by the Abrahamic covenant, to give the land of promise to the faithful portion only of Abraham's seed. He has "tied His hands" to give immortality through Christ only. He has "tied His hands" to justify Adam's descendants, in this dispensation, from condemnation, only by baptism into Christ; and He has "tied His hands" to forgive Christ's brethren through their High Priest only. In view of these statutes God could not give the promised land to any outside Abraham's seed; He could not give immortality through any other channel than Christ; He could not

in this dispensation justify Adam's descendants by any other means than baptism into Christ; and He could not forgive His sons through any other way than the priesthood of their Elder Brother. To make these statements is in no way derogatory to God; it is but another way of saying that He is faithful to His own Word. He has taught us, in that Word, to regard Him as "limited" or bound by His own utterances. If it were otherwise His Word would not be reliable. If the principle of limitation be recognised in reference to resurrection and reward there should be no difficulty in recognising it in regard to resurrection and judgment; there is no real difference between the two. The limitation in regard to resurrection for both reward and judgment is expressed in the statement, "By man came also the resurrection of the dead" (I. Cor. xv. 21).

## A Dead Fly in the Ointment.

A dead fly in the apothecary's ointment is the Spirit's illustration of folly combined with wisdom (Eccles. x. 1). There are various kinds of folly, but the greatest folly is that which rejects revealed truths. Hence they who say there is no God (Ps. xiv. 1), who "hate knowledge" (Prov. i. 22), or who "despise wisdom and instruction" (ver. 7), are described by the Spirit as "fools." Achan "wrought folly in Israel" when he took "the accursed thing" (Josh. vii. 15). The "prophets of Samaria" are accused of "folly" because they "prophesied in the name of Baal" (Jer. xxiii. 13); and, through listening to "the prophet who teacheth lies," Isaiah declares that "every mouth speaketh folly" (Isa. ix. 17). Likewise the false statements of Job's friends are defined to be 'folly' (Job xlii. 8.)

These declarations are equally applicable to the false teaching of the present day—from an "infallible" Pope to the vagaries of those who profess the Truth; the difference in the "folly" exhibited is simply one of degree. Where the darkness is intense it is "folly" without wisdom; but where light and darkness are combined there is a corresponding amount of wisdom and folly. To the former the children of light are accustomed, and it excites no surprise; but the latter arouses wonder and commiseration according to the extent of the wisdom exhibited.

These thoughts have been suggested by the receipt from time to time of a magazine published in California, entitled *Eusebia*. To the "man of God" this word—which means *piety, devoutness, religious reverence, or "godliness"*

(I. Tim. iii. 16)—has a sweet-smelling savour. When, therefore, he sees it on a publication—which, in the matter of paper and typography, invites perusal—he expects to find the contents a reflection of God's mind. He does find it so to some extent, as the following extracts attest:—

"When we understand *Who Jesus is*, as the 'word' of promise 'made flesh'—or the previously declared purpose of God in a Saviour, or endless life-Giver—who through a redemption process brings us out of our relation to the sin-condemned race, through death, to satisfy the demands of law, which is death absolute and final, and into a sonship and so to an heirship to a purchased immortality, we have the kernel of the gospel."

"Faith and obedience brings justification to the believer. It is faith in God's good message that is counted to the believer for righteousness, and a baptism upon or into the house of YAH-OH-SHA (the original of Jesus, signifying the Living God's Redeemer) brings the believer into Christ as a member of His body politic."

"It is in Jesus, the self-redeemed One, that we receive release from sins, by a redemption from the final death, by His life blood. It was His birth-relation to a life forfeited by sin in the original ancestral head of the human race—Adam, the first—that constituted Him legally qualified for a sin bearer. This is a point of primary importance, for otherwise justice and law could not consent to a sacrifice purely vicarious—for absolutely, one man unrelated to penalty cannot be punished for the offence of another. This point is denied by pseudo-orthodox divines. If an innocent man should volunteer to suffer for the crime of another, though it might be an act of generosity, justice could not accept it."

"He (Christ) died unto *the sin* once for all' (Rom. vi. 10). He could not die to the sin if He had not come into or under it by being 'made of a woman, made under the law'; 'the sin' was the 'one man's offence' by which 'the death [final] reigned,' and by which 'judgment came upon ALL men to condemnation'—the one man's disobedience that made the 'many sinners.' The 'many' were all the race out of the

ancestral head, and Jesus was one of them. Read carefully Rom. v. 12-21. Pseudo-orthodox divines are so afraid, as they say, of 'making Christ a sinner,' they evade this very point—that Paul demonstrates so clearly. It was no fault or voluntary act of Jesus, nor of ours, that legally made Him or us sinners—but we were all in the loins of Adam when HE sinned, and thus being flesh of Adam, were 'sold under sin.' This explains *how* Christ could be a sin bearer and yet be 'without sin'—that is, without personal guilt. Had He not been generated out of sinful flesh—that is, flesh related to sin—He could not have redeemed us. He rendered just what the law demanded. . . . He died out of His relation to broken law, and carried us with Him—that is, if we get into Him and stay in Him—as the first offence of Adam took us all in, as His members. We do not dissolve our relation to the first Adam until we get into Christ—there we are said to be 'dead indeed unto *the sin*, but alive to God in and through Jesus Christ our Sovereign.'

. . . . In our burial in water we are thus 'planted together in the similitude of His death.' We cannot breathe under water; so beneath its surface we have passed out of our vital element—cut off from it—'dead'—yet alive as we rise out in His likeness, beyond the reach of condemnation."

The foregoing extracts, taken from an article entitled "Israel is an Everlasting Institution," exhibit a considerable knowledge of the elements composing the ointment provided by the Spirit for "the anointing" (I. Jno. ii. 27) or Christing of a believer. They set forth in a terse form some of the items for which we have lately been contending. What, then, our readers will ask, is the "dead fly" in this pot of ointment? It consists of two items:—

1st. That "all the race will obtain a standing up from the death state":

2nd. That "settling Jews in Palestine will not fulfil anything in the prophets, nor in what Paul says in Romans xi."

These and the previous extracts are from the same article, which bears the signature of the Editor (Wm. L. Stroud). The first item is a relic of the darkness

which covers the religious world. Universal resurrection is the outcome of immortal soulism; and on this supposition it has a certain amount of logical consistency. But, where natural immortality is repudiated, as in the present case, it is difficult to see what place there is for a resurrection of "all the race." It cannot be for rendering an account by those—the vast majority—who are ignorant of a Divine revelation. Is it for a formal condemnation to the death which reigns through Adam's sin? Such an idea is preposterous. Picture a cannibal nation, for instance, being raised from the dead and brought before Christ's judgment-seat to be told that they must return to the grave because they were descendants of a man of whom they have never heard. Or, worse still, imagine some millions of babies—from one hour old—brought to life to have a sentence pronounced upon them which they are incapable of understanding. And what about the death to follow the resurrection of such as these? Is it to be by disease or violence? The death which Christ is to pronounce on His unfaithful brethren is styled "the second death," and it is to be preceded by "few" or "many stripes." But such a death is obviously inapplicable to the ignorant and helpless. A full understanding of the Scriptural truth that Christ is "the Resurrection and the Life" would preserve anyone from the absurdities arising out of the universal resurrection theory.

The condemnation of the race is embraced in the sentence pronounced upon Adam and Eve in Gen. iii. 16-19. Eve is not the only woman whose conception has been accompanied by "sorrow;" it pertains to her sex as a whole. Adam is not the only man who has had to "eat bread in the sweat of" his face; this calamity affects more or less the whole race. It was inflicted on Adam because he "hearkened unto the voice of" his wife; and it is inflicted on his descendants for the same cause. The

Apostle Paul deals with the sentence as a racial one in Rom. v. 12-21—a passage to which the Editor of *Eusebia* calls special attention. When saying, "and so death passed upon all men" (ver. 12), the Apostle is not merely recording the fact that all previous generations had died; he is enunciating a principle applicable to future as well as to past members of the race. And when he says that "judgment came upon all men to condemnation" (ver. 18), he is referring, not to a future, but to a past, decree. In the "condemnation" pronounced in Eden, Adam and Eve are treated as the head of a body of "sinners," and their descendants as a continuation of this head. Any further sentence, judgment, or decree is, therefore, a superfluity; the "condemnation" of the head is the condemnation of the whole body.

In an article entitled "Sin's Penalty—Is it Natural Death?" in a subsequent number of *Eusebia*, the editor contends that the penalty due for Adam's sin on the whole race is the second death. This is obviously an attempt to justify universal resurrection; but it brings its author into an inextricable dilemma. Christ died "the penal death due for sin"—to use the language of the editor of *Eusebia*; but Christ did not die the second death. If, therefore, the second death be the penalty, it is clear that Christ has not undergone it. When the facts are rightly placed such a dilemma is impossible. The penalty due for Adam's sin was death by slaying, and this death Christ underwent; the second death is to be inflicted only on those who, after being freed in Christ from the first death, commit sin and fail to obtain forgiveness. Judicial condemnation by Christ is unalterable; no provision has been made for taking away the second death.

The second item constituting the dead fly, is amplified in the following words:

"The Apostles put no Millenarian construction upon the prophecies. They knew no 'Age-to-come' beyond the Lord's

coming for a 'restitution of all things'—another gospel era for the reformation of Jews or heathen. Millenarian restitution is a mass of confusion, found nowhere in either Old or New Testaments, nor in the joint correspondence of their parts or their whole. Such false doctrine subverts the truth, and the faith of all who embrace it."

To refute this "froward" (Prov. ii. 12) utterance would be an easy task as a matter of evidence and argument, but it would occupy more space than we can spare, or our readers would care for. The restoration of the kingdom of Israel—which involves "the settling of Jews in Palestine"—is so abundantly taught in the Scriptures that no unprejudiced mind can dispute it; we might as well deny the shining of the sun in the heavens. The marvel is that one should go astray on this simple truth, and yet

be so clear on more difficult truths connected with Christ's death.

The "things concerning the name of Jesus Christ" are all-important, but they must not be allowed to eclipse the things concerning His kingdom. To do so is to preach "another gospel" than that which Paul preached. If there be no re-settlement of the Jews in Palestine, there can be no restoration of the kingdom of Israel, no restitution of the throne of David, no rulership of Christ and His immortal brethren over the Israelitish and Gentile nations, no transformation of the kingdoms of the world into Christ's kingdom, and no establishment of the kingdom of God. If no kingdom of God, there can be no realisation of the salvation offered through the death on the Cross.

EDITOR.

---

## The Numbers 6, 7, 8.

---

A Jewish writer (Schimmelpenick) states the Hebrew derivation of these numbers thus:—

6. From a word meaning exultation and pride;

7. From a word meaning filled, satisfied, or completed; and

8. From a word signifying superabundance or overflowing.

A consideration of the use of these figures as used in the Scriptures whilst greatly bearing out these definitions is also instructive.

Whilst 7 is the symbol of fulness and completeness, and 8 signifies the superfull and overflowing number, 6 (or one short of 7) may appropriately form the number of incompleteness.

There are 6 days appointed for work, but a complete week is only to be obtained by the addition of a day of rest. This order in Creation shadowed forth the fact subsequently revealed that there remaineth a rest for the people of God, a 1,000 years of rest after 6,000 wearying years spent by man in his incomplete, because sinful, state.

Christ's first miracle apparently foreshadows His mission. He turned water into wine, and "in this beginning of His signs did Jesus manifest His glory" (Jno. ii. 11). Was not this a "glory" greater than the use of Spirit power merely to astonish the people? Is it not Christ's glory to have superseded "the Jews manner of purifying" (5, 6) by a permanent manner of purification, even of His own blood, a cleansing for the inward as well as the outward part. The Jews' "manner of purifying" was, on this occasion, contained in "6 water-pots," testifying of incompleteness.

It is, perhaps, worth noting that the Papacy is numbered 666, and to it pre-eminently does this figure apply. It prescribes works, works, works, which cannot make the worshipper complete, nor bring him to a Sabbath of rest. To this system, also, well applies the root meaning of the figure, pride and exultation. Supposing itself to have "need of nothing," it is, when "weighed in the balances, found wanting."

A few illustrations will suffice of the

use of the number 7. The completeness of God's deliverance to His people is stated in Job v. 19. "He shall deliver thee in 6 troubles; yea, in 7 shall no evil touch thee."

God's words are, by a similar use of 7, proclaimed to be completely pure. "The words of the Lord are pure words, as silver tried in a furnace, purified 7 times" (Ps. xii. 6).

7 lamps and 7 eyes are used in Rev. iv. 5 to denote the completeness with which God can penetrate the unseen, and the fulness of the one Spirit, styled "the 7 spirits" (i. 4), in all its diverse operations.

Paul exhorts Christ's brethren to be always abounding in the work of the Lord. This is set forth by Solomon in an obscure manner by the use of the figures 7 and 8. "Give a portion to 7, yea, even unto 8, for thou knowest not what evil shall be upon the earth" (Ecc. xi. 2). This is contained among some instructions for casting "bread upon the waters" in the assurance that it will be found "after many days." The inspired writer observes that there are both clouds and winds, but that those who are deterred from working on account of these will not gather; therefore we must do our part and leave the result to God. If we literally observed this precept by giving either the bread that perisheth, or the bread of life, to 7, or, at the most, 8, we should utterly miss the idea presented for our instruction. Put into other words, it means, Give to the full; yea, give abundantly, and overflow in doing good before the evil days prevent us. A pertinent example in this connection is to be found in those Macedonian believers who "out of the abundance of their joy gave in deep poverty according to their power . . . yea, and beyond their power they gave of their own accord" for the necessities of the destitute in Judea (II. Cor. iii. 2).

The figures 7 and 8 are used by Micah to indicate the complete and superabundant means which will be at the disposal of Israel's king and peacemaker, when the modern Assyrian shall invade his land. "Then shall we raise against him 7 shepherds and 8 principal men" (Mic. v. 5). In this case there may be a literal meaning also. If so, who will constitute the 16 men of might for Israel's protection? Possibly they are Israel's rulers. Twelve of these were

appointed by the Lord, who promised 12 thrones to his apostles and companions in tribulation. Who are the remaining 3? An answer to this question is suggested by the author of the "Ezekiel Temple," who points out that the several places in which the 3 patriarchs received their promises and erected altars, apparently as memorials of the same, were situated in 3 different spots of what will be the Holy Oblation in the age to come, whilst the rulership of the Apostles is outside this, the 12 tribes occupying territory to the north and south of it, according to the re-arrangement outlined by Ezekiel.

The figures 6, 7, and 8 may be regarded as applicable to the children of God in different stages of their existence. Before noticing these it should be observed that although 7 is the number of fulness and completion it is not the number of perfection. The difference between these two qualities is sometimes slight, but this difference is observable in the Scriptural use of the numbers that represent these ideas.

The figure 4 and its multiples are used by the Spirit to indicate the perfect state. The immortalized are represented by the cherubic creatures with 4 faces (Ezek. i. and Rev. iv.), and by 24 elders (Rev. v. 8); their symbolic number amounts to 144,000 (Rev. xiv. 8); their foundation is the 12 Apostles and their city, 4 square, of 144 cubits each way (Rev. xxi. 16, 17), &c.

It is true that the term "perfect" is applied to the saints now, but it relates to their "ways." Noah and Job were "perfect" men. Christ's doctrines have for their object "ye therefore shall be perfect, as your Heavenly Father is perfect" (Mat. v. 48); but perfection is not consummated yet.

Our former "far off" state is signified by 6. It is a state of vain works without attaining to a period of rest. Emphatically is this so if we have been members of the Apostacy, ever striving to provide our own makeshift coverings for sin—efforts originating in the pride of man's heart. In Christ we reach the state of fulness or completion, as it is written, "Ye are complete in him" (Col. ii. 10; made full in him, R.V.)—the state of figure 7.

The state of full perfection is the immortal or 4 square condition as declared in Heb. xi. 40:—"These all died

in faith . . . that they without us should not be made perfect." In this glorified state "the spirits of just men made perfect" will enjoy their "rest" in the Kingdom of the Heavens.

It is difficult to conceive greater perfection than this, and, as to nature, we know it is the highest attainable.

But as to state there will be improvement even above the blessedness of the 1,000 years' reign of Christ. Paul had a glimpse into the 8,000 year state, but was forbidden to reveal it. The pre-

sence of sin in the earth might, conceivably, detract even from the joys of the millennium, but in the "Beyond" the last enemy will have been destroyed, and Christ having delivered up the kingdom to His Father, God is all and in all.

Yes, there is a state beyond the "satisfied," "completed" and "perfect"—the state of the figure 8, the "super-abundant," the "overflowing."

R. H. FORD.

London.

## Things New and Old.—No. 14.

### "A NOBLE VINE."

"Yet I had planted thee a Noble Vine, wholly a right seed." . . . (Jer. ii. 21). "Now will I sing to my well-beloved a song of my beloved touching his vineyard." "My well-beloved hath a vineyard in a very fruitful hill (margin, "the horn of the son of oil"); and he fenced it, and gathered out the stones thereof, and planted it with the choicest vine" . . . (Isaiah v. 1, 2).

From the foregoing Scriptures we learn the Deity's estimation and care for the Vine of His planting:—"For the vineyard of the Lord of Hosts is the house of Israel, and the men of Judah His pleasant plant" (ver. 7).

The care and love for this plant is emphasised in the 4th verse: "What could have been done more to my vineyard, that I have not done in it?" Alas! that there should have been such requital for the exalted position given and wealth of blessings bestowed as to cause the Planter and Bestower to say, "Wherefore, when I looked that it should bring forth grapes, brought it forth wild grapes." "And, now go to; I will tell you what I will do to My vineyard: I will take away the hedge thereof, and it shall be eaten up; and break down the wall thereof, and it shall be trodden down" (verses 4, 5).

Again, "How art thou turned into the degenerate plant of a strange vine unto Me?" (Jer. ii. 21) And again, "Son of man, what is the vine tree more than any tree, or than a branch which is

among the trees of the forest?" (Ezek. xv. 2) And again, "For their vine is of (margin, "worse than") the vine of Sodom, and of the fields of Gomorrah; their grapes are grapes of gall, their clusters are bitter: their wine is the poison of asps" (Deut. xxxii. 32-34). Truly these are terrible indictments; we cannot read them without a thrill and a feeling such as is expressed in verse 29: "O that they were (had been) wise, that they (had) understood this, that they would consider (had considered) their latter end." Had they done this what stores of blessing would have been their lot: "I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt (see Ps. lxxx. 8); open thy mouth wide, and I will fill it" (Ps. lxxxi. 10). It had, however, to be recorded against them: "My people would not hearken to My voice: and Israel would none of Me" (ibid. 11).

Brethren, of one thing we may be quite sure, that the Deity had no pleasure either in this wayward course of Israel or in the infliction of the terrible judgments they merited. The "vine" truly was a collective failure, as the first Adam had been an individual failure. The purpose of the Deity was not, however, to be frustrated; as there was to be a second Adam, so there was to be a second Vine—"a Noble Vine, wholly a right seed"—and this one none other than a man of Judah's tribe, who should be "His pleasant plant."

Though the first planting was a failure,

the second has not been; for could He not triumphantly say "I am the true Vine, and My Father is the husbandman" (Jno. xv. 1)? As the first Vine was called out of Egypt, so was the second: "Out of Egypt have I called my Son."

The first Vine would not hear the Lord their God, the second was ever on the alert to hear the Voice of His Father:—"The Lord God hath given me the tongue of the learned, that I should know how to speak a word in season to him that is weary; he wakeneth morning by morning, he wakeneth mine ear to hear as the learned. The Lord God hath opened mine ear, and I was not rebellious, neither turned away back" (Isa. l. 4, 5).

How splendidly do the Scriptures unfold to us the grand principles which were so completely grasped by Christ! He never failed to realise the work the Father required of Him; He never forsook the path of Wisdom; He considered His latter end, for is it not written of Him: "Who, for the joy that was set before him, endured the Cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God"—there to await His Father's appointed time, when "He shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied" (Isa. liii. 11).

The term "Vine" in itself shows us that it is God's intention to have a number, or "cluster," which shall be separate and distinct from "the Vine of the earth"—a name which in the language of our beloved brother, Dr. Thomas, "is a phrase representative of the civil, military, and ecclesiastical constitution of what is called Christendom." The grapes of this "Vine are the nations clustered together into empires and kingdoms upon it" (*Eureka*, Vol. III. p. 435).

Now dear brethren, is it nought to be so highly privileged as to be grafted into the true Vine? Consider this, ye who have become branches thereof; are we not in Him who is the "Noble Vine"? Are we not related to the "goodly Seed"?

Yes, you answer; let us be mindful, then, that a great obligation rests upon us, no less than that we must be fruit bearers. Hear ye the Master's words, "Every branch in Me that beareth not fruit he taketh away: and every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit" (Jno. xv. 2).

Keep the first vine before you, look back upon their failure; "Israel is an empty vine, he bringeth forth fruit unto himself;

according to the multitude of his fruit he hath increased the altars" (Hosea x. 1). Put these facts and the Words of the Master together; if we do, it will be profitable to us now, and obtain for us help from Our Father and Our Saviour Jesus Christ in the present time of trouble, and, hereafter, the reward of Eternal Life.

Remember, that if the branches of the vine do not bring forth fruit of the right kind, they cannot be adapted to the commonest articles of utility, and, consequently, are of no use to "the Husbandman":—"Shall wood be taken thereof to do any work? Or will men take a pin of it to hang any vessel thereon? Behold it is cast into the fire for fuel; the fire devoureth both the ends of it, and the midst of it is burned. Is it meet for any work?" (Ezek. xv. 3, 4). As is the natural, so is the spiritual. If, as branches of the true Vine, we do not bring forth "the fruits of the Spirit," we are fit for nothing but to be burned in the fire of Jehovah's wrath.

We have replied "Yes" to the questions, Are we not in Him who is the Noble Vine? and Are we not related to the Goodly Seed? We have in previous articles endeavoured to show how this exalted position is attained, but it may not be out of place to briefly re-state it; God is pleased with faith, and He is not pleased with anything short of it. To have given us the opportunity of pleasing Him is a great honour. "Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God" (Rom. x. 17). "Of His own will begat He us with the Word of Truth, that we should be a kind of first fruits of His creatures" (James i. 18). This Word, working effectually in us, brought about that "repentance towards God" which led to "the obedience of faith"—(Rom. xvi. 26)—the event by which we were grafted into the Noble Vine. Do we realise the privilege and responsibility of this position? It claims absolute fruitfulness—not like that of the first Vine, who "brought forth fruit unto himself." In the Israelitish Vine there was a multiplication of outward signs and observances, probably a great multitude of worshippers, but their fruit was "Grapes of gall, and their clusters bitter." This result could not be acceptable to the Father, and hence they became to him as a "strange Vine." What could this mean but counting it on a par

wish the Gentile Vines which were of no value to Him. They had become "servants of sin," as we all once were, and "free from Righteousness." Well might it be written, "What fruit had ye then in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? for the end of those things is death. But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life" (Rom. vi. 21, 22). To have our "fruit unto holiness" is the very opposite of having it unto ourselves. It is to have a due recognition of the undivided service which Our Heavenly Father claims from us. Let us then sink the flesh, brethren, and exalt the Spirit.

"My Father is the husbandman." How consolatory was this fact to *Our Master*. He is our "husbandman," also, brethren, and in this we ought to find much consolation; for it is the source of the loving kindness shown to us, and a guarantee that all is done for us that is possible. Look at the precious words giving us honour and distinction: "For we are labourers together with God; Ye are God's husbandry; Ye are God's building" (I. Cor. iii. 9). This is due to our having been constituted "Sons of God" by birth of water and the Spirit. Let us not, then, be weary in well-doing; nor allow the trying circumstances under which we may be placed to be a deterrent to our fruit-bearing. Consider that the truly Noble Vine was a "man of sorrows acquainted with grief," of "strong crying and tears." "We are," as Bro. Roberts so well puts it, "bone of His bone, and flesh of His flesh, and therefore bound up with Him in the closest of connections—BRETHREN OF CHRIST. This is the highest dignity on earth, appreciated by those only who understand, and see things in their ultimate bearings. It is full of blessing now and in the age to come" (*Seasons of Comfort*, 1890, p. 51). The italics are mine.

To keep in memory these things necessitates our looking to the Tree every day. The vine tree is very peculiar as to attention; it requires plenty of water; it needs great diligence in the matter of pruning and directing; also plenty of sunshine. When these things are properly regulated fruit will result.

"My Father is the husbandman;" the Noble Vine had all things done well; Our Father and Our Saviour in like manner

do all things well for us. Let us appreciate this perfect attention at its proper value; water daily, prune daily, ask for guidance daily, keep continually in presence of the Sun of Righteousness by doing His commandments. Fruits unto the Spirit will then abound, and we shall realise more and more what the Apostle means by saying, "Ye are not in the flesh." The spirituality of mind which will then predominate, may be likened unto the force behind the grape propelling it forward into the delicious fruit, and so our fruit will be acceptable unto our Father and our Saviour Jesus Christ.

The first vine was "of the vine of Sodom and of the fields of Gomorrah." Listen to the Spirit's description:—"Behold, this was the iniquity of thy sister Sodom, pride, fulness of bread, and abundance of idleness was in her and her daughters, neither did she strengthen the hand of the poor and needy. And they were haughty, and committed abomination before me: therefore I took them away as I saw good" (Ezk. xvi. 49, 50).

No wonder "the grapes were gall and their clusters bitter." Let us examine ourselves, brethren, and see if any of the above iniquities cleave unto us; as a household it will be marvellous if we are found free. When we have examined let us at once prune all the obnoxious offshoots, such as bitterness towards our brethren. Such fruits of the flesh would have no place if we felt the full force of the words, "Now ye are the body of CHRIST and members in particular." Consider this and let all bitterness and evil-speaking be put away; bitterness will rot the branch, and no fruit can possibly spring from a rotten branch. Let us obey the exhortation: "Looking diligently lest any man fail (margin, fall from) of the grace of God; lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble you, and thereby many be defiled" (Heb. xii. 15). Again, "Who is a wise man and endued with knowledge among you? let him show out of a good conversation his works with meekness of wisdom. But if you have bitter envying and strife in you hearts, glory not" (James iii. 13-14). The Apostle shows us that this kind of fruit is of the flesh entirely, and then he presents the antithesis: "But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good

fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy" (*ibid.* 17 v.). The Vine is a tree whose branches require gentle handling, being easily trained when the proper conditions of handling and guidance are observed. Thus in the Wisdom of God the Vine is made unto us a beautiful metaphor. The Noble Vine, the goodly seed, is a *splendid example*; and the degenerate Vine is a *warning and solemn admonition* unto us. May the example and warning not be in vain, dear brethren; rather let us go forth with renewed vigour, valiant for the Truth, full of Faith, earnest zeal, tempered with wise discretion, filled with wisdom which is from above, bringing forth fruits unto righteousness, renouncing all hidden things of the heart, keeping under all pride, uprooting all bitterness, working as labourers who

have the high and dignified coadjutorship of Our Heavenly Father and the Grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ to help us.

"O solemn, dreadful, glorious news:  
The Gentiles' times about to close,  
And Zion's King appear.  
O, then, what fearfulness shall seize  
Those *Virgins* who have lived at ease  
Nor thought the bridegroom near!"

"We lift our hearts to Thee,  
Seeking for Grace.  
May we Thy goodness see  
In Jesus' face.  
Keep in Thy narrow way,  
All who Thy word obey,  
Lest from Thy paths they stray,  
And lose the race."

WM. WHITEHEAD.

New Romney.

## Our Letter Box.

### CHRIST'S BAPTISM AND JUSTIFICATION.

Writing further on this point, Bro. G. C. Harvey says,

"You misrepresent (No. 15, p. 69) what I said in reference to the baptism of Christ. What I did say, if my memory is right, was, that you had argued that the declaration of the Father after His baptism was a justification by Spirit, because God is Spirit, and I then said that if such were the case He must have been justified a second time by Spirit when the Father, upon the Mount of Transfiguration, uttered the same words, 'This is my beloved Son;' and added, 'Hear ye Him.' If the one declaration of God was a justification, then so must the other have been. So that gathering up all your justifications, we find that the Messiah was, 1st, justified from the Adamic condemnation by circumcision; 2nd, He was justified from His sin-nature a second time by baptism; 3rd, He was then justified by Spirit by the Father's declaration after baptism; 4th, He was again justified on the Mount; and 5th, He was justified by Spirit by a resurrection from among the dead."

It is not correct to describe these five justifications as ours. We recognise the

first, but with this addition, that by circumcision Christ was justified for a life under the law in the land of Israel. The second and third we view as one—the baptism and the Father's spoken approval being, as stated in the last number (page 69), two aspects of the same thing. The fourth (on the Mount of Transfiguration) we never described as a justification. Though an expression of approval, it was not accompanied by any ceremonial; a justification ceremony was not required, for no defilement had been contracted since baptism by John. A verbal expression of approval may be repeated any number of times, but a ceremonial justification in connection with "the things in the heavens" (Heb. ix. 23) does not require repetition. In regard to the 5th (Resurrection), we must, to make it complete, add the death on the Cross; for if others are "justified by His blood" (Rom. v. 9), certainly He was justified thereby.

There were thus three justifications; one typical, another symbolic and verbal, and the last real or substantial. To admit only the third (resurrection), and deny the first and second (circumcision and baptism)—as Bro. Harvey does—is to ignore Scriptural testimony. It is

written, "Circumcision verily profiteth, if thou keep the law" (Rom. ii. 25). How did circumcision thus profit? It ensured long life in the land of Israel—as promised in the law (Deut. xxx. 16, 19)—for any one who kept the law perfectly. It therefore justified such a one, provisionally, from the condemnation to death under which he was born; for all who continue under that condemnation are accounted as dead and liable to die at any time. Circumcision profited Christ in the above manner, because He kept the law in every particular—the only Jew who did so—and it would have continued to so profit Him if he had not surrendered Himself and His life to a higher purpose. For that higher purpose circumcision was not a provisional justification, because it was part of a law whose blessings related only to this life. When, therefore, the time came for him to become "the Lamb of God," to take away sin and give eternal life, it was necessary for Him to be justified with reference to that object. This was effected by His baptism—an event obviously referred to when speaking of Himself as having been "sanctified and sent into the world" (Jno. x. 36). The connection between His baptism and His death is shown by the fact that His death is described as "a baptism" (Luke xii. 50). The baptism in the Jordan was thus a symbol of His death and resurrection. The symbol could not effect what the reality accomplished; it was therefore provisional. It lasted until Christ was hung on a tree. By this He was "cursed" (Gal. iii. 13), and therefore His provisional justification—when eight days old, for a life in the land, and at thirty years of age for eternal life—came to an end. Hence, when hung on the Cross, He was in an unjustified condition. But being now in a position to be justified permanently—by shedding His blood—this unjustified state did not interfere with the fulfilment of His sacrificial mission. It was indeed a necessity; for it was while on the Cross that the Father, in the person of His Son, "condemned sin in the flesh" (Rom. viii. 3). That condemnation, being an act of Divine justice (Rom. iii. 26), could not be inflicted justly while Christ was provisionally justified. He must become unjustified, and this was effected by His coming under "the curse of the law" through "hanging on a tree" (Gal. iii. 13). But

in a brief time, by shedding His blood, He became permanently justified; "for he that hath died is justified from sin" (Rom. vi. 7, *r.v.*).

It will thus be seen that when Christ's several justifications are correctly defined and expounded there is no "confusion," "fancies," or incongruities in relation to them. They each have their place in God's typical and antitypical systems of righteousness.

The cause of the foregoing denial of Christ's provisional justification is to be found in the fact that Bro. Harvey, although believing that Christ had an "unclean" nature does not believe that it was "sinful," excepting in a metaphorical sense. Animals as well as man, he says, are "unclean," and it is attributable in both cases to their being "earthborns." Hence, he says, "All your talk about Holy flesh, justified sin-nature, and kindred phrases, are to me very smoky ideas. I cannot make them out."

Where the foundation is wrong the superstructure is sure to be defective. Adam was not created "unclean"; he became so by disobedience. "Holy flesh" is not our phrase but the Spirit's (see Jer. xi. 15). It is paralleled in the New Testament by the "body" of a baptised believer being described as a "holy temple" (I. Cor. iii. 17; vi. 19)—a condition due to such "bodies" having been "washed with pure water" (Hob. x. 22).

#### JUSTIFICATION OF BELIEVERS.

Referring to our article "Justified and Glorified" (No. 15, page 49), Bro. Harvey says:—

"I see you say 'God charges men with the possession of inherited sin before He justifies them.' Just fancy: Because a man suffers the effect of a crime his father was guilty of before he was born he is charged with the crime—being guilty of it, I suppose."

It will be observed that in paraphrasing our statement the word "crime" is substituted for "inherited sin." This is a specimen of the way in which we are misrepresented by one and another. "Inherited sin" is not a crime, but a misfortune; nevertheless it is a reality, and therefore there is no injustice in charging men with its possession. The charge is embodied for instance, in the Apostolic statement, "They that are in the flesh cannot please God" (Rom. viii. 8). We have never said that Adam's

descendants were guilty, in a moral sense, of Adam's crime; neither have we taught—as another opponent recently affirmed—that they are responsible for that crime. These accusations are the result of the wholesale misrepresentation to which we have been subjected by those who ought to have known better.

#### THE DIVINE BEGETTAL OF CHRIST.

W. thinks that Christ's Divine begettal was for the purpose of giving Him a mind superior to that of any other Son of Adam. This is not an uncommon idea; and to this supposition is attributed His resistance of all temptation. The objection to such a view is that it gives to fallen flesh a higher place than the Bible does. Wherever this flesh is spoken of it is condemned. "To be carnally minded is death" (Rom. viii. 6); or as the margin gives it, "The minding of the flesh is death." The word "minding" is Old English for *thinking*. It was through this flesh that the Law of Moses could not be kept by any Jew before Christ; "it was weak through the flesh" (Rom. viii. 3). No mind, therefore, however well-balanced or perfectly developed, if made of this flesh, could of itself have kept the Law. How was Christ able to keep it? Not through having a superior mind, but through his Father dwelling in Him from childhood. "I was cast upon Thee from the womb; thou art my God from my mother's belly" (Ps. xlii. 10). God "made Him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord" (Isa. xi. 3). His "quick understanding" was not the result of begettal, but of the Spirit of God dwelling in Him. By this means His evil inclinations were kept in check, and "a body" was "prepared" (Heb. x. 5) for an acceptable sacrifice.

This "body" existed before it was "prepared." The preparation process occupied thirty years; for it was when baptised by John that Jesus is represented as saying "A body hast thou prepared me." He said this "when He cometh into the world." He could not say it at birth, and therefore that was not the time when He came "into the world." He came into the Jewish world when "made manifest to Israel," by "the Spirit descending and remaining on Him" (Jno. i. 31-33). Then it was that "The Father sanctified and sent" Him "into the world" (Jno. x. 36). He

was "sanctified" for the mission of becoming a Saviour.

There are other and quite sufficient reasons for Christ being begotten by God:—

- 1st. To fulfil the promise that He should be the "seed of the woman."
- 2nd. To show in a definite way that man's Saviour has been provided only by God.

In viewing Christ's life it is necessary to divide it into two halves: 1st, before baptism; 2nd, after baptism. Before baptism the Spirit of God was in Him and he was under its control, but He had no power over the Spirit (see Ps. cxxxix. 7-12; Isa. xlix. 2). During this period He was in a position to say, "Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit, or whither shall I flee from Thy presence? If I ascend up into Heaven, Thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold, Thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall Thy hand lead me, and Thy right hand shall hold me" (Ps. cxxxix. 7-10).

After baptism the Spirit dwelt in Christ without measure, and He could use it any way He thought best. In this period He showed the result of the Divine training and restraint of the first period. He was severely tempted in the wilderness and in the Garden of Gethsemane, but He overcame on both occasions through the Spirit-truths which had been planted in His mind during the first thirty years of His life.

#### MARRIAGE WITH THE ALIEN.

In a note on this subject in No. 14 (page 32) we referred to an ecclesial contention in Barnsbury Hall before the Responsibility division, remarking that nearly all who opposed the Scriptural restriction in regard to marriage were supporters of the enlightened rejector theory. Bro. Lake writes to say that some who supported the Scriptural contention "felt aggrieved by the implied reflection of" our remarks. He admits, however, that the brunt of the opposition came from those who left with him. This is, in substance, what we intended to convey. If our remarks have conveyed the impression that all who left were on the wrong side we regret it; for Bro. Lake spoke out nobly, and some others voted, on the right side. The resolution then passed is, says Bro. Lake, deemed by the Temperance Hall Brethren to be

binding on them, and if the necessity arrives, will be acted upon. This we are glad to hear.

Another correspondent, writing on marriage, asks whether a brother is justified in making overtures of marriage to an alien, even if he abstains from marriage until she has become a sister? Unquestionably not. To act thus is to contravene, in principle, the Scriptural obligation. Though the letter of God's law is kept, the spirit of it is made void. Preference is given to the natural inclination of the flesh instead of to the pre-

cepts of the Spirit. How can such a brother be sure that his wife has embraced the Truth from a pure love of it? She may have accepted it as a matter of expediency, to secure a husband. In such a case, though there be outward conformity to the requirements of the Divine Word, hearty subjection thereto will be wanting; and instead of being a helpmeet in the Lord, such a wife will probably prove a drag. A brother who loves God with his heart, soul, and mind will seek for a life companion only among those who have already become espoused to Christ.

## Things Hard to be Understood.

### 58.—JESUS AND CONDEMNATION.

*Was Jesus under condemnation of Adam? If so, when was he freed from the condemnation?*

As a descendant of Adam, Abraham and David (Luke iv. 23, 31, 34, 38), Jesus was necessarily included in the "all men" upon whom "judgment came to condemnation, by (or, through) the offence of one" (Rom. v. 18). He was justified from that condemnation for a flesh and blood life in the land of Canaan, under the law, when circumcised at eight days old; he was justified therefrom, provisionally, for a probation unto immortality when baptised by John the Baptist; and he was justified permanently when he "put away sin by the sacrifice of himself" (Heb. ix. 26). As the result of this justification he was raised from the dead and made incorruptible.

### 59.—THE EFFECTS OF ADAM'S SENTENCE.

*Are not the effects of the sentence on Adam quite different from being under the sentence and condemnation of Adam—seeing that members of the human race can suffer the effects of that sentence, as the brethren of Christ suffer those effects, though not under the penalty of death?*

The sentence and condemnation of Adam embraced all in his loins. This is proved by the facts:—(1) that "the ground" is still "cursed," (2) that Adam's descendants "ent of it in sorrow," and (3) that they "return unto dust." It was for Adam's "sake" that

this three-fold penalty was decreed, and it is experienced by his descendants whether they commit sin or not. To exclude them from the sentence and condemnation, is to leave us without any explanation as to why they eat in sorrow, from cursed ground and then return to it. The members of the human race who remain in Adam, suffer the sentence and condemnation to the full, but those who pass out of Adam into Christ realise the effects thereof to a comparatively small extent. The condemnation is taken away at the time of their transfer from the first Adam to the Last Adam; and though they continue to eat in sorrow, their food is "sanctified by the word of God and prayer" (1. Tim. iv. 5): they need not necessarily return to the ground, but, if they should, they are certain to be brought out of it.

### 60.—THE OPERATION OF CIRCUMCISION.

*On page 16 of "The Blood of the Covenant" you say: "From birth to circumcision the sons were dead in Adam (II. Cor. v. 14); but when they were circumcised they became alive" (Rom. vii. 9). If this made the males alive, how about the females? How did they get life? Or, were they not dead in Adam?*

In answer to this question we cannot do better than quote a paragraph from *Eureka*, Vol. I.:—"How females partook of the circumcision of their fathers, even as Levi before he was born paid tithes to Melchizedec, being, as it were, in the

joins of Abraham, so, after a like arrangement, the 'Bride, the Lamb's wife,' springing as Eve from the side of Adam, partakes of the circumcision of Jesus' flesh; and does no more therefore need to be circumcised individually in the flesh of their persons, than the female half of Abraham's posterity" (p. 227.)

An illustration of the dependence of the woman on the man is presented in the regulations about vows. When a daughter living at home bound herself by a bond, it was not valid unless sanctioned by her father; if he disallowed it her vows or bonds did not "stand" (Num. xxx. 3-5). In like manner the vow of a married woman was not binding if "disallowed" by her husband (vers. 6-8)."

#### 61.—JEWISH CHILDREN.

*If Paul was alive without the law, were not all Jewish children also? And if they died in this state will they not be resurrected?*

As a child, Paul was in the same position as all Jewish children. By birth they were accounted "dead" (Rom. v. 15), but by circumcision they were justified from this dead, or sinful condition—not unto eternal life, but for a life in the land of Canaan, under the Mosaic Law. If the parents were righteous and the children obedient to their parents, the children would not die in childhood. This was guaranteed by "the first commandment with promise":—"Honour thy father and thy mother; that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee" (Exod. xx. 12). When Jewish children died it was due either to disobedience to their parents, or to the unrighteousness of the parents or their predecessors; for God visited "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). Before Jewish children could be amenable to resurrection they must attain to maturity of mind, and, by acceptance of the Abrahamic covenant, become heirs of the endless life promised in that covenant.

#### 62.—ADAM'S JUSTIFICATION.

On page 25 of "The Blood of the Covenant" you say: "The penalty due to Adam was death by slaying"; and on page 8, "As soon as Adam was clothed he was justified": this you say was

"legal." *If this was right, he must have had forgiveness; and, if forgiven, of course he should not die—that is, if natural death come through sin. But, I understand you to say that it was a violent death, or death by slaying. I do not see how it could be both.*

Forgiveness of sin involves redemption from death, but it does not exclude an abode in the grave. The Apostle Paul, for instance, received forgiveness of sin when immersed into Christ, and his subsequent faithfulness indicates the forgiveness of his probationary sins; and yet he died. In like manner all forgiven ones, before and since Paul's time—except Enoch and those now alive—have passed into the grave. If it were true that forgiveness of sin excluded death we should be shut up to the conclusion that there were no forgiven ones. But it is not true; the institution of resurrection is evidence of this. A sinful man brought death, and a righteous man brought resurrection (I. Cor. xv.). Adam was brought into relationship with the then future man who was to bring resurrection, when he was clothed with skins, which typified the garment of Christ's righteousness. As a consequence, Adam will be raised from the dead to give an account, not of his first, but of his second, probation.

Writing on this point Dr. Thomas says: "This was the lamb slain at the foundation of the world, and represented Him who is the Lamb typically slain from the foundation of the world. Adam and his wife were, in this way, clothed by Yabweh Elohim, and being thus clothed, their iniquity was expiated or covered" (Exposition of Daniel, page 33, at end of Eureka, Vol. III)

The forgiveness of Adam and Eve saved them from being slain, but it did not spare them from a return to the dust. They died, as other forgiven ones have died, in hope of resurrection, because the time for reward had not then arrived. If they had been slain they would have died in their sins, without hope, and without any prospect of a resurrection.

#### 63.—EVE THE FIRST SINNER.

*If Eve was the first to sin, why are we counted sinners in Adam?*

There is no question as to Eve having sinned first, but her head was Adam:—"The man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man" (I. Cor. xi. 8). The

order in which they sinned is obviously of less importance than their relative positions. Adam was a "figure" (Rom. v. 14) of Christ, Eve of Christ's Bride. Sinners in Adam are paralleled by the righteous in Christ.

64.—DAVID'S CHARACTER.

*Was David a perfect man except in the matter of Uriah?*

The word "perfect" is applied to David in recording the fact that Solomon's "wives turned away his heart after other gods: and his heart was not perfect with the Lord his God, as was the heart of David his father" (I. Kings xi. 4). This passage evidently means that David was "perfect" in the sense of adhering continuously to the worship of "the Lord his God." The same statement is made of King Aza, who "did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, as did David his father"; "Aza's heart was perfect with the Lord all his days" (I. Kings, xv. 11, 14). On the other hand, Amaziah "did that which was right in the sight of the Lord, but not with a perfect heart" (II. Chron. xxv. 2). The defect in Amaziah's conduct is seen in the fact that "he brought the gods of the children of Seir, and set them up to be his gods, and bowed down himself before them, and burned incense unto them" (ver. 14). David never acted thus, and therefore, in this respect, his heart was "perfect."

65.—DAVID'S HOLINESS.

*Can we attain in this day to the holiness of character which David exhibited?*

Certainly; this is implied in the injunction, "Be ye holy; for I am holy" (I. Pet. i. 16), and in the declaration, "Without holiness no man shall see the Lord" (Heb. xii. 14). If impossible, there is no force in the exhortation, "Be not slothful, but followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises" (Heb. vi. 12). David was one of these, and, therefore, we are called upon to follow him in that which was right.

The Apostle James, in declaring that "The supplication of a righteous man availeth much in its working" (Jas. v. 16, *s.v.*) reminds brethren that "Elijah was a man of like passions with us." The same may be said of David and of all others who "through faith and patience inherit (i.e., prospectively) the promises." With the fuller revelation

of God's mind which we now possess, the holiness of some of the Old Testament faithful should be not only equalled but exceeded.

66.—CONDITIONS OF SALVATION.

*Are there conditions in Scripture to be fulfilled by a person before he can obtain salvation? If so, please quote chapter and verse.*

There are; and the testimony in proof thereof is very voluminous, but the following will suffice for the present:—

1. "Without faith it is impossible to please God" (Heb. xi. 6).
2. Christ "became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey Him" (Heb. v. 9).
3. "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved" (Acts xvi. 31).
4. "Baptism doth also now save us" (I. Pet. iii. 21).
5. The Gospel "is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth" (Rom. i. 16).
6. "I declare unto you the Gospel . . . by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you" (I. Cor. xv. 1, 2).
7. "He that doeth the will of God abideth for ever" (I. Jno. ii. 17).

67.—NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING.

*Are the teachings of the four Gospels, Hebrews, and James, as applicable to us as the Epistles of Peter, Paul, and John?*

Yes, except where they refer to John's Baptism and obligations of the Mosaic Law not now in force. These are found, for the most part, in the Gospels. When introduced into the Epistles it is for the purpose of illustration, or of pointing out a parallel to the things pertaining to Christ. The epistle to the Hebrews and the epistle to James were written to Jews in Christ, not out of Him.

PROOFS:—"Wherefore, holy brethren partakers of the heavenly calling" (Heb. iii. 1). "Ye are come . . . to the general assembly and church of first-borns" (Heb. xii. 22, 23). "Be patient, therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord" (Jas. v. 7). "Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth" (ver. 19).

68.—SALVATION: HOW OBTAINABLE.

*Can anyone who desires salvation obtain it by his own efforts?*

If this mean solely by his own efforts,

the answer is No. The first qualification is to obtain a knowledge of the way of salvation, and in the present state of universal darkness this is improbable, if not impossible, unless brought into contact with writings or persons able to open up the Scriptures, as Philip did for the Ethiopian Eunuch (Acts viii. 31-35). The circumstances by which this result is brought about are under the control of God, for He it is that "giveth the increase" (I. Cor. iii. 7). And when this knowledge results in entrance into the Name of Salvation Divine action is still required. It is written that "all are partakers" of chastisement, and that this chastisement is inflicted, in love, by the Father, who "scourgeth every son whom He receiveth" (Heb. xii. 5-8). It does not follow that all who are chastened are benefitted; for it only "yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby" (ver. 11). It has an opposite effect on those who are not rightly "exercised." This Divine chastening is an essential part of the "much tribulation" through which "we must enter into the kingdom of God" (Acts iv. 22).

All the saved "first-fruits" are represented as having "come out of great tribulation" (Rev. vii. 14). No Son of God seeks tribulation for the purpose of self-chastisement, neither is he required to do it; and, therefore, from this point of view it is impossible for a man to obtain salvation solely by his own efforts. On the other hand, it may be safely said that no one can attain to immortality without personal effort. "For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption" (Gal. vi. 8). Individual exertion is clearly the basis of the numerous exhortations to "love," "walk," "strive," "stand fast," "keep in memory," "keep the Word," "be faithful," "overcome," &c. To define in each case exactly where Divine action begins and ends is difficult. It no doubt varies according to the attitude of God's several Sons. Although exhorted to "work out" their "salvation" they are at the same time reminded that "it is God which worketh in" them (Phil. ii. 12, 13), and the Apostle prays that God will "make" them "perfect to do His will" (Heb. xiii. 21). In view of these testimonies it is obvious that salvation is the result, in each individual case, of combined human and Divine action.

#### 69. — FAILURE TO OBTAIN SALVATION.

WILL IT BE A MAN'S OWN FAULT IF HE SHOULD NEVER OBTAIN SALVATION?

If he is never shown the way to obtain salvation it is his misfortune, not his fault. If, however, he is shown the way, and neglects it, or misuses it, the fault is his. Respecting such as enter the way of salvation, and fail to walk faithfully therein, the Scriptures plainly state that the blame rests with them. To deny this is to make void the many reproofs in the Inspired Word, and to attribute failure to Him who "willeth not the death of a sinner."

#### THE WORD MADE FLESH.

We have received a rather lengthy communication from "Philologus" in reply to our comments on his exposition in No. 14, pages 43 to 47. The subject being one of importance, and much misunderstood, we give it in full, with parenthetical remarks:—

"You have treated my contribution on this subject very freely. I do not object, but consider your comments on what I have written upon to great question in supporting what I cannot but think a wrong view altogether of John's teaching and contributing unscriptural support to the widely accepted belief in the pre-existence of Christ, a belief which I think the first chapter of John lends no real countenance to."

[It was partly because we considered our correspondent's view to "support the widely accepted belief in the pre-existence of Christ"—though not intentionally—that we thought it necessary to treat his contribution "freely."—Ed. S.-K.]

"I number your parenthetical paragraphs 1 to 7 for reference.

"In parenthesis 1, you say 'that to apply "the Word" in the first verse of John i. to Christ destroys the meaning of the statement in verse 14 that "the Word" was made flesh; whatever "the Word" was, it existed before it was made flesh.'

"The only justification you give for this assertion is another unsupported statement that "the Word" existed in two conditions: (1) Before embodiment in the flesh, and (2) after such embodiment."

"I do not see any conflict, much less destruction, in these two verses, the 1st and the 14th. The one explains the other."

[The evidence in support of the statement that the Word existed before embodiment in flesh is to be found in the fact that "the Word" possessed these qualifications:—

It was "with God."

It represented God.

It was the foundation for making certain "things."

It contained "life" and "light."

All this is affirmable of the Word of promise spoken in Eden, and subsequently elaborated into the writings of Moses and the prophets. If it had not been for that Word Christ would have had no existence. The phrase, "The Word was made flesh," is a positive statement which implies that "the Word" had an existence before being "made flesh." If, therefore, "the Word," before being so "made" be construed to mean Christ, the only logical conclusion is, that Christ had an existence before he was "made flesh." If, however, it be viewed as God's Word of promise, such a misapplication is excluded. It would be in harmony with Scriptural facts to say, Dust of the ground was made man; and in such a sentence "Philologus" would not deny that "dust of the ground" existed before it was made man.—Ed. S. K.]

"The first five verses of the chapter (John i.) which constitute the Prologue appear to me to be an epitome of the manifestation of Deity in Christ—a concise summary of the Life, Character, and Work of the Lord Jesus, for John wrote 'that we might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God' (John ix. 35); and what he states in the 8th and following verses is elucidation of this condensed summary, giving the circumstances attending this great feature in the development of the Divine plan of human salvation. The plain statement of the 14th verse that 'the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld His Glory,' was part of that elucidation, and affirms that the Word Jesus was made 'flesh' and not 'Spirit' made not of 'Angelic' but of 'human' nature and conveys no intimation of a previous existence of Christ or of the Word. The Word was *in* the Beginning and not *before* the Beginning, and John is so very explicit as to that Beginning, that there ought to be no misconception concerning it; it was, he states, that which was *from* the Beginning, that

which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we beheld and our hands have handled, concerning the Word of Life (margin—the Word), and the Life was manifested, 'and we have seen and bear witness' (I. John i. 1, 2, *n.v.*). So that there is no destruction of the meaning of the 14th verse in applying 'the Word' of the first verse to the Lord Jesus.

"The reverse is the case; it supports and substantiates it in what it truly teaches, that the Word—the Lord Jesus—was made flesh and dwelt among us.

"That this is the true force and meaning of the passage that Jesus was made of flesh, and not of spirit nature, is evident from the context, which states that as many as received Him to them gave He power to become sons of God (right to become children, *n.v.*), that is, a qualification for obtaining conformity to the body of the Glory of the Lord—(Phil. iii. 2, *n.v.*) in other words to constitute them children of the Spirit. Once made flesh like 'the Word'; subsequently, like Him also, made Spirit; born again not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. 'The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us.'"

[It does not follow that because John wrote of a "beginning" on two occasions that he referred in each case to the same time. In his epistle he defines the "beginning" as the time when he and others had first "heard," "seen," "looked upon," and "handled" Him in whom was Life (I. Jno. i. 1-3). In his Gospel he leaves us to ascertain from the context to what time he refers. It is obvious he cannot mean the "beginning" of Gen. i. 1, because he is treating of matters succeeding the introduction of sin and death. He is, in fact, dealing with the means by which death-stricken man may obtain "life." To say the least, therefore, it cannot be either improbable or inappropriate for him to refer to the time when God's offer of life was first made. And there can be no question that this was in Gen. iii. 15.

"Philologus" paraphrases the statement, "The Word was made flesh," into "Jesus was made of flesh." This, we submit, is not permissible. It does not say, the word was made of flesh, but "the Word was made flesh"—a statement which conveys an entirely different meaning; especially in view of

the fact, already noted, that "the Word" is previously described in respect to a time when it was not flesh.

The reference in John i. 12 to those who received "the Word" becoming "Sons of God," is not evidence that "the Word" had no existence before Christ's birth; for the reception of the Word of promise from Adam to John the Baptist resulted in many becoming "Sons of God" (see Gen. vi. 2, &c., &c.) —Ed. S.-K.]

"John emphatically states that the name of Christ is called 'the Word of God' (Rev. xix. 13.) We ask, Where is He so called? Unmistakenly, in the Beginning, in John i. 1.

"The Word, then, is Christ, and Christ is the Word, for that is 'His name,' and He had no existence apart from Divine purpose and decrees until embodied in flesh; first made flesh, afterward transformed into Spirit nature 'with power according to the Spirit of holiness by the resurrection of the dead' (Rom. i. 4).

"The Word' did thus exist in two conditions, not before embodiment in flesh, and *after* such embodiment, but first *made flesh*, embodied in human nature, and afterwards *made Spirit*, exalted to the Divine through resurrection by the power of the Father.

"In parenthesis 4 much Truth is asserted, but it is difficult to see that the terms of the serpent-sentence convey any intimation of God's purpose to form a new Creation in supersession of the old. To bruise is not to kill or destroy, but to hurt or to master. R.V. margin says 'to lie in wait for.' Death or Destruction, or even Removal is not hinted at. There was to be enmity between the two seeds, and the engendered antagonism and conflict might defer the end."

[We cannot but express surprise at this objection. The promise in Gen. iii. 15 is clearly the germ of all subsequent revelation; it is, indeed, in relation thereto as the acorn is to the oak. To bruise the serpent in the head was to take away the evils introduced through its subtlety. The head being the seat of power, a bruise in the head is the most effective method of destroying the power. Whereas the heel, being a less important part of the body, may be bruised without its power being taken away. Adopting, for the time being, the statement of "Philologus," that "to bruise is to

master," let us look at the fulfilment. The seed of the Serpent mastered the seed of the woman for three days; but since that time the seed of the woman has been the victor, and he will yet master the seed of the Serpent in relation to all who fulfil the required conditions.

Although the order in which the two seeds were to be bruised is not stated, it may be gathered from the nature of the bruising. The seed of the Serpent could not be bruised first, or it would not have had the power to bruise the seed of the woman. And the seed of the woman must be healed of its bruise in order to have the strength to bruise the seed of the Serpent. As the bruise of the seed of the woman was death, the healing of its bruise means resurrection. As the power of the Serpent's seed includes the infliction of death, the taking away of that power opens the way to life. Hence the promise in Gen. iii. 15, involves, in its realisation, resurrection and deathlessness.

It is true that Christ at His first appearing was the Word made flesh, and that He is now the Word made Spirit. On this point we are at one with "Philologus." But this does not exclude the truth that that Word existed before it was "made flesh." The name "Word of God," given to Christ in Rev. xix. 13, is the same as that given to certain "Scripture" or writings which "came" to the Jewish nation (Jno. x. 35) before Christ had an existence. And that name is obviously given to Christ because He fulfils (now and hereafter) God's purpose as foretold in the written Word. In like manner Christ was "the Word made flesh" because He was the fulfilment of certain predictions in "the Word of God" which came to the Jews prior to His birth.—[Ed. S.-K.]

"The idea of an existent Word to be regarded as no more than promise prior to that time when it was made flesh presents itself as unscriptural, and bolsters up one of the chief errors of the religious world, the Trinity, in upholding a pre-existent Christ-word. This is a vital part of the teaching of the Apostasy. They cannot accept or see the affirmation of John that the Word was in the Beginning, which Beginning was indicated in the Apostolic history, commencing at His birth, was developed at His baptism and consummated at His

resurrection. What the Apostasy holds and teaches is, however, of secondary importance except as an item of Satanism and continual conflict, for it is wrong *here*, as it is in most things, but let the brother of Christ leud no countenance to this feature of their wrong teaching."

[It is a misapprehension to say that the application of "the Word" in Jno. 1. 1 to a previous Divine utterance

"bolsters up the Trinity." Quite the reverse; a pre-existent promise excludes a pre-existent person; for a promise loses the characteristics of a promise as soon as it is fulfilled. On the other hand "the teaching of the Apostasy" is supported by defining "the Word" of Jno. i. 1 to be Christ. For it is universally recognised that that "Word" preceded the birth of Jesus.—**ED. S.-K.**]

(To be concluded in next number.)

## Within the Holy Place.

### GUERNSEY.

Bro. and Sister Fawcett report that, being in harmony with the Jersey Ecclesia, they have deemed it a duty, for doctrinal reasons, to withdraw from the ecclesia in Guernsey.

### HARRIETSHAM, MAIDSTONE.

I am sorry to have to report that Bro. Baker has left us for a situation at St. Leonard's-on-Sea, where he will meet with Bro. and Sister Simmons. **F. SITFORD.**

### JERSEY (CHANNEL ISLES).

Our week-after-week endeavour to make the truth known meets with very little encouragement, but we are determined to imitate Noah in times very similar to the period of the flood. Our latest effort is a special series of eight addresses covering the Sundays and Thursdays in February. Bro. Becquet, who has hitherto been in isolation in France, has returned to Jersey; we have therefore the pleasure of active fellowship with him. We have to record the death of our aged (83) Sister, Miss M. A. Hayes, which occurred on Friday, February 4th. Our sister had long known and loved the truth, while her consistency and humility had endeared her to all. The brethren committed her to the ground on Tuesday, February 8th, in hope of the resurrection which they believe cannot be a very far distant event for the sleeping saints. The ecclesia has withdrawn from Bro. Le Cras for being unequally yoked in marriage with an unbeliever.

**N. J. PAIGG**, Recording Brother.  
13, Colomberie.

### LEAMINGTON.

It gives me pleasure in having to report that, although we have no increase in number, the few of us have continued to meet together in fellowship on Sunday mornings at eleven o'clock, at Brother Colledge's, No. 3, North Villiers Street, and should be happy to have the company of any brother or sister who might be coming this way.

**J. HUDSON.**

### LIVERPOOL.

We had the pleasure of assisting Mrs. Alice Mand Croll to put on the name of Christ by immersion on January 22nd. Our new sister has been looking into the Truth for some time past. This increases our number to 13, including those who meet with us from Southport.

**H. KOSTROVITZKI.**

### LONDON (NORTH).

#### BARNBURY HALL, N.

We are still endeavouring to keep the light of The Truth steadily burning and are pleased to report an addition to our numbers, in the person of Mr. Walter Ham, eldest son of our Bro. and Sis. Ham, who was immersed into the Saving Name on December 19th.

On December 14th, Bro. John Owler and Sis. Eva Harding were united in marriage.

With a view to increasing the effectiveness of our Sunday Evening Lectures, a number of posters have been judiciously distributed in the immediate neighbourhood.

The Lecturers during the quarter have been Bro. J. J. Andrew, C. Balls, C. Bly, C. Bore, R. H. Ford, G. Handley, (Nor-

thampton), B. Overton, W. Owler, and J. Owler.

On December 27th our usual tea meeting was held, and a profitable evening spent in the consideration of I. Cor. iii., several brethren contributing to the work of exhortation.

JNO. OWLER, Recording Brother.

#### LONDON (SOUTH).

CREPSTOW HALL, High Street, Peckham.

We are sorry to state that our Brother Rushnell has left us in consequence of business taking him to Derby. We trust that he will be able to find some of like Faith with whom to Fellowship. On the other hand, we are glad to say that we have Bro. Jessop now meeting with us. In this case our gain is a loss to the Portsmouth Ecclesia. We have had the pleasure of a visit from Sister Kinnaird, of Southminster, Essex.

Lectures during the past quarter have been given by Brethren Bore, Balle, Andrew, Hookham, Jones, W. Owler, Richards, and Vingoe.

H. C. RAMSDEN, Recording Brother.

#### NEW ORLEANS.

Bro. Samuel T. Blessing, after a rather long illness, died November 18th, 1897. For thirty-five years he had maintained a solitary testimony for the Truth in New Orleans. After the Responsibility controversy had become prominent we had two or three letters from him, endorsing in the main the truths set forth in *The Blood of the Covenant*, though previously he had believed in the resurrection of certain ones out of Christ.

#### NEW ROMNEY.

This time I have to report the falling asleep of our aged and beloved Sister Trowell; this occurred on Wednesday morning, the 9th February. She has long and patiently endured the sufferings entailed by cancer, but throughout has maintained that joyous hope which is the outcome of the knowledge and obedience of the truth. The family, although none of them are associated as yet with Christ, most willingly consented to the carrying out of their mother's wish in regard to her burial, and in accordance therewith notification was given to the "Rector" of the parish that I should take the service. No opposition being made to that course I performed the necessary duty at the

grave, preceding same by a short service in our meeting room, at which all the family attended, together with our own brethren, and Sister Allen came from Teunterden, and Bro. Brand from Dover. I read a portion of the eleventh chapter of John, and afterwards gave a short address embodying, concerning our sister, what Martha said to Christ touching Lazarus, her brother: "Lord, if Thou hadst been here" our sister "had not died." I pointed out that she may be said to have died for a different reason from that which explains the occurrence of death in the case of mankind in general. They die and return to dust in fulfilment of the sentence which was originally pronounced upon Adam, by whom "Sin entered into the world and death by sin." But our sister, I said, did not rest under that sentence. She was under it by natural birth, but she had escaped from it by that Divine arrangement which God had provided for the purpose, in Christ Jesus, for all who are willing to avail themselves of it. "The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus" made her "free from the law of sin and death." Thus there was no legal necessity for her death; if the measure of her strength had enabled her to live until the return of Christ, she would not have required to taste of death at all, but would have been changed in a moment from a state of mortality to one of incorruptibility and endless life at His appearing and Kingdom.

One of the family, ere he returned to London, expressed the desire for some of our literature so that he might study and compare it with the Bible. It may therefore be that our sister in death will speak more strongly than when living. I pray that it may be so. Our sister was 79 years of age, and has been a faithful member of the household for some six or seven years. It is the first death in our Ecclesia since established here, nearly 18 years ago, and we trust it may be the last, by reason of the Master's presence in the earth.

WM. WHITEHEAD.

#### NORTHAMPTON.

The lectures have been delivered here weekly, reports Bro. Thorneloe, partly by brethren in the Ecclesia, and partly by brethren from London. A special effort is being arranged for the last week in March.