

Bros. T. H. Phelps, and M. I. Lewis, and also republish a paper of Bro. Dealtrey's on the time question, which it appears is now engaging much attention among the brethren in England, and this will be continued next issue. After this we intend to publish some notes on the Apocalypse by Bro. Broadfield, of Cheltenham. Since the leading articles for this issue were made up, we have received the continuation of Bro. Lavish's articles on the Gospel; and also a paper from Bro. Oakley, which will appear in due time. We would like to hear again from others of our correspondents, especially, Bros. Boulter, of London, and the different places in England, where the MESSENGER is received. We would also like an expression of opinion from a number to whom the MESSENGER has been sent, and who, we think, will not now request it to be discontinued, and also to remember that more assistance is needed to pay the printer's bill, as that is all that we have asked for. As a number of mistakes have been made in some articles of the last two issues, we wish to say that we have been so much occupied, since the opening of the spring, with farm and other work that we had scarcely time to read the proof, we will try hereafter and see that the proof is corrected by the copy.

In regard to the statement made in Bro. Phelps's article, that the two first chapters of Luke's Gospel, excepting the first four verses, as well as the greater part of the two first chapters of Matthew, are interpolations, we wish to remark that there is not a uniformity of belief on *this point* among those who repudiate the miraculous concep-

tion, and those portions in Matthew which were "written by some nameless Greek" with the design of supporting that anti-christian fable. And although these parts of Luke have doubtless been tampered with by men of corrupt minds, yet to us there does not seem sufficient evidence to reject them as a whole. We still cling to the belief that the account contained therein relating to the early life of Jesus is historically true, even though it may be shown that Luke was not the author; but we think that Luke did write the greater part of these disputed portions, for he tells in the introductory to the "Acts" that in his former treatise, *i. e.* Gospel, he had given an account of all that Jesus "began both to do and teach." In the Gospel Luke says that Jesus was about thirty years of age when he began to teach, therefore in a former part he must have recorded what Jesus began to do and to teach. There is nothing whatever in the second chapter of Luke to support the miraculous conception, but much to show that Jesus was, according to prophecy, the child of human parents, and a law-abiding Jew. The fact that these portions were not in the copies of Luke, used by Marcion, in the second century, is in favor of their genuineness, for that apostate rejected the humanity of Jesus, and held that "the Christ" first manifested himself to his disciples, at his baptism in the Jordan in the form of perfect manhood, and we believe it can be proved, that the account of the enrollment, when Jesus was born under Quirinius (not Cyrenius), when the Kingly government was taken from Archelaus, does not contradict the history of Josephus. These matters, however, require to be carefully investigated, and as they are not articles of faith, but of historical veracity, should not cause dissunity among those who are otherwise in harmony.