

THE AMBASSADOR
OF
THE COMING AGE.

A MONTHLY PERIODICAL DEVOTED TO THE EXPOSITION
AND DEFENCE OF

“THE THINGS CONCERNING THE KINGDOM OF GOD, AND THE NAME OF JESUS
CHRIST,” AS COMPREHENSIVELY UNFOLDED IN THE WRITINGS OF MOSES,
THE PROPHETS, AND THE APOSTLES.

“Earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the Saints.”—JUDE.

VOLUME IV.

BIRMINGHAM: PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR:

ROBERT ROBERTS, CARLTON PLACE, BELGRAVE ROAD.

MDCCLXVII.

CONTENTS OF VOL. IV.

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Elpis Israel	1, 55	Mansfield	202
Tour in Scotland 3, 48, 235, 267,	312	Detroit, (U.S.)	202
Dr. Thomas and his Mission 8,	38	Australia	202, 327
Good Fight of Faith—Halifax <i>v.</i>		Devonport	250
Huddersfield	11	Frome, (Somerset)	250, 325
Trinitarianism and the Truth, 16, 42,		Heckmondwike	251
74, 144, 167, 190, 216,	295	Bradford-on-Avon	283
Political Heavens and the Signs		Leeds	283, 325
thereof, 18, 55, 84, 90, 118, 151,		Littlebury, (Essex)	283
173, 199, 228, 242, 278,	319	Ripponden	284
Judgment-seat of Christ 21, 61, 109,		Tewkesbury	284
133,	205	Whitby	286
Anastasis	34	China	287
Signs of the Times	35, 182	Jeffersonville, (U.S.)	287, 327
Dowieism and our Correspondents ..	45	Sweetwater, (U.S.)	288
Biblical Figures of Speech	51	Roths, (Scotland)	326
INTELLIGENCE:—		Tranent	326
Aberdeen .. 59, 83, 105, 154,	249	Norfolk, (U.S.)	327
Birmingham 59, 83, 129, 154, 178,		Truth's Progress, Statistics of ..	179
201, 249, 281,	324	Dr. Thomas's proposed visit to	
Jersey	59	England	324
Edinburgh 59, 155, 179, 201, 225,		Doctrine of the Devil & the Doctrine	
253,	325	of Christ (connection between)	70
Galashiels 59, 179, 283,	325	Poetry: The Vision	80
Halifax 59, 105, 108, 130, 155, 202,		How Long, Holy and True? ..	129
250, 283,	325	CORRESPONDENCE—W. D., J. R., J.	
London .. 59, 155, 179, 284,	326	M., C. B. H., G. D., D. B., J. D.	80
New Barnet, (London) .. 59,	83	Will the Kingdom only last a	
New Zealand	59, 107	Thousand Years?	
Swansea .. 59, 84, 155, 284,	326	Deficient Knowledge and the One	
Turrieff .. 59, 107, 155, 286,	326	Baptism	
Nottingham 83, 131, 202, 253, 284,	326	Name of the Father, Son and	
Glasgow .. 105, 179, 250,	325	Holy Spirit	
New York, (U.S.)	107	Nature of Christ	
Huddersfield	130	Query about the Devil	
Newark	131	Coming of Christ and Temporal	
Ballus by Mintlaw, (Scotland) ..	154	Affairs of Saints, see also p. 126	
Derby	155	Holy City	102
Dunkeld, (Scotland)	178	Kingdom Preached to the Gentiles	
Scarborough	179	Resurrection—Brother Sharpe's	
Beith, (Scotland)	201, 281	Article	
Berwick-on-Tweed	201	Oaths, Is it Lawful to take?	
Gateshead	201	Resurrection, Wicked in the ..	126

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Ten Virgins, Parable of	126	Devil of Orthodoxy Compared with the Devil of the Bible	121
J. M., A. E. B., H. B.	222	<i>Twelve Lectures</i>	131, 204
Sun and Moon Standing Still		Declaration of First Principles ..	131
Born Again		Letters from Dr. Thomas ..	157, 182
Perish, Meaning of		Judgment at Home, Social and Individual	185
Kingship of Christ		Mystic Times of Prophecy	196
Eternal Life, Duration of		Mosaic Gospel	198
Human Spirit, Proprietorship of the		<i>Ambassador</i> , Enlargement of ..	229
Spirits of Just Men made Perfect		Judgment, New Testament Doctrine of 230, 257,	289
Spirits in Prison	315	Christadelphian Synagogue, Birm- ingham	302
American Colony in Palestine ..	84	Father of Jesus, Who was the? ..	304
Nature of Christ	85	Notes 33, 41, 108, 132, 156, 179, 203, 227, 288,	328
Apocalypse Paraphrased 88, 115, 141, 163, 188,	265		
Death and Life	97		
Coming and Kingdom of Christ in Relation to the Gospel	100		



THE AMBASSADOR

Of the Coming Age.

“A wicked Messenger falleth into mischief, but a faithful Ambassador
is health.”—PROV. xiii, 17.

No. 31.

JANUARY, 1867.

Vol. IV.

TO OUR READERS.

WE have been unable, for want of time, to write a continuation of the article on “Judgment” for this number. We must bespeak the patience of our readers, reminding them that there are onerous secular and other duties on our shoulders which sometimes press too heavily to admit of *Ambassador* work. We shall try our best to have an article ready for next month.—EDITOR.

December 21st, 1866.

PROSPECTUS FOR A FOURTH EDITION OF *ELPIS ISRAEL*,

BY JOHN THOMAS, M.D.,

*Author of “Eureka: An Exposition of the Apocalypse,” “Anatolia,”
“Herald of the Kingdom,” &c.*

“For the HOPE OF ISRAEL I am bound with this chain.”—*Acts xxviii* 20, 23.

Build by whatever plan Caprice decrees,
With what materials, on what ground you please;
But KNOW, that ISRAEL'S HOPE alone shall stand,
Which PAUL proclaim'd in ROME to ev'ry man.

For a considerable time, there have been no copies of *Elpis Israel*, or *Israel's Hope*, for sale. The author has had many applications for it which he has not been able to satisfy; and as they have been earnest, and accompanied oftentimes with an offer of any sum within reason for

a copy, he has concluded to try the pulse of the friends of the hope Paul preached; and to see, if interest enough exists among them for the publication of a **FOURTH EDITION** of what many consider the only Scriptural and systematic exposition of that hope extant. Besides this, some in these States and Britain, whose deeds do not drag their slow length behind their professions, having already started a subscription for its re-publication as one of the most necessary and useful works of this, or any other, generation, since the **APOSTOLIC AGE**, the author has been stirred up to revise it, and by the issue of this prospectus, to see what can be done.

It is not necessary for him to say anything about its contents. These are pretty well known to the public with which he has had to do; and in which are now circulating two thousand eight hundred copies. In the proposed edition, there will be a **FOURTH PREFACE**, in which the scriptural character of the present remarkable times will be set forth. No real believer of Israel's Hope can be indifferent to this; for they are remarkably significant of the nearness of the Advent, the Resurrection, the Redemption of Israel, and the Judgment.

Besides this Preface and the revision of the work, there will be annexed the *Chronikon Hebraikon* (assailed by scribblers, but untouched by candid and enlightened criticism), as a substitute for the very brief chronology at the end of previous editions; so that the work will be thereby enlarged about forty pages.

The artistic fabrication of this Fourth Edition will be after the pattern of the last; which is equivalent to saying, that it will be got up in a neat and workmanlike manner. The mechanical revision, with the high prices of labor and materials, will enhance the currency price of the volume. The contract with the printer will be for the lowest cash price; hence, the author must deal with subscribers upon the same principle. He proposes, therefore, to set the printer to work *as soon as three hundred copies are subscribed for with prepayment*. These *thus reliably engaged* will set the press in motion, and result in the issue of the edition as soon afterwards as it can be completed.

TERMS.

THREE DOLLARS a copy; and thirty cents postage additional. Freight and duty to Britain and its Provinces, at subscribers' cost.

☞ It is desirable, that the names of correspondents, their Post Offices, Counties and States, be all very plainly written, that mistakes may be prevented.

☞ Letters containing orders to be addressed to John Thomas, M. D., *West Hoboken, Hudson Co., New Jersey*; and R. Roberts, *Athenæum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham*.

All of which is respectfully submitted by
Nov. 5, 1866.

THE AUTHOR.

TO THOSE WHO HAVE SUBSCRIBED IN BRITAIN.

It will be observed from the foregoing announcement that those whose names have from time to time appeared on the cover of the *Ambassador* as "subscribers for the forthcoming edition of *Elpis Israel*," are now expected to remit the price of the volume, and we wish to impress upon them that it will be their interest to do so at once, as the rate of exchange has been steadily lowering for some time, and is likely to continue doing so. By remitting the money at the present price of gold, the cost of the book will be less to English subscribers than it would probably be a few months hence. With gold at par, the price would be 12s6d., without freight and postage; at 133, it will be something under 10s.; freight and postage added, will raise the amount to 11s6d. per copy. To subscribers, we say please remit at once 11s6d. for every copy ordered. We append a list of those who have ordered, so that all parties may remember their duty:—

	Copies.		Copies.
Andrews, J. J., London	... 10	Holland, W., Birmingham (paid)	1
Atkins, D., Bradford	... 1	Hughes, J., Kington	... 1
Bane, W., Dundee	... 1	Jones, F., Birmingham	... 1
Bingley, R. C., Birmingham (paid)	5	Kitts, J. J., Plymouth...	... 1
Butler, J., Birmingham	... 2	Milne, W., Galashiels	... 4
Brown, J., New Zealand (paid)	4	Mitchell, W., Edinburgh	... 1
Clement, D., Mumbles	... 45	Moss, J. T., Earlisterdale	... 1
Coombe, J., Toronto	... 6	Pettigrew, James, Dalry	... 1
Drawhill, Mary, Innerleithen...	1	Rackam, E., London	... 1
Dean, R. H., Birmingham	... 1	Rayer, Chas., Birmingham	... 1
Dick, George, Glasgow	... 1	Rhodes, J., Huddersfield	... 1
Dyer, H., Bradford-on-Avon	... 1	Rooke, R., Sydney	... 4
Eccles, J., Scarborough	... 1	Sister J.—	... 5
Evans, H., Swansea	... 1	Sister N.—	... (paid) 6
Fletcher, S., Nottingham	... 1	Shuttleworth, F. R., Halifax	... 9
Fidler, M., South Shields	... 1	Taylor, Mary, Birmingham	... 1
Findlay, Geo. B., Fraserburgh	1	Tomkins, J. G., Birmingham...	1
Fuller, T., Headingly	... 1	Turner, H., Birmingham	... 1
Grant, J., Carrbridge	... 1	Turner, J., Innerleithen	... 1
Griffith, J., Kington	... 1	Turney, J., Nottingham	... 6
Goldie, R., Swansea	... 3	White, D., New Zealand (paid)	4
Haire, J. P., Liverpool	... 1		

TOUR IN SCOTLAND.

SINCE the meeting reported from memory last month, which Mr. Dowie prevented from being reported in any other way, by refusing to allow notes to be taken—the Dowieites have issued a document intended to counteract "repeated erroneous statements, published in the *Ambassador*, which are calculated to

shake the confidence of brethren in the validity" of their position. This is described as "The things most surely believed" among them. The first thing we have to say to it is, that this description is merely an accommodation to Luke, and not an accurate or a natural description of their attitude, even

to the things they claim to believe. The Dowieites as a class, believe nothing with much cordiality or confidence. Uncertainty is the synonym of Dowieism, in reference to all divine things. They are not sure about anything, except a few things that it were worse than childishness to doubt. Their want of positiveness and enthusiasm is an insult to the truth; their ignorance of some first principles, is criminal in men assuming their position before the brotherhood. Their influence is a spiritual leprosy, which all earnest sons of God will flee.

The next thing we have to say is, that in its attempted definition of "the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ," there is an imperfectness and an indefiniteness incompatible with that clear and cordial state of enlightenment, which alone can form the basis of the fellowship they claim.

The things of the kingdom are stated with tolerable accuracy, so far as defined; but the ground covered is more limited than the truth, and the definition is too meagre to satisfy. This is the most that can be said in the way of objection on this score. But this could be pardoned, if the things concerning the name of Christ were acknowledged with even proportionate clearness and fulness. It is in this department of the truth where the baldness and poverty of the faith, represented by the "statement" differs. The Messiahship of Jesus is alleged to be restricted to the office he holds in connection with the throne of David. This is done in the following statement—"That it is in consequence of his being anointed for the throne of David, that Jesus is termed 'the Messiah,' or 'Christ.' Matt. ii, 1-6; John i, 35-49." This forms part and parcel of the definition of "the things concerning the kingdom of God," but in reality it bears upon "the things concerning the name of Jesus Christ;" for if the Messiahship of Jesus consist of his heirship to the throne of David, then a man can believe on him as the Christ, and yet be ignorant of his death, resurrection and priesthood, and the great doctrines underlying those facts. And can in that case, believe with impunity in the immortality of the soul, the pre-existence of Jesus, the existence of a supernatural devil, or any other of the ancient and modern fables, which undermine and destroy the things concerning the name of Christ. For a man might believe in the re-establishment of David's throne under Jesus, and yet nurse fondly in his bosom the Platonic conceit of native immortality, the monstrous fiction of Infernal Diabolism, or the wild and misleading theory of Trinitarianism, all of which he could find some way of reconciling with the expectation that "the third person of the Trinity" was to be manifested a second time personally on *terra firma*.

But such a definition of the Messiahship is entirely defective. The anointing of Jesus

covers the whole ground of his mission. This is evident from Isaiah lxi, 1: "The spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because HE HATH ANOINTED ME to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord." The accomplishment of these things involved his death, resurrection and priesthood; for he could not achieve the liberty of captives, or the opening of the prison for the bound, &c., without going through the process, by which he was to acquire "the keys of death and hades."—(Rev. i, 18)—destroy the great gaoler, the devil, or sin, which through fear of death, kept the captives all their lifetime subject to bondage, (Heb. ii, 14-15; Rom. vi, 16; Jno. viii, 34)—and constitute himself the Way, the Door, the Resurrection and the Life. He required to be anointed with the spirit, to accomplish this process. "THROUGH THE ETERNAL SPIRIT," says Paul, "He offered himself without spot to God."—(Heb. ix, 14). How far from the truth, therefore, it is, to confine the Christship of Jesus to his regal function. His occupancy of the throne of David in the universal rule of the world, will be but the sublime consummation of a mission inaugurated in babyhood, on the plains of Bethlehem, and sealed in blood on Calvary, nearly twenty centuries ago. It will be but the outward and official expression of the great principles which his manifestation and humiliation in the flesh, more loudly proclaim than his kingly triumphs. It is an event which none will share the glory of who have not previously fellowshipped the sufferings which divinely precede exaltation—an event which none can understand who do not comprehend the Judean antecedents of Him who will then command the obedience of the world. In itself it is not the Christing of Jesus of Nazareth; his anointing covers every stage of his existence and mission. No man, therefore, can believe that Jesus is the Christ without comprehending the truth in its past and future aspects. In fact, no one savingly believes the truth concerning Jesus Christ, who is ignorant of "the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ." The former is inefficient for salvation without the latter. The "things concerning the kingdom of God," require the addition of "things concerning the name of Jesus Christ,"—(Acts viii, 12); elsewhere styled "Those things that concern our Lord Jesus Christ" (as distinct from "the kingdom of God," Acts xxviii, 31)—to make them of any value to the believer of them. It requires a knowledge of the nature and objects and the first coming of Jesus, to make a knowledge of the second coming of any service. This involves the apprehension of questions and principles which are studiously

ignored in the "statement" now under consideration. The attempt to confine the Messiahship to the kingship of Christ, is an attempt (unwitting it may be) to underrate and reduce to small consequence, the mystical elements of the truth of God, viz., those relating to the moral relations of man to Deity, as exemplified and embodied in the things concerning the name of Jesus Christ,—an attempt which must be strenuously resisted on the part of all who desire to preserve uncorrupted the gospel, which is the power of God unto salvation. We must contend not less earnestly for this element of the faith once for all delivered to the saints, than for that relating to the kingdom. On this principle we review, paragraph by paragraph, that part of the Dowieite statement of first principles relating to the things of the name.

I.—"That the humiliation, suffering and death of the Messiah, were appointed by his Father to be a sacrifice for sin, and to perfect him for being the Saviour and High Priest of the human race. Luke xxiv, 25, 27, 46, 47; Heb. ii, 10, 14, 18."

This is too general to be accepted as a definition of the truth. It is elastic enough to fit into any theory of the sacrifice of Christ. The most rabid Methodist could write 'amen' at the bottom of it, with fervid satisfaction. He would see in it an acknowledgment of his cardinal doctrine that Jesus was the second person of a triune Deity, standing in the room of condemned immortal souls, to endure the concentrated anguish of eternity that immortal souls might escape the fangs of the sulphurous devil, and be transported, on angels' wings, to regions of celestial day,—all of which is sheer nonsense, as utterly subversive of the truth as the words of Hymenæus and Philetus.

II.—That the race of man is absolutely mortal by nature, and, in consequence of sin, under the sentence of death; and that God in his great love, has appointed that those *alone* who believe in the Christ, the Son of the living God, shall live for ever. Psalm cxlvi, 3, 4; Rom. vi, 23; John iii, 16; xx, 31.

This is one of the "things" represented to be "most surely believed" among the Dowieites, and one of the "declarations," as we learn from the last paragraph, that is "embraced in the gospel," and, therefore, we may presume, one of the things necessary to be "most surely believed;" although it has to be observed, that throughout the whole document, of which this forms a part, there is a careful abstinence from any expression that would commit them to the proposition that anything in particular is necessary for belief. This is one of the worst features of the case. Supposing the "statement" were comprehensive and accurate enough to embrace the whole truth, the absence of this one element (viz., the conviction and the contention that such truth is

the power of God unto salvation, and as such must be maintained in its purity as against all "fables") would be a defect fatal to its validity as a basis of fellowship; for if any professing the truth are not prepared to go this length and to "contend earnestly" for the uncorrupted faith as *the seed of eternal life*, they are unfaithful to the truth they profess. Nay, more; they are traitors to it. They wound it in its tenderest part—they rob it of its principal glory—they deny its chief testimony of itself, viz., that without it a man cannot be saved. They insult it by saying in effect, "Yes, these things are true, but they are of no particular consequence; a man may be saved without them." It is here where Dowieism is most hateful. It makes a profession of the truth, but covertly gives it the lie. It kisses it with the mouth, and with the hand stabs it to death. In words it protests friendship and agreement, but in actual working it makes greater havoc than the Adversary, Methodism, walking up to the truth, with all the terrors of an omnipotent Devil, and an extinguishless and eternal hell, and invoking the maledictions of heaven upon so vile and infidel a system, hurts it not, and discourages it not. On the contrary, it invigorates, purifies, and gives valour and triumph to it, for the NEW MAN rises in his might, and with his invincible sword with two edges, hews the enemy to pieces, stamps out his infernal fires, and annihilates the monster that waits in his train—whereby the truth gains friends and renown. But Dowieism comes sneaking over the ramparts, utters the password, which it has filched from an unwary sentinel, and passing current in the camp, whispers sedition and disaffection, divides the counsels, distracts the purposes, and weakens the hands of those who are fighting for the king, by insinuating that it is a pity to make such a fuss against the good people in Satan's dominion; "they are nice people: wouldn't it be better to stop this bloody onslaught upon them: cease this relentless firing; undo the gates; stop the war; be friendly; you can keep your guns mounted of course, and fly your own flag; we prefer the Christadelphian flag ourselves; but then other people have their flags, and they speak fairly of our captain; let us be at peace with them; we daren't say that they are entirely in the wrong; perhaps we have mistaken orders in setting out on this expedition against them." And so the spirit of valiant testimony for the truth of God against the superstitions and impositions of the time, is frittered away, and nothing left but a weak, uncertain impression that certain things may be right or may be wrong, and that nothing can be positively known.

Dowieism says it "most surely believes" that man is *absolutely mortal*, and that this is "embraced in the gospel." If this is a genuine profession, of course it "most

surely believes" that the immortality of the soul is a lie, and upsets a part of the gospel. If so, why does it "hesitate to accept the conclusion" that a man must reject the immortality of the soul before he can receive the truth? (See James Cameron's speech, *Ambassador* for Dec., 1866, p. 269.) And why does it lay down a "kind of postulate" with the object of discountenancing all condemnation of the immortality of the soul in the proclamations of the truth? (G. Dowie on page 265 ditto.) If this statement of faith means what it says, why did its framers refuse to append a declaration to the effect that it was necessary to reject the immortality of the soul before the truth of the matter could be received?*

Dowieism professes to recognize some merit in "most surely believing" in the "absolute mortality of man." If so, what objections can it have to saying to people who "most surely believe" the contrary, that they are believing a lie, which they must reject before they can believe the truth? Why "decline to answer" the plain question, whether a person believing the immortality of the soul can hold the faith which is unto salvation? (See G. Dowie's statements, page 258, December *Ambassador*.) Can a man believe in the immortality of the soul, and believe in the "absolute mortality of man"? Of course not. Then can a man believe in the immortality of the soul and believe in the truth? Dowieism is not sure, and declines to answer. Does this not shew that Dowieism's profession of belief in the "absolute mortality" of man is not a profession of the one faith at all, but a mere statement of abstract conviction to which it attaches no importance whatever? It puts forward this profession as a reason why it should be received by the brethren of Christ; but let Dowieism take notice, and hereafter know, that this is not such a profession of faith as will assimilate it to them. The mortality of man is a part of the truth or not. If it is a part of the truth, which Dowieism professes to believe, it must be upheld without compromise. Dowieism must not only believe in the mortality of man; it must be able to say, that no man believing in the immortality of man can believe the truth. Then it will cease, on this particular question, to be Dowieism, and put on a new and a more worthy name, and take its stand side by side with the truth, in its uncompromising warfare against the lies

and fables everywhere abounding in the outward garb and profession of the gospel. Such a change would gladden the hearts of men and angels, and give a new and a joyous impetus to the labours which are here and there in weakness, but in love progressing, against the strongholds of Satan. Till then, Dowieism must stand off, and leave the king's friends alone, and bring not upon itself a severer condemnation by obstructing the path of the truth's triumph. It must not pretend to be at war with the "imagination and high thoughts that exalt themselves against the knowledge of God," while all the while it gives them quarter and encouragement, by refusing to say, "Begone." It must not pretend to "most surely believe" in human mortality, while afraid to declare against the most sure belief in human immortality. So long as it does so, its professions will be scouted by all honest men as a mere accommodation, a blind, and a delusion.

The "STATEMENT" proceeds as follows:—

III.—That in order to the obtaining of this salvation, God requires of those who thus believe in his Son, that they be immersed in water into Christ, and submit to him in all things as their Lord.—(Mark xvi, 15, 16; Acts ii, 36—38; ii, 9—11.)

IV.—That all who thus believe in Jesus as Lord and Christ, and are immersed into his Name, are accounted by God as the seed of Abraham, to whom the promises were made; and are joint partakers with him of his eternal kingdom and glory.—(Gal. iii, 26—29; Rom. viii, 17; Rev. iii, 21.)

V.—That God bestows these favours on believers, on account of the death of his Son, Jesus the Christ.—(John iii, 14, 15; Gal. iii, 13, 14; Eph. ii, 11—13.)

VI.—That the resurrection and glorification of the faithful, and the establishment of the kingdom of God, take place at the second coming of the Lord; and that at his appearing and kingdom, he shall judge the quick and the dead.—(1 Cor. xv, 23, 50—54; 1 Thess. iv, 15—17; Matt. xxv, 31; 2 Tim. iv, 1; 2 Cor. v, 10.)

To these propositions there is little to be said in the way of objection. Indeed, if the "statement" truly represented the position of those putting it forward, there would be an end to the differences now existing. But it does not. It misrepresents their position in so far as it withholds those peculiarities which overturn the principles apparently avowed in the words of the statement. It does not say, as it ought to say, that in the opinion of the Dowieites, it is a matter of uncertainty whether a man requires to believe in the New Testament doctrine of immortality or not, in order to be saved; it ought to say what it does not say, that the Dowieites do not believe that Christ will judge the dead at his appearing, but consider that his object in raising people from the grave at that time

* When the "statement" was submitted to the Dowieites for adoption, W. Norrie proposed the addition of a clause affirming that it involved a repudiation of the doctrine of natural immortality, and they refused to add such a declaration, although the very object of the statement being drawn up, was to rebut the accusations in circulation as to the unfaithfulness of the Dowieites on this point.

is merely to distribute honours among them; it ought to say, which it does not say, that the Dowieites consider it a matter of entire indifference whether the object of Christ's death be understood to have been to destroy a superhuman infernal personal antagonist of the human race, or to deprive the *divine law* of sin and death of its power to destroy mankind. It ought to say a good many other similar things which may be gleaned from the contents of the last number of the *Ambassador*, by the aid of which, the reader is enabled to perceive that the statement is a mere "form of words," which, as words, may be unobjectionable, but as an expression of faith is entirely without value. Indeed, accompanying the statement, there is a kind of boast that its words cannot be challenged. The remark is made that however imperfect the propositions may be considered, "the Scriptures cited *express exactly* all that is contained in" them. This fact is of no value whatever as the case stands. Any orthodox believer might so manipulate the wording of his faith as to make it accordant with the terms of certain parts of Scripture testimony. He might say, for instance, that Jesus Christ was everlasting, and quote Micah v. 2; that he was the Father, and refer to John xiv. 9, 30; that he came into this world to fight the devil, capture him, chain him up, let him loose again, and finally destroy him, and cite as proof 1 John iii. 8; Heb. ii. 14; Rev. xii. 7-9; xx. 1-3; He might say that the human soul was worth the whole world, Matt. xvi. 26; Mark viii. 37; that it was in danger of hell-fire, Matt. v. 22, xviii. 8, where the worm dieth not, and where fire is not quenched, Mark xix. 44; he might say that the promised inheritance is in heaven, 1 Peter i. 4; and that our duty is to lay up treasure *and set our affections* there in heaven above and not on the earth, Matt. vi. 20; Col. iii. 2; Christ's kingdom not being of this world, John xviii. 36; he might go on to say that after death comes the judgment to every man, and quote Heb. ix. 27; that when a believer is absent from the body, he is present with the Lord, 2 Cor. v. 6-8; and that for him to die is to depart and be with Christ, which is far better, Phil. i. 21-23; Having done all this, he could say with as much boast as the language of Dowieism, "However imperfect the language we have employed may be, the Scriptures cited *express exactly* all that is contained in these propositions." Where would Dowieism be then with its most sure belief in the "absolute mortality" of man, the unconsciousness of the dead, and the kingdom to be set up on earth? Confuted and confounded by itself! for on its own principle, the Scriptures above referred to "express exactly," so far as mere appearance of words is concerned, the propositions of an orthodox believer. But would Dowieism be content with such a "statement and references?" We trow not. It would be for

sifting the "scriptures cited" to see what they *meant*, what they were *intended to express*, what on a right construction of their *terms*, in view of other parts of the word, they really did express. And thus it would rightly come to be a question of ideas, as opposed to mere words, which in the uncertain state of the theological vocabulary, are little or no guide to the truth. This is the rule to judge Dowieism, and by this rule it is condemned. It is found as a matter of *words* professing a belief in the "absolute mortality" of man, but as a matter of practice tolerating immortal-soulism by refusing to proclaim the imperative necessity of its rejection. It is found confessing a belief in judgment as a matter of phraseology, but in point of actual fact denying it, by excluding the resurrection of the unfaithful at the appearing of Christ. It is found in words saying that the wages of sin is death, that sin is disobedience instigated by rebellious promptings of the flesh, that Christ came to take away sin, by enduring the consequence, but in absolute principle, it reduces the whole to a nullity by admitting the existence of a separate personal supernatural Being, who has the power of death in his hands, and whom in the same way it is Christ's mission to destroy. In many other respects it stultifies its professions by its principles, and lands everything in obscurity, trying all the while to hide itself under Scripture forms of speech, which it cannot trust itself to grasp or explain. Farewell to Dowieism! The Master of the Household will soon be here to set things in order. Meanwhile 'tis ours to abide by the truth, measuring all men and things by it, and accepting every issue to which it guides us. Division and bitterness, even to fire, were foretold long ago as the result of the truth's workings among men, we therefore need not be discouraged at realizing them in an unexpected form now. Heat and conflict is what we have to expect on the field of battle. In due time the fight will be over, and the crown conferred in peace and glory, where the strife is nobly and heroically sustained. But, now we must be good soldiers, fighting against the beleaguering hosts of the enemy, of which Dowieism is but a small and feeble section. The lusts of the flesh must be overcome; the world must be vanquished in its attempts to enslave us in the interests of self; the philosophy of the schools and the old wives' fables of the apostacy in whatever form, strong or weak, must be vigilantly kept at bay; that having done all, we may enter into that perfect rest, that remaineth for the people of God.

(To be continued)

"Know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God; whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world, is the enemy of God."—JAMES.

DR. THOMAS AND HIS MISSION.—No. 11.

(Continued from page 249.)

LEAVING his wife at Cincinnati, the Dr. returned with his daughter to Richmond, where he took up his abode with the friend who invited him to share with him the accommodation of a large new house. On the first Sunday after his arrival, the Dr. was taken to a meeting-house at Bethesda, ten miles from Richmond, where was accustomed to meet, a Campbellite congregation. Being known among them, he was invited to address the people, very much to the annoyance of their preacher, who was known as "Parson Talley." This old gentleman not only refused to stay to hear the Dr., but gave vent to his aggrieved feelings in a very lugubrious style. "Dr. Thomas!" said he, in the presence of the company, "why do you come here to trouble us? we don't want you, sir! We have no use for you, sir! We have no more fellowship with you than with an infidel!" upon which he left the house, boiling over with indignation. The old man's son, Dr. Talley, who was one of the congregation, was one of the principal parties to inviting the Dr. to speak, and he was, therefore, chagrined in no small degree at this display on the part of his father. The Dr. spoke, and returned to Richmond with his friend, who got into trouble in connection with the incident. It was noised abroad that he had gone out with Dr. Thomas to Bethesda, broken bread with him there, and had procured speaking facilities for him. This offence, in process of time, was charged against him by the authorities of the Richmond "church," and made the ground of his expulsion, and also of a resolution, duly passed and recorded, that any member having anything to do with Dr. Thomas in a friendly way should be excommunicated. This, of course, made little impression upon Dr. Thomas, who had been accustomed to that sort of thing for a considerable time; but it had the good effect of causing the Dr. and a few others to commence a meeting on non-Campbellite principles. This may be said to have been the first organic manifestation of the truth. Previous to this, it had been rankling and germinating in the ranks of Campbellism; now, through the force of circumstances, it became the basis of a distinct ecclesiastical organization, though not in its pure and ultimate form. The Odd Fellows' Hall was offered and accepted for the delivery of an introductory discourse. There was a considerable audience. The Dr. laid the case before the meeting; he defined their principles, and explained their purpose for the future, intimating that thenceforth a few of them would meet every first day of the week, at his friend's house. The number who carried out this plan was four or five. They crept along slowly for a while, till they resolved to come out more publicly by hiring the Temperance Hall for a meeting every Sunday. This step resulted favourably to the truth, along with other agencies at work. The Dr. continued to publish the *Herald of the Future Age*, at his office in Richmond, subscriptions and contributions barely paying the expenses of publication. Though barren in a financial point of view, however, this period was rich in spiritual results to the Dr.'s mind. His editorial duties in connection with the

Herald imposed upon him an amount of scriptural research which, otherwise, would not have been attempted, and, being unencumbered by secular occupation, though not unburdened with the anxieties incident to the provision of food and raiment, those labours in the mine of divine truth, introduced him to many an undiscovered vein of treasure, and formed a link of no small importance in the chain of circumstances that led him from the darkness of the apostacy, to the full blaze of the light emanating from the oracles of the Deity.

About this time, the Dr. accepted an invitation to visit New York. The invitation proceeded from a Richmond friend, who offered to pay expenses both ways, and assured the Dr. he would be able to procure for him a hearing in the Campbellite church of that city. On their arrival at New York, the Dr.'s friend applied to a Campbellite of the name of Goole, a stationer and printer in the city, for the purpose named. The application was duly reported to the leading men, and the result was that a deputation waited on the Dr. to ascertain if he had not been excommunicated by the church at Richmond. The Dr. replied that whatever disposition might have existed in the Richmond church to do such a thing, it had never been carried out, and that he was an unexcommunicated individual. The deputation said, as that was the case, they could have no objection to his using their hall. Accordingly, the Dr. lectured there several times on various prophetic and doctrinal subjects. This was the Dr.'s introduction to New York in connection with the truth.

Shortly after his return to Richmond, the Dr. saw a letter in the *Protestant Unionist*—(a publication conducted by

Walter Scott)—signed by a man named Jones, in which the writer stated that he had been to New York shortly after the Dr.'s visit, and found the minds of the brethren "confused and agitated by all sorts of chaffy things, such as the reign of Christ upon David's throne, the restoration of the Jews to their own land, the millennium, the destiny of the wicked, the non-immortality of the soul, &c." This caused the Dr. to say to himself, "Is it possible that all these things are mere trash, and that the genuine wheat is the Campbellite doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins to everyone who believes in Jesus Christ?" This started a vein of thought in the Dr.'s mind, which brought a sifting comparison of modern religious hopes with those arising out of the prophetic testimony. This he reduced to writing in an article on "The hope of the world and the hope of Israel." In the writing of this article, he had occasion to quote Paul's words, "We are saved by hope." This suggested the enquiry to his own mind, whether at his immersion, hope formed any element of the faith by which he sought salvation. On looking at the original, he found that Paul's words, literally rendered, ought to be "We are saved by *the* hope." This made matters worse for him. He asked himself "Could I have said when I was immersed, 'I am saved by *the* hope.'?" The only answer was, that in these days he did not know what *the* hope was, and therefore, it was utterly impossible he could be saved by it. "But," said he, "I will not condemn myself too soon," and he went on with his article. By the time he had finished it, he had arrived at the conviction, from testimony and reason, that when he was immersed

into Campbellism, he was only immersed into a sect and not into Christ,—that in consequence of his ignorance of the one faith and one hope, he had not in his immersion obeyed the gospel, and consequently, was still in his sins. Previously to this, the Dr. had been advocating the elements of the gospel of the kingdom, without at all perceiving that they were essential to a valid faith. Persons would ask him, “Well, supposing all these things that you contend for are true, of what practical use are they? Can’t a man be saved without knowing them?” to which, of course, the Dr. was unable to return an answer in proper vindication of his proceedings. Not until he came to see the truth in its combination, as the result of writing the article on the two hopes—the hope of the world and the hope of Israel—would he have dared, by any means, to affirm the essentiality of the apprehension of these things. His accustomed reply to those who deprecated the prophetic and other topics, was that as God had condescended to reveal these things, it was their duty and their privilege to make themselves acquainted with them.

The Dr. wrote and published a renunciation of his errors, followed by a declaration of his faith, as derived from the writings of Moses and the Apostles. The former was afterwards used against him by the Campbellites, who published to the world what he renounced without the honesty of, at the same time, making known the faith he had embraced in the place of errors rejected.

Having perfectly satisfied himself on all points, the Dr. asked a friend to accompany him to the water, and there addressed him in the following terms: “I desire you to immerse me. All I ask

of you is to put me under the water, and pronounce the words over me, ‘Upon confession of your faith in the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, I baptize you into name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.’ I don’t ask you for any prayer or any ceremony. All that is necessary I will do for myself, except the mechanical part of putting me under the water, and your utterance of these words.” With this understanding the Dr.’s friend immersed him. The Doctor did not ask for re-immersion on the supposition that the administrator could add anything to its efficacy. “Thus,” says the Dr. “after a journey of fourteen years, I had found the truth, which, on the ocean, I declared I would not rest till I had found, should I be permitted again to tread on *terra firma*; but, in all this journey, I had been directed in a course very different from what I would have selected, if I had been left to map it out for myself. I had been entangled into preaching and editing, and taking part in distasteful theological controversies, which, however, in their combined influence, brought me to a knowledge of the one faith, and the obedience which it demands.”

(To be continued.)

ERRATA.—Brother Brown sends the following statement of errata in the lines “The Day of God,” published last month; some of them interfere with the sense. Their occurrence is due to caligraphic peculiarities of the “copy.”

In the 4th verse, for “sainthood,” read “sonship.”
 In the 5th verse, for “nations,” read “nation.”
 In the 6th verse, for “fought in,” read “foughten.”
 In the 7th verse, for “promise shall,” read “promises.”
 In the 9th verse, for “vow,” read “won.”
 In the last verse, for “whole,” read “whose.”
 ” ” “travelling,” read “travailing.”

And so restore it to the scriptural idea.

THE GOOD FIGHT OF FAITH.

Letter from certain in HUDDERSFIELD, holding the truth Dowieistically, and rejoinder
 by the faithful in HALIFAX.

The Church which is in HUDDERSFIELD,
 to the Church in HALIFAX.

BRETHREN.

We desire to notify unto you the doctrinal basis of that fellowship in Christ which we have one with another in this place, and in conformity with which we feel justified in extending the right hand of fellowship to everyone.

I. We are believers of the gospel.—
 (Mark xvi, 15.) *i. e.*

The glad tidings of the kingdom of God. (Luke viii, 1. Matt. xxiv, 14.)

II. We are believers on the Lord Jesus Christ. (Acts xvi, 31.) *i. e.*

The king of Israel. (John xx, 31. Mark xv, 32. John i, 41, 49)

The bread of life. (John vi, 51. John xiv, 6.)

The lamb of God. (Matt. i, 21. Matt. xxvi, 28. Luke xxiv, 47.

Acts x, 43. Rom. iii, 25. Heb. x, 10, 12, 18. Rom. viii, 3.)

Thus we are believers of the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, and have been baptised by immersion, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. (Acts viii, 12. Matt. xxviii, 19.)

But as the Scriptural phrases have been made use of by some with considerable laxity, diffuseness of meaning, and have been held to include matters which we do not believe are presented to us in the Word, as points essential to faith unto salvation, we will define the subjects which we hold to be necessary to a saving faith, and a valid baptism.

I. The kingdom of God,—

- The reward, A
- The hope of the gospel, B
- Constantly expected. C

II. Jesus Christ,—

- As "Christ" the anointed king D
- As "Jesus" who shall save his people from their sins," by E
- His life perfecting righteousness for them F
- His death, obtaining remission of sins G
- His resurrection, obtaining eternal life H

A Luke xviii, 17; xii, 31, 32; Matt. v, 8, 5; Rev. iv, 21; Jas. ii, 5; 2 Tim. ii, 12; 2 Peter i, 11; Colos. iii, 24.

This reception of Jesus as the sent of God to proclaim the kingdom, as the anointed king of the kingdom, as sacrifice for the remission of sins and justification of sinners, as the prince of life; concentrates in faith in Him as the access to the kingdom, the "way," the "door" to which He likened himself, when He said, "if by me any man enter in, he shall be saved."—(John x, 9.)

1.—We believe the glad tidings of the kingdom of God; that is we receive the kingdom as the one hope of reward of the gospel, we define that hope to be eternal inheritance therein. And when the Lord shall return to the earth again, and as Christ king of Israel shall ascend the throne of his father David;—then we believe our reward will begin, "we shall reign with him" (2 Tim. ii, 12.) as priests and kings on the earth.—(Rev. v, 10.) The law going forth from Zion; (Isa. ii, 3.) Messiah reigning over the house of Jacob for the Aion; (Luke i, 33.) all nations serving and obeying Him; (Dan. vii, 14.) and his saints associated with him in glory and power over the nations.—(Rev. ii, 26; iii, 21.)

We hold this our hope of the kingdom, in the attitude of constant expectation of, and watchfulness for the Lord's summons to meet him in the air. We view his coming for his saints as a first step in the setting up of the kingdom, which is momentarily impending; and this watching attitude we find to be emphatically enjoined by the Scriptures upon Christians in all ages. The present non-completion of certain preliminaries to the kingdom, such as the partial restoration of the Jews, the rebuilding of Jerusalem, &c., which are indicated in unfulfilled prophecy, offers

B Acts xxviii, 20; xxvi, 6, 7; Eph. iv, 4; Colos. i, 5, 28; 1 Pet. i, 13; Eph. i, 18.

C Luke xxi, 36; Titus ii, 12, 13; Phil. iii, 20; Heb. ix, 28; Jas. v, 7; 1 Thess. i, 10; 2 Pet. iii, 12; Acts i, 7, 8; Matt. xxiv, 42, 44; Luke xxi, 20, 21; 1 Thess. v, 1, 2;

D John xx, 31; Mark xv, 32; John i, 41, 49; Matt. xvi, 16—18; xxv, 31, 34.

E Matt. i, 21.

F Rom. vi, 18, 19; 2 Cor. v, 21; Rom. v, 17, 19; iii, 22; 1 Cor. i, 30; Phil. iii, 9.

G Heb. ix, 22; Matt. xxvi, 28; Romans iii, 25; Heb. x, 10, 12, 18; Rom. v, 8; viii, 3.

H 2 Tim. ii, 8, 10, 11; Rom. vi, 5, 8; 2 Cor. iv, 14; Eph. ii, 5, 6; 1 Pet. i, 8; iii, 21; 1 Cor. xv, 21, 22; Rom. vi, 28; 1 John v, 10—12; John xiv, 19; vi, 47, 48, 50; xi, 25; xiv, 6; v, 24.

no obstacle to our "looking for him," (Heb. ix, 28.) because the duration of the "meeting of the Lord in the air" is undefined by Scripture, and many events will doubtless find their proper place in the interval, before the Lord descends with His saints upon the Mount of Olives. Dates, therefore, fixing the time of the Lord's return, historically introduced by learned ingenuity, we place no reliance upon, desiring rather to "watch at all seasons, praying we may be found worthy," (Luke xxi, 36) and always to "be ready" for the thief-like coming of our Lord.

II. The kingdom of God "is an everlasting kingdom," (Dan. 7, 27.) hence inseparably connected with the "good message" concerning it is the glad tidings of eternal life. Jesus himself proclaimed this quality of the kingdom: "he brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." He taught concerning himself that he was the life-giver (Luke ix, 56.) to all believers on him, "I am the bread of life;" "Because I live ye shall live also;" "I am the resurrection and the life;" "He that believeth on me hath eternal life;" "This is the bread from heaven that a man may eat thereof and not die;" "I will raise him up at the last day;" "He shall live by me;" He shall live for ever. We read also, (1 John v, 10—15.) "He that hath the Son hath life, he that hath not the Son hath not life."

From these testimonies we believe that "the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ." Similarly to the believers of old, who heard these sayings from the Lord's mouth we "believe on him" in this respect, as well as on the "Word of the kingdom." Hence, rejecting the popular theory that a man has inherent immortality and possesses naturally unending intelligent existence, even though he "hath not the Son," we conclude that all "them that sleep in Jesus" in the unconsciousness of death, will, on the resurrection morn, be wakened to a life that knows no end. Also, as we know that through the first Adam "sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all, for that all have sinned, so we are able to perceive how by the gift of God, eternal life, coming to us *through* His Son the Lord Jesus, became thereby a "Saviour of his people from the effects of their sins." Sin being remitted or forgiven them on this their faith being counted to them, as was Abraham's, and in this way "to as many as received him, believed on his

name, have the privilege to become sons of God."

We have now shown that we accept Jesus as the king of Israel, as the bread of life; not *only* do we thus accept Him, but also as the justifier of the repentant sinner before God we know that we have remission of sins through Him, and that it is through His blood. He "died for our sins" by "one offering of His body;" we are sanctified by the "putting away of sin by the sacrifice of Himself." By His sacrificial death we have forgiveness of sin, by His glorious resurrection the sacrifice was ratified, our salvation assured, and the portals of eternal life triumphantly thrown open to all believers.

The MANNER in which the death and resurrection of Jesus accomplished these results, and adjusted the disturbed relations between man and his Maker, need not here be elucidated. Our views are, we believe, the same as your own, being just those of brother Roberts on this subject, (Lecture 5,) Romans viii, 3, 4, is the only passage we shall name as containing the pith of the matter. But, we desire it to be understood that we do *not* stand on the *comprehension of the philosophy* of the plan on which the sacrificial work of Christ, and reconciliation of things antagonistic, was brought about by the wisdom of God; but we claim to an interest in the results, on the ground that our faith rests in the knowledge of *what* has been obtained for us, *who* did accomplish this for us, and that it was secured to us *only* through the spilt life-blood of our Lord the second Adam, by *union* with whom through baptism in *faith*, can we *alone receive*, through patient continuance in well-doing, glory, honour, and immortality—eternal life.

EPITOME; AND CONCLUSIONS DRAWN.

From examination of the Scriptures we are firm in the conviction that the foregoing subjects of faith, viz:—First. Christ's kingdom; our hope of reward, and second, the righteous life, sacrificial death, and redemptory resurrection of Jesus; our access to it through faith in the kingdom and the sacrifice, are the only two subjects on which it is essential that faith should rest previous to passing through the appointed waters of baptism. We define the subjects as *two*, for they resolve themselves into a *crown* and a *door*, the kingdom the one, the Lord Jesus the other, the one (the crown) the one hope of the gospel; the

other the way, the truth, and the life,—the “door, by which if any man enter in, he shall be saved.”—John x, 9.)

We conclude and believe that if a man, by reception of these two modes into his mind, receives the word of the kingdom as a little child, making it his sole gospel hope, looks upon Jesus as the Christ, the future king of that kingdom; beholds in him also the Saviour from sin, resting his hope of remission of sins and justification before God upon the sacrificial work of Jesus; rests his expectation of resurrection to life and immortality upon *His* death and resurrection, and centres his faith in the Lord as the living door of the kingdom, the only way and access thereto; then we believe that if such a person be baptised in the scripturally prescribed form, and “walk as a child of the light in goodness, righteousness and truth,” he will infallibly be saved.

We, as a church, are desirous to be more “filled with a knowledge of His will,” but we systematically avoid subordinate “questions which do gender strife,” for “strivings about words to no profit,” we deem an hindrance to “increase in the knowledge of God.”

We are *resolved individually and collectively* to “hold fast the faithful words as we have been taught” in the Scriptures, and *to refuse* to put any other subjects than the two before specified, on the footing of essentials to saving faith, essentials to valid baptism, essentials to fellowship in Christ.

Subjects, more or less abstruse, such as personality or non-personality of the devil, the mortal or immortal resurrection of the saints, &c., we cannot exalt into portions of the glad tidings to be preached in all the world as a witness, nor into portions of the testimony of Jesus that he is the giver of life to believers, and that his blood was shed for remission of their sins. We dare not call these “questions,” these “doubtful thoughts,” (Rom. xiv, 1.) essentials to the saving faith, which a man must have before he can please God and be accepted of him. We dare not,—First, because the passages of Scripture which state the terms of salvation do not set forth such subjects. Second,—Because we have no authority in Scripture to supplement the divinely stated terms of salvation with other conditions. Quite the contrary. (Prov. xxx, 6; Deut. iv, 2; Galat. i, 7, 8.)

This concludes our deliverance on matters of faith and doctrine.

We have now to direct your very special attention to Rom. xvi, 17—19, and Galat. ii, 4, 5. Paul says, “I beseech you, brethren, mark them that cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine ye have learned, and avoid them * * * by good words and fair speeches they deceive the hearts of the simple, * * * I would have you wise unto that which is good and simple concerning evil.” “Brethren unaware, * * * came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us unto bondage, to whom we give place, no! not for an hour, that the truth of the gospel might continue.” * * * * *

REJOINDER OF THE HALIFAX ECCLESIA.

The Ecclesia of the Deity in Halifax. To those claiming Fellowship in Huddersfield.

In reply to yours of the 30th Sept., we desire to intimate to you our sincere regret that you should repudiate the Truth concerning subjects of such manifest importance as those in dispute, and we are further sorry that you should be so oblivious of their relationship to “the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, as to denominate them, “supplemental doctrines,” “subordinate questions,” “words to no profit,” “doubtful thoughts,” and as such to deliberately and “systematically” exclude them from your further consideration.

The conviction wrought upon our minds by the reading of your manifesto is,—that most clearly it has been written in the ignorance implied in the following statement contained in your manifesto: “Whether their teachings on these points be right or wrong we shall not here say, &c.” A statement like this, from you as a church, can only indicate the most palpable and culpable darkness, for if you had apprehended anything of the requirements of a manifesto; it was just what you ought to have said, it was just all that was required to be said to settle the whole matter; it was the only ground upon which it could be legitimately named.

Now there are but two alternatives; the points are either right or wrong; in either case your arguments are inappropriate, and therefore valueless; for if they are wrong, (*i. e.* unscriptural), the uselessness of discussing the propriety or non-propriety of exalting them into glad tidings is at once apparent, and if they

are right (*i. e.* scriptural), their relationship to the Kingdom and the Name is indisputably certain beyond all controversy.

But is it true as you assumed that "essentials to saving faith," "essentials to valid baptisms" "essentials to fellowship in Christ," are all comprehended in and circumscribed by the glad tidings? Most assuredly not, for surely you will not deny that it is essential for a candidate for salvation to reject the popular doctrine of inherent immortality, and to believe by consequence in the scripturally attested fact of man's mortality, and yet essential as this is, the mortality of man, as you know, formed no part of the gospel promulgated by Jesus Christ. How possible it is, therefore, for a thing to be absolutely essential without at all being an integral part of the gospel. Exactly so is it with the question of the devil; you rightly say "we cannot exalt it into a portion of the glad tidings," but the gospel has not the less to do with it for that, any more than with the mortality question. That this may be apparent to you, let us just place them side by side, thus:—

MORTALITY	DEVIL
Has reference to man and describes his subjection to death.	Has reference to man and is descriptive of his enmity and opposition to the Divine law and purpose whether individually, socially or politically developed.
THE GOSPEL	THE GOSPEL
Of the Kingdom and Name includes the announcement of its abolition.	Of the Kingdom and Name includes the announcement of its destruction.

In this we have a small illustration of what must be admitted as a general and withal a necessarily essential feature of revealed truth, *viz.*, that it opposes itself to, and is antagonistic of everything not in harmony with itself. It is upon this principle alone that, it could possibly be glad tidings to us. This may be further simplified as follows:—The gospel announces the gift of immortality, and by consequence the abolition of mortality—it is essential, therefore, to know what mortality is as well as immortality.

The gospel announces the establishment of the kingdom of God, and by consequence the overthrow of the kingdom of men; it is essential, therefore, to know of what the kingdom of men consists as well as

the kingdom of God. The mission of Christ was to give life, and by consequence to "destroy (him that hath the power of death, *i. e.*) the devil." Essential knowledge of the mission of Christ, therefore, involves the comprehension not only of that which he has to bestow, but also, and equally of, that which he antagonises and destroys. How far a correct conception of the remedy is dependent upon an accurate knowledge of the condition requiring it, is abundantly illustrated in the history of orthodoxy. Whence arises their misconception of the salvation, but from their pagan notions about the constitutional condition of that (man) to which it is offered; in other words they accept the phrase, mortality of man, but attaching their own unenlightened interpretation thereto, in preference to the revealed truth of the Deity; the result is, as you know, the most erroneous conceptions of the nature and circumstances of eternal life. Seeing, therefore, the very serious and even fatal nature of this error in their case, we ought to be the more careful that we repeat not their folly.

The subject of the devil is not correctly stated in your manifesto. It is not a question of personality or non-personality, (for the devil in manifestation is always personal,*) but it is a question of human or superhuman. Now, it is not the latter most assuredly, and the theology which says it is, belongs to his (the devil's) lying inventions, for indeed, as was said of him of old, "he is a liar, and the father of it."

And what about the brethren of so called "supplemental views" you refer to? Let us tell you, they are brethren worthy the name; who have dared, in the spirit of Jude's injunction, to contend earnestly for the purity of the faith once delivered to the saints, against "vain talkers and unlearned," who discern the things of the spirit after the natural man, who glory in "oppositions of science," (falsely so called), who teach to the subversion of the truth "doctrines of devils" and familiar spirits, who affirm the post resurrectional ascent of saints to heaven, (where they locate the devil), who deny the essential attributes of the "judgment to come," and who variously seek to seduce the unwary by their specious reasoning into the same estrangement and damnable latitudinarianism in which they are beguiling themselves to their own destruction in Gehenna.

* That is the reason why the personal pronoun is applied in the Scriptures.

Trusting that consistent with your expressed desire to be "more filled with a knowledge of His will," you may reconsider the propriety of a more thorough investigation of these subjects, and that thereupon you may be led to renounce the devil and all his works, and further led to the acknowledging that *all* Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and, therefore, profitable for doctrine and instruction in righteousness, we remain yours faithfully, aspiring to the blessings awaiting those

who know accurately, and give heed, and narrowly observe the things which are written in the testimony of Jesus Christ.

On behalf of the Brethren,

F. R. SHUTTLEWORTH.

N.B.—Any future relationship between us must be based upon your expressed and avowed renunciation of the foolishness by which you are now adulterating, and otherwise making void the word of God. We shall be ever happy to hear of such a renunciation.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

Continued from page 20 of the present number.

anxiety on the part of the writers. The tone in which *great and early changes are forecast*, is, to say the least, significant."—*Levant Herald*. "The language of the Russian government press, in regard to the *rising shadow of the Eastern Question*, is becoming so violent, that it behoves us to notice it. The official and semi-official papers of St. Petersburg are encouraging the insurgents, and *speaking of the overthrow of Turkey as a necessary and indeed imminent event.*"—*Times* Russian Correspondent. "Berlin politicians on their part, are closely watching the *seething cauldron of Oriental affairs*, and observing a new phenomenon in the visible eagerness of the Czar to make the Russian grievances a cause of quarrel; they speculate upon his ultimate intentions. Is it not possible, they ask, that the Czar, *dreading a European attack in case of his interfering with Turkey*, should be preparing to forestall the blow?"—Prussian Correspondent of the *Times*. "The subject that most occupies the Russian Press at this moment is that of the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire."—*Daily News*, Nov. 2. "If anybody is sanguine enough to suppose that the capture of Sebastopol has materially changed the policy of Russia, he has only to live a very short time among the Russians to lose the delusion. * * * The Russians look forward to the ultimate possession of the Bosphorous as a matter of certainty. * * * Russian statesmen fancy that the day of the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire is near at hand."—*Daily Telegraph*, Dec. 10th.

All hail the coming day! Ye have long tarried; break now in glory on our dark horizon, where faith alone, begotten of Yahweh's word, can see the glimmer of thy coming dawn. O, we wait with strong desire; give us the first token; send athwart our night the gleaming messenger of thy

presence. Release thy prisoners: justify thy children; give them to see with their eyes the unbared arm of Omnipotence lifted up to save His chosen, and to smite all the proud and lofty. O, lift the curtain that shuts them out in the darkness that covers all the earth; unveil the impending glory; open the temple; uncover the ark of their covenant with God; scatter the lightnings of Jehovah's anger among the nations; crash, ye hidden thunders, and destroy them that destroy the earth; bring to the dust the high refuges of rebellion and lies; cast down the thrones; slay the Mother of Harlots; bring perdition on the fourth beast; and let all the world know that there is a God that judgeth, and who, though long silent, will not always be still, but will rise to avenge his own elect, to carry out his own purpose, and to vindicate his own majesty and honour, against the ignorance, brutishness, perversity and wickedness of a hundred generations. High and low, rich and poor, need the terrible lesson. They are filled with their own devices. God is not in all their thoughts; they cast the testimony behind their backs, and seek every one gain from his quarter. But now shall they see the glory of Yahweh; for his hand is about to be lifted up. The end has come; the times of the Gentiles are knelling to a close. Behold the signs!

EDITOR.

Dec. 24th, 1866.

THE AMBASSADOR SUPPLEMENT.—We acknowledge the following contributions to the cost of the *Ambassador Supplement*: J. J. Andrews, London, 10s.; R. C. Bingley, Birmingham, 15s.; J. Grant, Carrbridge, 10s; H. N., £1; C. Bennett, Mumbles, 10s.; J. H. Kidd, Scarborough, 3s; G. Cree, Biggar, 5s.; A. Hewitt, Birmingham,

2s.6d.; S. Dixon, Leeds (for the brethren), 5s.; Eliza Haire, Creestown, 5s.; J. Mitchell, Balluss, 6d.; A sister, 6d.; W. Ellis, Edinburgh, 10s.; W. Clark, Glasgow, 6d.; A brother, 6d.; T. Haning, Auchinlech, 5s. J. Robinson, Turriff, 5s.6d. —We will give extracts from letters next month.

TRINITARIANISM AND THE TRUTH, CONSIDERED IN RELATION TO THE FIRST THREE VERSES OF JOHN'S GOSPEL.

THE "PRE-EXISTENCE" OF JESUS CHRIST—HIS BEING THE WORD MADE FLESH.

(Continuation of "*The Bible as a Law of Life and Immortality*," from page 259)

Preliminary to our entering on this subject we will recal a few things necessary to be remembered, from our previous papers.

- 1.—The Deity is a located Being, and invisible to man.
- 2.—He is Omnipotent, not in person, but in spirit.
- 3.—His spirit is an emanation from his person, and is everywhere.
- 4.—He is thus personally in immediate connection with every being and thing in the universe.
- 5.—His spirit, therefore, is that only of Him that surrounds us, and hence that only of Him we can speak of, or think about.
- 6.—Himself we cannot search out
- 7.—What His spirit is we cannot define, but the operations of it are everywhere visible.
- 8.—It manifests itself in all the laws which create and destroy, make and unmake.
- 9.—It is the basis of everything, the force and power of everything.
- 10.—What is called electricity, magnetism, combustion, heat, light, attraction, cohesion, gravitation, and the like, are it in its various manifestations. All that we see, hear, taste, smell, feel, and know, proceed from its operations. These are the spirit of Deity variously manifested in everything—in man and beast, fish and fowl, insect and vegetable; in the wind, the rain, the snow; in the thunder, the lightning and earthquake—all is from ONE spirit, and this spirit is out of ONE Deity.
- 11.—In this respect it is *common*—common to all things animate and inanimate. In this respect it is the spirit of Deity in Nature.

12.—But another phase of this same spirit is manifested through Scripture. And this phase of it having relation to higher purposes, and for an eternal duration it is called the Holy Spirit, *not* that it is a different spirit from what is common to all, but that its operations relating to Scripture truth, are limited to a certain field, and are distinguishable from its common operations. The operations are *set apart* for higher and holier ends, and these ends characterise the operations as holy, and the operations characterise the Spirit as Holy, as deeds characterise all doers: so that in point of fact as a man can be *wise* by one line of conduct, *benevolent* by another line, and *just* by a third, the ONE spirit is the Creator and Former by one set of works, the Omnipotent by another set of works, and the Most Holy by a third set of works. And so again, as the higher or holier operations relate to the conversation which the Deity holds with man, it is termed the word of Deity, or that power by which the Deity conveys the outward expression of his ideas or thoughts to man. This, in Greek, is called the Logos, or that power from which proceeds the verbal expression of the Deity's reasoning with man on things pertaining to eternal life, and hence embraces all that His reason embraces—all other expressions of whatever character is the book of nature. Reason is the pre-eminent feature of mind: verbal speech its highest expression; and nothing can be done without reason. Therefore, John, in speaking of the Logos, speaks of it first in its abstract and highest aspect, and as it were by itself. He next descends to the handiwork manifestation of it, "all

things were made by him, and without him was there nothing made that was made." The works of God in nature are a *speech* as well, but not so high an expression of the Deity's reason as the verbal speech; but had John spoken of the lower manifestations only—"the work of his hands," he could not have named this the Logos in the full sense of the term, as the work of the hands do not include in any circumstances the highest manifestations of reason; and had he spoken of them first, ere he spake of reason itself, he would have invented the natural order, and done injustice to his subject. But he speaks first of the Logos in the abstract. He begins at the centre and mind of Deity, and works outwards. The Logos embraces all as all things issue from it, but as it was religiously known in John's day amongst the Jews and Christians by its verbal, or highest expression, he descended to the lower to remind his readers that the power he spake of, was not only the speaker, but the doer—not only the ideal and verbal reasoner from Deity, but the architect, artist, and artisan of all things in nature as well. He by this comprehended ALL things as proceeding from the Logos or reason of Deity, affirmed this security which must exist against the workings of nature being otherwise than in harmony with the ends of prophecy, and so asserted in other words that "the invisible things of Him, from the creation of the world are clearly a tested, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead." Had he not done this, the special manifestations of the Holy Spirit might have led some to suspect the spirit so manifested, to be one spirit, and the spirit in nature another.

Now when we reflect on the operations of the spirit in nature, and consider that "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork; that day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night *sheweth* knowledge: that there is no speech or language where their voice is not heard," and that *this* speech is as much an utterance in signs and symbols, as legible to man concerning nature, as the Scriptures are an utterance from the same spirit concerning a future life—both lead the mind up to Deity. We need not wonder that a man so reflective as Plato should term the power he saw so man-

ifested—we need not wonder, we say, that Plato called this he saw so reflected, the Logos of Deity. He saw design in everything around him, and therefore reason; but spoiled with his own philosophy concerning the immateriality and personality of spirits, he imagined this reason such a spirit, and distinguishing it from what he called a father-spirit, termed it a son-spirit so united with the father-spirit, and some other imaginary spirit he called the soul of the world, that they were three personal spirits in *one*, or three gods "united with each other by a mysterious and ineffable generation," a doctrine as different from that of John as one multiplied into three is different from three thirds united in one; not that we mean to convey that John presents three kinds of one Deity for consideration, but three contemporary manifestations of one Deity; Deity in person only visible in the heaven of heavens; Deity in spirit, or through spirit manifest in *every* thing, and Deity through the same spirit (in its highest aspect or holy nature for special ends), manifest in man. Such, however, is the superficial similarity between the Logos of Plato and the Logos of John, that the latter is confounded with the former. And such is the precedence given to Grecian philosophy that the reader of John's gospel cannot read it save from the light of Plato. The infantile mind is so moulded to the Platonic idea, that as it grows, the idea grows with it, and when maturity is reached, the freedom to understand the words of John otherwise is chained to the habit of never having thought of them otherwise. The mind is prepossessed, and, therefore, prejudiced against a right understanding of John, and so grows the Trinitarianism of the day—the invention of man. In its beginning unadulterated Platonism, but now a hybrid, a mule by an impregnation of the letter of Scripture from the mind of man brimful with the philosophy of Greece. And this we shall see the more confirmed as we proceed with the subject before us, and mark the sense in which "the Word was made flesh and dwelt amongst us."—W.D.J.

THE BOUNTY TO DR. THOMAS.—The brethren in Edinburgb have already collected and sent off £30. In addition to this, we have received the following sums: H. N., £5; R. C. Bingley, Birmingham, £10; J. Grant, Cambridge, £1; S. Dixon, Leeds, 15s; W. Ellis, Edinburgb, additional, (promised) £1.

There have been four responses to the appeal for brother Robertson of Turiff.

THE POLITICAL HEAVENS AND THE SIGNS THEREOF.

THE year 1867 opens with promise for those who look for the great *denouement* of Daniel's vision, and the climax of Israel's hope. The sign-evolutions progressing in the political heavens are ominous, and full of hope for those who look for "his appearing." The little horn of the fourth beast is on the verge of ruin. Austria—its Apocalyptic, woman-carrying-beast element—lies shattered by the shock of war, and threatens to break up before discord within, and the menace of a Russo-Prussian alliance without. Pontifical Rome, the blasphemous mouth of the horn, and the drunken harlot on the back of the beast, is on the point of political annihilation. On these two points we quote the testimony of the press. The Catholic organ, the *Monde*, says in reference to the first point, as affected by the late war, "Prussia represented the Protestant element, and around her were grouped all the interests appertaining to that faith, whilst on the contrary, all Catholic sympathies attached themselves to Austria. Formerly Protestantism in Germany was on a footing of equality with Catholicism. THE VICTORY OF PRUSSIA OVERTHROWS THIS EQUILIBRIUM; the Catholic influence exercised by Austria in Italy and Germany is HENCEFORTH DESTROYED." This, it will be observed, is the opinion of the highest Catholic authority. It is confirmed by the opinion of a Paris newspaper correspondent, who, writing on the same event, says, "The irreparable injury done to Austria has not been physical discomfiture, but MORAL ANNIHILATION. * * * Ever hostile to every idea of modern times, she is vanquished at last by the Revolution, and history having already pronounced her verdict, is uttering her funeral oration." Cardinal Cullen's declaration is, "Austria, the last state that supported the Pope, is now almost completely ruined." There is more trouble brewing for Austria. Russia and Prussia have formed an alliance. This is the uncontradicted fact of the hour. That the objects of this alliance are adverse to Austria, may be seen in the following remarks of the *Paris Presse*, published in the *Times* on the 2nd of November. "The alliance between Russia and Prussia is now an accomplished fact; binding engagements have been entered into with reference to a special object, and in anticipation of events already determined upon. If Russia, in the execution of her plans in the East, should meet with any other obstacle than the Turks, Prussia will range herself on her side. Prussia, on the other hand, can rely on the avowed co-operation of Russia in case of foreign interference with her German schemes; the sole obstacle in the accomplishment of their

designs is Austria. Nothing exists to divide Russia and Prussia; everything tends to unite them. 'Backing each other,' writes a Russian statesman lately, 'Russia and Prussia may defy the rest of Europe.' We believe that Russia and Prussia are now backing each other. * * * Russia is making preparations at Nikolaiëf, which are not very consistent with the spirit or the letter of the Treaty of Paris. Her journals are daily demanding the restitution of the lost bank of the Danube. Her official agents stand aloof at Bucharest, and protest by their abstention against the concessions of the Porte. Finally, *Russia is accumulating very considerable forces upon the Austrian frontiers.* Austria discovers every instant in Bohemia, in Moravia, in Silesia, the hand of Prussian agents." Austria has several times been reported to be concentrating troops on her Gallician frontiers, in consequence of the attitude of Russia. Austrian government papers have denied the reports, but the latest intelligence reiterates the reports as well as the denials. We know from experience the utter worthlessness of an "official" denial. In her extremity, Austria seeks a French alliance, and is likely to attain her object. A pamphlet has been published in Vienna, the Austrian capital, advocating such an alliance. The pamphlet is said to have been inspired from Paris, and concludes in the following words: "France, like Austria, has everything to dread from the democratic movement which is taking place everywhere in Europe. *No king at the present moment is certain to be to-morrow on his throne.* The Austro-French Alliance can conjure all perils. Let, then, these two powers unite at once." The preparations of France are something astounding. A scheme is on foot to raise the military force to 1,300,000 men. The Emperor is in earnest, and thinks the augmentation of the army essential to the "just influence" of France. He is pressing the scheme against the adverse opinions of the nation, and some members of his council. The Paris correspondent of the *Morning Herald*, writing December 17th, says there was a time when the raising of such an enormous army by France would have developed a European coalition against her, but, at such a moment, when the alliance between Russia and Prussia threatens Europe with designs inimical to the general equilibrium, it is considered legitimate and wise. He says, "I have reason to believe that the first practical result of this vast increase of the French army will be to accelerate enormously the movement (already existing) of the whole of Germany to throw itself into the arms of Prussia. I have reason to know that

throughout Germany this increase of the French forces is looked upon as the prelude to an aggression; and whatever dislike of Prussia may be entertained in a few diminutive principalities, it will be obliterated by this threatening move on the part of the *Erl-Feind*. All the small States which were still wavering and hesitating whether they would join the North German Confederation, or form a petty confederation of their own, will have their doubts readily solved by the re-organization of the French army. The instinct of self-preservation already inclined in favour of Prussia, and if they held aloof, it was chiefly owing to an unwillingness to profess a distrust of France which most of them entertained. They have no doubt now, and from what I hear, six months will not elapse before the whole of the forces of Germany will be at the disposal of the Cabinet of Berlin." Russia is meeting this gigantic movement of France by one on a similar scale. She has ordered a recruiting for the 27th of next January, at the rate of four conscripts per thousand inhabitants, which will produce 850,000 men. The Russian army at present numbers 800,000, so that the new levy will bring it up to 1,650,000. This is on the authority of *The Europe*, quoted by *The Globe*, on the 12th of December. The Vienna correspondent of the *Times* writing a day or two after that date, says that ostensibly, a reduction of the Russian army is going on, but that this may possibly be a blind, or a husbanding of forces for a blow in the spring. He, however, thinks it is not likely. It must be remembered he writes from Vienna. The *Posen Journal* says that it is undeniable that Russia is secretly arming, and putting herself ready for any event that may happen in the spring. It also stated that she is openly reorganising her fleet in the Black Sea.

As regards the Papal element of the little horn, the current facts are of the deepest interest. The evacuation of Rome by the French troops is now an accomplished fact, and the Pope is left face to face with the subjects of his now contracted and insignificant domain. To the present date nothing visible has resulted beyond a proclamation from the National Committee, addressed to the Romans and circulated in Rome, congratulating the people that Italy is now mistress of her own destiny, and that no foreign flag floats from the Alps to the sea. The committee beseech their fellow-citizens to indulge in no idle manifestations, but to await patiently and calmly for the hour which will satisfy all their wishes. It concludes as follows:—**OUR TRIUMPH IS CERTAIN; THE DAYS OF CLERICAL DESPOTISM ARE INEXORABLY NUMBERED.**" Rome, at the present moment is one of the principal centres of interest from a prophetic point of view. The eye of the student is intently fixed on her. A

catastrophe is certain. The time of Papal sovereignty is up this year, or within the next two, and significantly enough, it is placed in a position in which its disappearance from the stage of history is unavertible: up to the present moment all is quiet, but there is mischief brewing under the surface. The revolutionary element is only held back by its own leaders till the moment deemed opportune for action arrives. Even under restraint, it is fretting and seething with impatience. An explosion is imminent. This fact has caused the abandonment of an intended visit to the Pope by the Empress of the French. The Italian Government is endeavouring to come to an arrangement with "His Holiness;" that is to say they are trying to induce him to consent to such changes in the government of the Roman province as will reconcile his subjects to the continuance of his authority; but the news by to-day's telegrams is to the effect that "the court of Rome appears but little disposed to come to an arrangement." This is accompanied by the intimation that "the Pope has declared that he will not abandon Rome." By a divine infatuation, he persists in refusing water to quench the fire of Roman hate, and at the same time makes up his mind to brave the dangers of the conflagration. This will doubtless bring the crisis. The patience of his revolutionary subjects is at the last point. He knows this, as is evident from the words he addressed to the officers of the Roman legion on the eve of their departure. He reproached "the eldest son of the church" for leaving him face to face with the revolution, and telling the officers not to be deceived, assured them that the revolution would come and plant its banner on the Quirinal. His only hope in the matter was that God would interfere to prevent what was humanly speaking inevitable. His hope is a vain one. The catastrophe is divinely decreed and cannot be prevented. What shape it will take it is impossible to say, but the violent destruction of the "court of Rome" seems probable. On this point, the *Spectator* has the following:—"The attitude of the cardinals has changed from that of suffering angels to one of fierce and almost despairing anxiety and suspense. The Papacy presents a calm unblenching defiance alike to France, Italy, the Roman people, and the spirit of the age. In the supreme hour of its existence, *abandoned by its allies, tricked by its friends, DETESTED by its children*, it will concede nothing, will promise nothing save pardon after submission, will make no reforms, will accept no advice, will simply assert itself now as ever, as beyond the need of human wisdom, and above the range of earthly insult or aggression * * * The opposing forces must in a few weeks be face to face without any barrier between them, and then the cool English observers who know the Vatican and Rome as it is known

only to cardinals and the secret police of Florence, seem inclined to give way to fear, and anticipate a catastrophe which will rouse the whole catholic world." The situation is ripening on all hands. The elements of war are gathering in every direction.

The correspondent of *The Daily Telegraph*, writing from Paris on the 10th of December, says, "Society here,—and after all society knows a good deal more than we give it credit for knowing,—declares that war is imminent. When? Here society goes into different lobbies; the minority says Prussia will not wait till after the "Exposition," but go on with the work of Bismark the great, early in the spring of 1867. The majority, with which I vote, think that nothing will happen till after the above named festive period, but that once the exhibition is closed, France will go in at Prussia, and the war will be highly popular." The troubles are not one nor two; the questions that trouble Europe are more numerous and complicated than the statesmanship of the hour can unravel.

Prominent among these is the notorious and inextinguishable "Eastern Question;" this is smoking with danger to Europe. The Cretan insurrection, which Turkey is straining every nerve to get the upper hand of, is as active as ever. It has several times been announced from Constantinople that it was all over: but later telegrams have invariably given the lie to Turkish representations. On this subject we quote the following from the *Daily Telegraph* of December 24. Speaking of the Constantinopolitan telegrams, the Cretan correspondent of the paper says, "They are not even travesties of truth—they are pure fiction and point-blank falsehood. It seems incredible that the agent of any government should have dared to cheat civilised Europe on a point where Europe's peace is so nearly concerned—to assure the grave diplomatic world for six weeks in succession, that all was over; and equally incredible that Europe should be six times humbugged by the same simple fiction. And now let me once more assure your readers that to-day, the 3rd of December, 1866, N.S., there are no more signs of peace than there were two months ago; that the insurrection is organising, and doing what it may to winter in comparative comfort; but that there is no thought of submission in the Cretan heart." * * * The last corps of volunteers who landed brought a printing press and artillery of other kinds; the blockade-runners are throwing into the island, almost without interruption or inconvenience, all necessary supplies; and some of the oldest residents declare it to be their opinion that the affair has just begun." Italian volunteers are finding their way to the island. Garibaldi has offered his services. Greece is particularly active in her aids to the insurgents, and is reported in to-day's telegrams to be preparing for the war with Turkey into which her policy is dragging her. This

state of things is giving great uneasiness to the French government, which above all things dreads the opening of the eastern question. It is said it has offered the Sultan the assistance of the Mediterranean Anglo-French fleet, for the purpose of enforcing the blockade. This has caused a powerful sensation at St. Petersburg, where sympathy with the Cretans is very strong. The following is the comment of the Russian *Nord*, on the subject:—"The measure attributed to the Cabinet of the Tuileries would constitute an intervention in the affairs of Candia, and would inevitably lead to the interference of the other European Powers. The Eastern Question would thus be forced upon the tapis.

We append further comments of the press, as indicative of the nature of the crisis. For access to them, we are principally indebted to the kindness and industry of brother J. J. Andrew, of London, who culls and transmits whatever newspaper matter has a bearing on the signs of the times. "The success of the Cretan Insurrection will doubtless precipitate an outbreak against Turkey among her subject nationalities; and there is every probability that it will result in the entire disruption of the Turkish Empire. That such an event must happen sooner or later, is pretty generally admitted; but then comes the question, Who is to govern the country in the place of the Turks? This question, upon which the most important interests of Europe depend, it will become necessary perhaps in a few months to decide."—*Fortnightly Review*. "THE EASTERN QUESTION—few words grate upon the ear with a more ominously disagreeable sound, than this short compendium of the inextricable tangle of disputes and interests wrapped up in its narrow limits. Of all the forms that imagination could conjure up, few could arise more calculated to damp joy and inspire fear, than this dreaded monster. Yet, unless appearances are very deceptive, the preludes to its ghastly resurrection are both manifold and manifest. That confused murmur of apprehension which usually precedes the advent of great calamities is already audible."—*Leeds Mercury*. "Russia once again goes hand-in-hand with the dissatisfied subjects of the Porte, and by encouraging sedition, raises misgivings in all Europe that her old hankerings after the Bosphorus have not been laid aside, France and Austria are thus touched to the quick, and must prepare, in the event of a great commotion in the east, either to make common cause with Russia, or to fight her with their last man and to their last franc."—*Times' Berlin Correspondent*. "The future of the East receives ominous prominence in the discussions on the new arrangements of Europe. It is discussed under all its aspects, and seemingly with a more than ordinary

(Concluded on page 15.)

THE AMBASSADOR

Of the Coming Age.

"A wicked Messenger falleth into mischief, but a faithful Ambassador is health."—PROV. xiii, 17.

No. 32.

FEBRUARY, 1867.

Vol. IV.

THE JUDGMENT SEAT OF CHRIST;

OR THE SECOND ADVENT IN RELATION TO THE HOUSEHOLD
OF FAITH.—No. 3.

WE use the phrase "resurrectional responsibility" in contrast with the responsibility of a more limited kind which attaches to every form of rational life, without involving a future state of existence by resurrection. Man *per se* has a moral responsibility to Deity, but it is only under the special circumstances we shall presently have to consider more fully that this goes beyond the relations of mortal existence. God is angry with the wicked (Psalm viii, 2) because they are wicked, without any intention to bring them to individual account. The general destiny of the class is expressed in the statement that "the wicked shall be turned into sheol" (the grave), (Ps. ix, 17) and that the name of the wicked shall rot.—(Prov. x, 7.) The attitude of the Deity toward them is indicated by the flood, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrha, and the extermination of the seven nations of Canaan; these were summary and destructive exhibitions of his displeasure at the perversions of a creature naturally endowed with Elohist capacities and affinities, but no proof that he intends to deal with those perversions in a "future state," rather the contrary; it indicates the absence of accountability in these instances; for had there been a tribunal in reserve there would obviously have been neither justice nor necessity in the judicial visitation which swept untold myriads out of existence at the times referred to. Jude indicates the finality of the judgment in the case of Sodom; he says, "they are set forth for an example, SUFFERING the vengeance of eternal fire;" (a good illustration, by the way, of what eternal fire means in Bible language in opposition to orthodox views.) Peter indicates the same thing in relation to the antideluvian world. (2 Peter ii, 5; iii, 6), viz, that the flood was to them a consummating

infiiction of Divine judgment. This would appear upon the reading of the record; "And God looked upon the earth, and behold it was corrupt, for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth. And God said unto Noah, the end of all flesh is come before me: for the earth is filled with violence through them, and behold, * * * *every living substance that I have made will I destroy from off the face of the earth.*"—(Genesis vi, 12, 13; vii, 4.) This was the end of "the old world."

Jewish responsibility was greater than that of the cast-off descendants of the rejected groundling of Eden, because their relation to Deity was special, direct, and privileged. The responsibility originating in natural constitution, was supplemented by the obligations imposed by divine election and arising out of the national contract entered into at Sinai, to be obedient to all that the Deity required—(Ex. xxiv, 3, 7). This is recognised in the words of Jehovah by Amos, "You only have I known of all the families of the earth; THEREFORE *will I punish you for all your iniquities.*"—(Amos iii, 2). Yet there is no evidence that this responsibility takes the individual form which it assumes in connection with the individual privileges of the gospel. The national sufferings of the Jews, in dispersion and privation, are evidently (both on the face of the testimony and on a consideration of the moral bearings of the case) a full discharge of the responsibility arising from national election.

A responsibility lying in degree between that of the Jews and the outlying Gentiles attached itself to those nations that were in contact with the Jewish people. This is evident on many pages of the prophets. Take for instance the words addressed to the king of Tyre: "Thou hast been in Eden, the garden of God; * * * thou wast upon the holy mountain of God. Thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the 'stones of fire' * * * *Because thou hast said against Jerusalem, Aha, she is broken that was the gates of the people; she is turned unto me; I shall be replenished now she is laid waste. Therefore, thus saith the Lord God, Behold I am against thee, O Tyrus, and will cause many nations to come up against thee, as the sea causeth her waves to come up.*"—(Ezek. xxviii, 13, 14; xxvi, 2, 3.) Take also similar words addressed to Ammon, Moab, Edom, and Philistia: To AMMON, "*Because thou hast said, Aha, against my sanctuary when it was profaned, and against the land of Israel when it was desolate, and against the house of Judah when they went into captivity, Behold, therefore, I will deliver thee to the men of the east for a possession, &c.*"—(Ezek. xxv, 3, 4.) To MOAB: "*Because that Moab and Seir do say, Behold the house of Judah is like unto all the heathen, therefore, * * * I will execute judgments upon Moab.*"—(Ez. xxv, 8-11) To EDMON: "*Because that Edom hath dealt against the house of Judah by taking vengeance, and hath greatly offended and revenged himself upon them, therefore thus saith the Lord*

God, I will also stretch out mine hand upon Edom," &c.—(12—13.) To PHILISTIA : "Because the Philistines have dealt by revenge, and have taken vengeance with a despiteful heart, THEREFORE thus saith the Lord God, I will stretch out mine hand upon the Philistines," &c.—(—16.) In none of these cases, is there any evidence that God intends to mete out individual judgment by resurrection from the dead. It requires a high state of privilege before such can with justice be done. The majority of mankind, particularly in the rude and barbarous times that required the schoolmaster lessons of the Mosaic law, were in circumstances of pure misfortune. Born under condemnation in Adam, and left to the poor resources of the natural mind which in all its history has never originated anything noble apart from the ideas set in motion by "revelation," they were as unable to elevate themselves above the level on which they stood as any tribe of animals. How just and merciful, then, it was of the Deity to "wink at" "the times of this ignorance" (Acts xvii, 30) which alienated from the life of God, (Eph. v, 18,) and allowing flesh under such circumstances to pass away like the flower of the field, that the place thereof might know it no more.—(Psalms ciii, 15, 16.) In the supposition that every human being is an immortal soul, such a line of action would of course be excluded, and the circumstances of the early "dispensations" would be altogether inexplicable. An immortal soul in the times of antiquity would be worth as much as one now; and if it be wise and kind to save immortal souls now, there would seem a strange absence of wisdom and beneficence in the arrangement which in these early ages put salvation beyond their reach, and made their doom to hell-fire inevitable by the lack of those means of knowledge which are in our day accessible. If, to get out of this difficulty, it be suggested that man in such a plight will in mercy be permitted to enter heaven, we are instantly compelled to question the value of our own privileges, nay, to doubt and deny the wisdom of the gospel, which, on such a theory, is not only not necessary to salvation, but a positive hindrance to it, since by its responsibilities it perils a salvation, which in its absence would be certain. We should also be compelled to deny the testimony of scripture, that man having no understanding is like the beasts that perish, and that life and immortality have been brought to light by Christ *through the gospel*. But we are not now dealing with the monster fiction of Christendom. We leave the immortality of the soul out of the account and deal with the question of judgment in the light of the fact that mankind is perishing under the law of sin and death, and in Adam has no more to do with a future state than the decaying vegetation, which year by year, chokes the forests and passes away with the winter. The endeavour is to realise in the light of reason and scripture testimony, the varying shades of responsibility created by the dealings of the Almighty with a race already exiled from life and favour under the law of Eden. We have seen that resurrectional responsibility was

limited to those who were related to the word of the God of Israel. The promises and precepts conferred privilege and imposed responsibility, having reference to resurrection. They formed a basis for that awakening from the dust to everlasting life, and shame and everlasting contempt, foretold to Daniel, and implied in many parts of the writings of Job, David and Solomon. The extent to which they operate, it is neither possible nor important for us to determine. The law of resurrectional responsibility operates much more vividly upon our own times, and it is the relation of this law to ourselves that we are more especially concerned to elucidate. It was left for him who proclaimed himself the Resurrection and the Life, to define clearly the relation of judgment to the great scheme of which he was the pivot and the means. He appears before us as the solution of the great difficulty which must have haunted the minds of the faithful men of ancient times, in reference to the declaration that "God would judge the righteous and the wicked."—(Eccles iii, 17.) He exhibits in himself the method by which the arbitration of the unapproachable and immeasurable Deity is to be brought to bear upon mortal and finite man. The Word made flesh proclaims himself the instrument and vehicle of divine judgment: He tells us that *the Father hath committed ALL JUDGMENT to the Son,*' (John v, 22) that as no man can come to the father but by Him, so no one will be judged by the Father but in the light of the word which operates through him—(John xii. 48.) It is highly important that this fact should be distinctly recognised. It is part of the truth concerning Jesus, which forms a prominent feature in the early proclamations of the gospel. This is evident from these testimonies; 1st, that in which Paul comprehends the doctrine of eternal (aionian) judgment among first principles, (Heb. vi, 1); 2nd, the declaration of Peter: "*He commanded us to PREACH UNTO THE PEOPLE, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be THE JUDGE OF QUICK AND DEAD,*"—(Acts x, 42); 3rd, the statement of Paul that there is a "day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Christ Jesus, *according to my (Paul's) gospel.*"—(Rom. iv, 16.) These general evidences are strengthened by the following testimonies, which we submit in detail on account of the importance of clear and scriptural views on the subject:—

He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth; *the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him at the last day.*—(John xii, 48.)

"As many as have sinned in the law shall be *judged by the law.*" Rom. ii, 12.

"Every man's work shall be made manifest, for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is."—(1 Cor., iii, 13.)

"The Father, without respect of persons, *judgeth according to every man's work.*"—(1 Peter, i, 17.)

"The day of wrath and the revelation of the righteous judgment of God, who will render to every man according to his deeds * * * *in the day when God shall judge the secrets of man by Jesus Christ.*—(Rom ii, 5, 6, 16.)

"We shall all stand before *the judgment seat of Christ.* * * * Everyone of us shall give an account of himself unto God." (Rom. xiv, 10, 12.)

"Judge nothing before the time, *until the Lord come*, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the heart.—(1 Cor., iv, 5.)

"*We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ*, that everyone may receive the things in body, according to that he hath done, whether good or bad."—(2 Cor., v, 10.)

"*The Lord Jesus Christ shall judge the quick and the dead* at his appearing, and his kingdom."—(2 Tim., iv, 1.)

"It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this (that is, when the death state ends in resurrection) *the judgment.*"—(Heb. ix, 27.)

"Who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead?"—(1 Peter, iv, 5)

"That we may have boldness *in the day of judgment.*"—(1 John, iv, 17.)

"The time of the dead that *they should be judged.*"—(Rev. xi, 18.)

The proposition that judgment is one of the prerogatives and functions of the Messiah, thus stands upon a very broad scriptural foundation, not merely as fact, but as a constituent of the truth as it is in Jesus. The bearing of the fact is apparent in connection with the mission of the Messiah, as related to our particular dispensation. This is briefly defined by Paul to be "to purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works" (Titus ii, 14.) and by James "to take out of the Gentiles a people for His name." The mode of accomplishing this work is the preaching of the gospel. An invitation has gone out to the ends of the earth, for people of any "kindred and nation, and people, and tongue," to become servants of the Messiah and heirs of the kingdom which God has promised to them that love him. Over the whole period of the times of the Gentiles, the number of those who respond to this call is considerable, but all who are thus called are not chosen, (Matt. xxii, 14), because many who accept the word preached are not influenced by it to "present their bodies living sacrifices, holy and acceptable." As in the case of the Israelites under Moses, "the word preached does not profit them, *not being mixed with faith*" in all who hear it.—(Heb. iv, 2.) The soil being bad, the seed produces no result of any consequence. The net of the kingdom (Matt. xiii, 47) submerged (by preaching) in the ocean of "peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues," encloses bad fish as well as good. The propagation of the gospel results in servants faithful and unfaithful. Not only so, but there are different degrees of merit among those who are faithful. Some sow bountifully, others sparingly. Some bring forth fruit thirty fold, and some an hundred fold. No man can assess the degrees. None of the servants can say, this shall be accepted much,

and that little, and the other not at all. In this matter they are commanded to "judge not" (Matt. vi, 1,) and indeed they cannot do it: though, if censoriously inclined, they may attempt to do it, and sin. There are secrets unknown (good and evil) which require to be known most accurately before a just judgment can be given. "Man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart." (1 Sam., xvi, 7.) Here then is a great community, living and dead, every member related to the rest by the closest of ties, and yet each sustaining a problematical relation to the *dénouement* upon which they have set their hearts—the attainment of immortality, and the inheriting of God's kingdom; each having a right to the promised blessing, so far as the judgment of the rest is concerned, and yet each so situated with reference to God, that unfaithfulness will bring his damnation, though all his comrades approve. When and by what means is this endless variety of causes to be adjusted? When and how is there to be a settlement of the accounts still open between the Deity and His servants? which to man is simply inextricable and impossible if extricated. Has God made any provision by which this superhuman task shall be accomplished? this balancing of good and evil in the infinite diversity of millions of "quick and dead?"—this determination of the minute shades of merit and demerit, attaching to the responsible dead and living of a hundred generations?—this rewarding, in just ratio, of unknown and forgotten deeds of constancy and mercy?—this exposure and retribution of evil thoughts, hidden malice, hard speeches, and deeds of darkness? Has He arranged for such a scrutiny of the affairs of His people, as shall result in the separation of the evil from the good, the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked among them?

The answer sometimes given to this question is true in the fact upon which it is built, but wrong in the construction of the fact. It is said that "the Lord knoweth them that are His," and that, therefore, there is no necessity for a judgment; that "He discerneth the thoughts and intents of the heart," and "needeth not that any should tell him what is in man." This is true, and marks the difference between the "judgment seat of Christ" and a human judicature which makes *inquisition for the purpose of ascertaining the facts*. But when this truth is made the means of displacing the necessity for the disclosed purpose of judging the quick and the dead, it is applied with an illogical and a pernicious result. It is illogical, because it by no means follows that the Deity's omniscient perceptions are not to have official expression, especially when, as in this case, those perceptions affect the standing of those who are the subjects of them, and determine, *in the expression of them*, their destiny. In all transactions between man and the Deity, there is an invariable accommodation on the part of the latter to the necessities and finite apprehensions of the former. Why did Jehovah allow a faithless generation of Israelites to escape from Egypt under Moses, and go through the miraculous experience of the desert, and finally pronounce condemnation on them, instead of acting on his knowledge, and summarily decimating them in a night like the

Assyrians, without warning or explanation? Because he was anxious to bring down to human apprehension the methods of his moral procedure, which he could only do by acting on human modes and processes. Why did he allow Korah, Dathan, and Abiram to lurk in the camp for a season, and trouble the congregation by attempting a rebellion against Moses and Aaron, instead of acting on his omniscience, and weeding them out at the beginning of the journey, and so saved the nation from turbulence? Because such a mode of procedure, instead of illustrating and justifying the ways of God to man, would have wrapped them in mystery, and clothed them with the appearance of caprice and injustice. Why did He so long forbear with the Jews in their obstinacy, foreknowing their ultimate rejection of all His messengers and His own Son? Why did Jesus, who discerned "spirits," tolerate Judas till he convicted himself by betraying his master? Why did the Spirit suffer Annanias and Saphira to come into the presence of the Apostles, and go through the formality of hearing their own condemnation, before their mendacity was punished with death? In fact, why do things happen at all as they do? Why did not the Deity frame the terrestrial economy of things on such a basis that obedience and not disobedience should have been the law? The whole history of divine procedure, in relation to human affairs, shews that divine omniscience is never allowed for a moment to forestal or displace the natural order of events, but rather sets up and enforces the law by which everything has its full and logical course, before the culminating consequence is reached. This is observable in "nature" as well as in "grace." The forces of the universe play upon each other in the evolution of the results forecast in the divine purpose. The geological transformation of the globe is an illustration. To use a hackneyed but useful phrase, "God works by means." He works progressively and by law. He is in strictest harmony with Himself in all the phases of His manifested power throughout His measureless domain.

To say, then, that because God knows the righteous from the wicked, he will not bring them to the formality of a judgment, is to reason against every operation of Deity on record. It is true, Deity knows, but is it not necessary that the righteous and the wicked themselves should know? How shall the righteous know themselves approved, and the wicked condemned, and the Deity be justified in the eyes of both, without the declaration of what He knows? The conclusion is therefore in the highest degree illogical.

It is also pernicious, because it involves the rejection of one of the doctrines which are defined as the first principles of the doctrine of the Christ. We have quoted testimony sufficient to show that the doctrine of the judgment of the living and dead by Christ, is part and parcel of the gospel-proclamation about him. We further submit, on the strength of considerations already passed in review, that logically viewed, it is a natural and necessary part of the glad tidings. It is one of the finest sources of relief which the truth affords, the knowledge that the disputes, misunderstandings and wrongs of the present mal-administration of

things, are destined, in the purpose of God, to come before an infallible tribunal at which every man shall have praise or condemnation according to the nature of the disclosures. It is gladdening to know that there lies between this corrupt state of things and the perfection of the kingdom of God, an ordeal which will prevent the entrance of "anything that defileth," which as fire will try every man's work, and thin down by a process of purification the crowd of those who do no more than say, "Lord, Lord!" It is comforting to know that wrongful suffering will then be avenged, that secret faithfulness will be openly acknowledged, that unappreciated worth will be recognised, and that evil doing unpunished, unsuspected, and unknown, will be held up for execration, in the face of so august an assembly as that of the Elohim, presided over by the Lion of the tribe of Judah. This is part of the glad tidings concerning Jesus Christ. Woe be to him who lifts the voice of denial against it.

In these remarks, we assume that the object and effect of the judgment is to mete out to every man who is summoned to it, *according to his deeds*, WHETHER GOOD OR BAD. This is apparent from the testimony quoted to prove that judgment will be executed by the Son of Man at his coming. We append further and more specific evidence on this point:—

Job xxxiv, 11.—"The work of a man shall He render unto him, and cause every man to find according to his ways."

Proverbs xxiv, 12.—"Doth not He that pondereth the heart consider? and He that keepeth thy soul, doth not He know? and shall not He render to every man according to his works?" See also Psalm lxii, 12.

Jeremiah xvii, 10.—"I the Lord search the heart, I try the reins, even to give every man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings."

Matt. vii, 22, 23.—"Many will say to me *in that day*, Lord, Lord, * * * And then I will profess unto them, I never knew you; DEPART FROM ME ye that work iniquity."

Matt. xii, 36.—"Every idle (evil) word that men shall speak, *they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment.*"

Matt. xvi, 27.—"The Son of Man shall come in the glory of His Father with His angels; and *then shall He reward every man according to His works.*"

Romans xiv, 12.—"Every one of us shall give account of himself to God."

"Matt. iii, 12.—"Whose fan is in His hand, and he will thoroughly purge His floor, and gather the wheat into the garner, and burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire."

Rev. xxii, 12.—"Behold I come quickly and my reward with me, *to give every man according as his work shall be.*"

Another important evidence of the conclusion to which these testimonies lead us, is to be found in the parables of Christ, in many of which he illustrates the relation between himself and his servants in connection with his departure from the earth. In all of these, he presents the fact, that at his return, he will "take account" of them, and

deal with them according to their individual deserts. Thus, in the parable of the nobleman (Luke xix, 12), "It came to pass that *when he was returned*, having received the kingdom, *He commanded those servants to be called unto him, to whom He had given the money, THAT HE MIGHT KNOW HOW MUCH EVERY MAN HAD GAINED BY TRADING.*" Those servants are given as three in number, and doubtless represent the several classes of which the bulk of Christ's professing servants are composed. The first gives a satisfactory account of himself, having increased five talents to ten, and receives jurisdiction over ten cities. The second had made two talents into four, and entitled himself to meritorious recognition and the allotment of four cities. The third, who though less privileged, might have stood equally well, had he turned his single talent into two, justifies his indolence on the plea that he dreaded a service where more was expected than was given in the first instance. This man, who stands for the unfaithful, is rejected. The decree is, "Take the talent from him, and give it unto him that hath ten talents, * * * Cast ye THE UNPROFITABLE SERVANT into outer darkness"—(Matt. xxv, 28, 30.) Here the unprofitable servant figures in the judgment of the king's household at his return as well as the approved. In Matt. xxii, 1—14, we have another parable, in which the same feature is introduced,—A certain king issues invitations to his son's marriage, but the parties invited make various excuses for not coming. The King then orders a general invitation to all and sundry whom his servants may find on the highways, and his servants execute the orders and "gather as many as they found, *bad and good.*" The king then comes in to see the guests, and "*saw there a man which had not on a wedding garment,*" whom he ordered to be "*bound hand and foot, and taken away.*" This shows that the judgment to be carried out by Jesus at the time of reckoning has the practical effect of "*severing the wicked from amongst the just*" To the same purport is the parable of which the latter italicised words are an explanation. "The kingdom of heaven was like unto a net that was cast into the sea and gathered of every kind, which when it was full they drew to the shore, and sat down and gathered the good into vessels, and *cast the bad away.*"—(Matt. xiii, 47, 48.) Also the following: "The Son of Man is as a man taking a far journey, who left his house and gave authority to his servants, and to every man his work, and he commanded the porter to 'watch, therefore, * * * lest coming suddenly *he find you sleeping*'"—(Mark xiv, 34.) Further: "Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning, and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their lord, when he will return * * * Blessed are those servants whom the Lord when He cometh shall find watching, * * * But, and if that servant say in his heart, my lord delayeth his coming, and shall begin to beat the men-servants and maidens, and to eat and to drink and be drunken, the lord of that servant will come in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour when he is not aware, and *will cut him under, and will appoint him his portion with the unbelievers.*"—(Luke xii, 45, 46.) The parable of the ten virgins enforces the same fact, viz., that the unworthy portion of his servants will be publicly and officially rejected at the time the others are acknowledged.

This is in harmony with the reason of the thing as well as with the numerous testimonies already cited from the Apostolic writings. Many are called, but only few out of the many are to be "chosen." When should the choice take place, but at the time represented in these parables, viz : "When the lord of those servants cometh" to develop the state of things in reference to which the choice is to be made? (Matt. xxv, 19.) The present is not a time for dividing the wicked from the righteous. Both go to the grave, and "rest together in the dust;" and their merits and demerits would sleep for ever with them, in the silence of the tomb, were it not for the awaking voice that calls the just and unjust at the appointed time from the oblivion of hades, to give an account before "the Judgment-seat of Christ." Now is not the time for Jesus to execute judgment. He is a priest over his own house. The great question of account is left over till He returns. "*He shall judge the quick and the dead* AT HIS APPEARING AND HIS KINGDOM." He shall open the dread book of God's remembrance, wherein are indelibly recorded the thoughts and transactions of those who shall come to judgment, and the dead shall be judged out of those things that were written in the book.

Shall the wicked be absent at such a moment? The suggestion is for ever precluded by the testimony and by the sense of the thing. A mockery of a judgment seat it would be if its operation were confined to the allotment of rewards to the accepted. To judge, in the executive sense, is to enforce the division of good from evil. This is the function of Jesus in relation to his servants at his coming. True, says the suggester, but it will only be the living wicked that he will reject; the dead wicked will sleep on to another period. Is it so, then, that the accident of death a day before the advent will shut off a wicked man from the jurisdiction of the Judge of quick AND dead? Is it so that Jesus will only judge the living and not the dead at His appearing? Is it so that he is not "lord both of the dead and living?"—(Romans xiv, 9.) The answer is self-evident; life or death makes no difference in our relationship to the judgment seat. The Son of Man has power to call from the dead at His will, and, therefore, virtually, the dead are as much amenable to His judicature as those who may happen to be in the flesh when he is revealed. The constituted servants of Christ (by belief of the gospel and baptism) are candidates for the kingdom to be manifested at the appearing of Christ which is to exist thereafter a thousand years; and it is meet that they should be arranged in His presence to have it decided, as between them and him when the time comes to enter the kingdom, which of all their number are worthy of the honour sought. This it is declared in the testimonies quoted he will do. To do otherwise, to leave over the undeserving of them for adjudication at a subsequent period, would both violate the fitness of things and contravene the express declarations, which we have quoted on the subject. Jesus has declared that he will confess or deny men in the presence of the angels at His coming, according to the position taken by them in His absence—(Luke ix, 26; Matt. x, 32, 33.) Does not this necessitate their presence on the occasion? Where would be the shame of a

denial if the one denied were not there to witness his own disgrace? Some will be "ashamed before Him *at His coming*"—(1 John. ii, 28). Daniel says that at that time "Many of them that sleep in dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and *some to shame and everlasting contempt.*" This agrees with Paul's statement that "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish," shall be the lot of every "soul of man that is contentious and disobedient to the truth, *in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Christ Jesus,*" (Rom. ii, 8, 9, 16;) and with his exhortation in another place, to "judge nothing before the time, till the Lord come, *who will bring to light the hidden things of darkness*"—(1 Cor., 4, 5.) Those portions of Scripture which are made the basis of the view here combated, viz., the view that the wicked will not rise when Christ comes, but will be left over to the close of the thousand years,—will engage our attention in due time.

With the general conclusion before us, that the judgment seat is the appointed tribunal for determining the great question of individual desert, in relation to the dispensation of God's favour in Christ, we come to the minor but involved question of the nature and position of the dead, during the interval elapsing between their emergence from the death-state and their adjudication by the judge. The object of that adjudication is defined by Paul in the following words: "We must all stand before the judgment seat of Christ, *that we may receive in body according to that we have done, WHETHER GOOD OR BAD*"—(2 Cor. v, 10.) What shall those "receive in body," who have in the sense of these words "done good?" and what those who have "done bad?" Paul, in another place, answers these questions. He says "God will render to every man according to his deeds: *to them who by patient continuance in well doing (he will render) ETERNAL LIFE.* But unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish * * * *in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Christ Jesus.*"—(Rom. ii, 6-9, 16.) The same fact he announces in more specific terms to the Galatians (chap. vi, 7, 8,) "Be not deceived; God is not mocked; whatsoever a man soweth, *that shall he also reap.* He that soweth to the flesh, shall of the flesh *reap corruption*; but he that soweth to the spirit *shall of the spirit reap LIFE EVERLASTING.*" Paul does not mention the judgment in this testimony, but it is evident that it relates to the judgment, since life everlasting is not "reaped" in the present state of existence, and "corruption" befalls all alike, without reference to the "sowing." It is evident that the results of present life are to be dispensed at the judgment seat. Paul indeed expressly declares it in the words already quoted, "that we may receive, &c." This is reasonable, and befitting of the Deity, who is "a God of order" to the utmost exactitude in all things. If this be so, does it not follow that prior to the judgment seat, both classes of those subject to judgment occupy the neutral position they hold in the present life, commingling indiscriminately, awaiting the tribunal, none knowing who is who? Is it not evident that the judgment seat forms the great natural boundary line between probation and exaltation? the great crisis for determining the standing of the many who have been

“called?” the time for that disclosure of divine secrets, which results in the severing of the wicked from among the just, and the rejection and condemnation of the one, and the acceptance and glorification of the other? If so, it follows that up to the appearance of the dead before Christ to give an account, these questions are undecided, so far as their effect in relation to them is concerned. They are of course known to the divine mind, as we have already had occasion to consider, but not declared or enforced. Christ, as the judge of quick and dead, is entrusted with that very duty.

What is the conclusion from these Scriptural premisses? There is only one; that the dead assembled for judgment are *men and women in the flesh* recovered from the grave, reproduced, and made to “STAND AGAIN” (*anastasis*) in the presence of their Lord and Judge, to have it determined whether they are worthy of receiving the “hidden manna” of eternal life, for which they are all candidates, or deserving of reconsignment to corruption and death, under the specially solemn circumstance of rejection by Him who is “altogether lovely.” Thus, those who are alive when the Lord comes, and those who emerge from the grave at that period, will be on a footing of perfect equality. They will all be gathered together into the one Great Presence, for the one great and dread purpose of inquisition: Not until they hear the spoken words of the king will they know how it is to fare with them. All depends upon the “account.” This can only be accurately estimated by the judge. A righteous man will tremble and underrate his position; on the other hand, one of “the wicked” may venture with coolness and effrontery before that august tribunal, to recount with complaisance and confidence the list of his claims to the Messiah’s consideration: “Have we not prophesied (preached) in thy name, and in thy name done many wonderful works?”

It is evident from three things—from the reason of the thing, from Christ’s parables, and Paul’s and Peter’s statements—that the judgment will be no dumb show, no wholesale indiscriminate division of classes, but will be an individual reckoning. “We must all give an account unto God.” It may be fancied that persons before the judgment seat would simply be paralysed and rendered powerless to utter their minds; but it must be remembered that the power is then and there present that touched Daniel, and made him stand on his feet, when he was felled to the earth by the terrors of angelic presence; and, doubtless, this power will be put forth to enable all calmly, clearly, and with deliberation to state their case for decision. Enswathed by the human spirit “mesmerically” applied, this result can now be achieved in a small way; how much more, when the power of the Highest sustains, will those who are acted upon by it, feel isolated from all perturbing influences, and be enabled to concentrate their minds upon the solemn task they have to perform.

Those parts of Scripture which are relied upon to sustain the ordinary view will engage our attention probably next month, for the purpose of enquiring whether, despite appearances, they are not in absolute harmony with the unequivocal testimony cited in this article.

We remark now that the view that the righteous dead will spring into being in a state of incorruption, and that the living faithful will be instantaneously transformed, in their scattered places throughout the earth, and changed into the spiritual nature before appearing in the presence of Christ, (though apparently countenanced by testimonies which we shall see are superficially construed by those who so read them) is an error of a serious complexion, since it practically sets aside the New Testament doctrine of the judgment, (itself a first principle) and tends to destroy the sense of responsibility and circumspection, induced by a recognition of the fact that we must all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, that we may receive in body according to that we have done, whether good or bad. To profess a belief in the judgment while holding this view, is only to retain a form of words out of deference to New Testament phraseology, while having lost that which is represented by the words. If the dead are to awake to incorruptibility or death, according to their deserts, Jesus is robbed of his honour as judge, and the judgment-seat is robbed of its utility and its terror. If the living are to be subject to immortalization, say in their own houses, before Christ pronounces them blessed, is the judgment-seat not a mere empty form? If (worse than all), the wicked are not to be there to hear and receive their doom, it is no judgment at all, but a mere muster of the chosen; no terror at all, but a ceremony divested of every element of anxiety, since to have a part in it according to this theory is to be safe beyond miscarriage; no rendering at all to *every man* according to his deeds, whether *good or bad*, but a mere bestowal of the gifts and honours upon the King's assorted friends. Yet this is the mistaken view which many are led to entertain by a superficial reading of certain parts of the Apostolic testimony which will next demand our consideration.

EDITOR.

January 15th, 1867.

NOTES.

THE BOUNTY TO DR. THOMAS.—Since last month, we have received the following contributions: J. Douglas, Glasgow, £1; G. Dick, Glasgow, £1; H. Turner, Birmingham, 10s.; R. Hodgson, Wishaw, £2; Sister Jardine, Birmingham, £1. Several others have promised, and among them, a Sister, £5.

THE AMBASSADOR SUPPLEMENT.—We acknowledge the following further contributions on this behalf:—J. Douglas, Glasgow, 6s6d.; G. Dick, Glasgow, 1s.; Dr. Hayes, Jersey, 10s.; H. Turner, Birmingham, 10s.; T. Bissett, (for ecclesia), 10s.; W. Birkenhead, Manchester, 3s.; Mrs. Shields, Harelaw, 4d.; W. Dew, Innerleithen, 1s2d.; Miss Hayes, Jersey, £1.; Mrs. Hough, Guernsey, 5s.; J. Hughes, Kington, 2s6d. These contributions, with those acknowledged last month, including 15s. promised in the first instance by the Mumbles ecclesia, amount to nearly £3 in excess of the cost of the supplement. This superabundance of liberality, we this month give our readers the full benefit of, in the shape of eight extra pages of matter.

ANASTASIS ;

OR

THE FALL OF THE ROMAN PONTIFICATE,

THE

RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD,

AND

THE JUDGMENT OF THE WORLD.

“There shall be a RESURRECTION OF DEAD ONES, both of just and unjust.”—PAUL.

“And as Paul reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and the JUDGMENT TO COME, FELIX trembled.”—ACTS xxiv, 25.

“Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that the Deity should raise the dead?”—PAUL TO AGRIPPA.

This is the title of a new pamphlet by Dr. Thomas, about to be issued by “the Christadelphian Association,” of Detroit, Mich., U.S., at 50 cents per copy. It embodies the substance of lectures recently delivered by the Dr. on the important topics set forth in the title. The price in England will be ONE SHILLING AND NINEPENCE. The pamphlet will be ready for English subscribers about the middle of February. Orders addressed to the Editor, enclosing the price, will ensure possession of what will doubtless prove a work of thrilling interest.

We append the preface which has been forwarded to us. It will enable the reader to form an idea of the contents of the work itself:—

“This treatise on RESURRECTION and JUDGMENT owes its existence to the urgent request of friends in Detroit, who heard the substance of it delivered there at a private meeting. The exposition on that occasion was deemed highly satisfactory; and they determined that I should not rest until they obtained it in the present form. I was th^o less disposed to refuse compliance when I considered the importance of the subject, the little information possessed upon it, the nearness of its development, and the “signs of the times” indicative thereof. In the present state of the public mind, it is a subject very difficult to present in such a form, that he who runs may read it intelligibly. My aim has been to set it forth with all possible simplicity, that the reader might be instructed;

his faith, if he have any, enlarged and strengthened; and his conduct purified by the conviction which so sublime and terrible a wonder cannot fail to produce in a well balanced and judicious mind.

But some may be prompted to inquire, *Is it necessary to understand all the details of Resurrection and Judgment in order to possess the faith which it justifies?* In reply, I would say, if it were necessary, there would scarcely be found, in this generation, a corporal's guard of justified believers. I apprehend that, if a person heartily believe in "the resurrection of the just and the unjust," and that both these classes will appear in the presence of the Righteous Judge "to give account of themselves to him," their understanding so far is sound upon these two first principles: but if, on the contrary, he deny the resurrection of "the unjust," or *saints of the Sardean tygg*, and repudiates the citation of the righteous to judgment, saying that there is no other judgment for them than what they are subjected to in the present state; and that they will not be called upon to give account; I can only say for myself, that I had rather never have been born than to appear in the Divine Presence with such a tradition. It would not be difficult to make out against such a case of constructive treason to the truth. But this is neither my purpose nor desire. "Judge nothing," says Paul; "before the time until the Lord come, who will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the heart." My purpose is to enlighten, not to condemn. The more we understand of what we profess to believe, the stronger is our faith therein; and the nearer we approach its development, the more necessary is it, that a lively interest be kindled in us, that our lamps be well trimmed, and our lights be found brightly burning."—MATT. xxv, 4, 7, 10.

THE AUTHOR.

West Hoboken, Hudson Co., N.J.,
December 8th, 1866.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

PROJECTED RESTORATION OF THE JEWS TO THEIR OWN LAND.

(From the DUBLIN COURIER.)

THE legend of the "Wandering Jew" must be familiar to the readers of the *Courier*, but it is only a legend. If we speak of Wandering Jews, we refer to a *fact* to which eighteen centuries bear testimony. Throughout the Christian ages a race of men have wandered up and down the world, dwelling in every country, but owning no land but one as their home—the land of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. They have existed during this prolonged epoch politically without king or government, but looking out for the advent of the Royal Son of David,—the promised Messiah; they have founded no metropolis in any part of the wide world, but have kept waiting for Jerusalem as "the city of the Great King." Religiously, they have

had neither priest nor sacrifice, keeping both in abeyance until another temple shall rear its stately walls on Mount Zion. In every clime whither they have come, along every shore on which they have wandered, they have reproduced the affecting scenes of Babylon, and, like their ancestors, have wept when they have remembered Zion. Beneath each foreign sky, the harp of Judah has been hung upon the willows, and to the taunts of their captors they have replied, "How shall we sing the Lord's song in a strange land?"

Jerusalem, it is true is still "a city of habitation," but to the Jew that city is desolate, for it is "trodden down" by the foot of the Gentile; hence the "wailing" of each

returning Friday on the part of the resident Israelites, gathering around the old foundation stones of Solomon's Temple, to bemoan the ruins of that once glorious structure.

But *what if the nineteenth century should put an end for ever to the wanderings and wailings of that remarkable people?* Strange as such a notion may seem to many, yet it must be admitted that in this remarkable age there is scarcely anything which can be said to be impossible. To the most ordinary observer it will be evident that we have left behind us the era of things tame and ordinary, and have entered upon that of the marvellous and extraordinary; nor have we arrived yet at "the end of these wonders." But *the restoration of the Jewish empire, we well know, has been proclaimed throughout Christendom (at least in these modern times) as nothing better than an idle dream, and it has therefore been remitted to the limbo appointed for all such like things.*

The creed of the Christian Church and the creed of the political and financial world are at variance regarding this matter. The former says, "It is impossible, and will not take place;" the latter says "It is possible, and shall be done."

But before proceeding to show what financiers and politicians are doing, let us for a moment turn to the "law and testimony," and inquire if the great Book has anything to say concerning the matter. We feel a strong temptation to place the Old Testament in the witness box, so prolific is it in chapters and verses touching this question; but we will pass by the glowing strains of the illustrious seers of old, for it is said that *they are not to be understood literally*, but require a figurative and spiritualizing exegesis; but, not having space on this occasion to offer reasons for a contrary opinion, we drop altogether the Old Testament from the discussion. Now let us turn to the New Testament, and, in looking over its pages in relation to this question we have another argument, for both books assert the same identical truths. But time will not permit us to refer to more than two arguments from the New Testament in behalf of the restoration of the Jews. But the first of these two, in our opinion, presents a basis sufficiently broad on which to build this sublime theory.

The *speaker* whose words we are about to cite is none other than *Christ*, and the passage carries such an air of literalness along with it that none but an Origen, who found a spiritual significance in every sentence of the Bible can evade its point. The following are the words:—"And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."—Luke xxi; 24.

It will be acknowledged by every candid student of the Bible that if the sword and

captivity are literal, so also is the predicted occupation of Jerusalem by the foreigner. That it is in a literal sense we must receive the passage is no longer a mere theory, but a demonstration, for it has received a literal accomplishment; *by a literal sword* the Jews have fallen, by a literal captivity they have been scattered among all nations, and *by a literal usurpation* the city has been for ages beneath the foot of the Gentile, and is so at this hour. *But is this to last for ever?* Those that think so have overlooked the force of one word in the passage—"until." What a significant word! It is the emphatic word of the whole verse, to the Gentile and also to the Jew; it tells the one that he shall not usurp for ever; it tells the other he shall not for ever be banished. "And Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles UNTIL the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." When these times are fulfilled, the Gentile is no longer in possession of Jerusalem—there is no one else then on the face of the whole earth to possess it but the Jew, for all who are not Jews are Gentiles—there is no third party in existence.

In the Acts of the Apostles we have the same fact stated, together with an explanation as to the "times of the Gentiles"—"Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for His name. And to this agree the words of the prophets, as it is written, After this I will return, and will build up the tabernacle of David which is fallen down, and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up, that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called, shall with the Lord, who doeth all these things."—Acts xv, 13—17.

Here we have three facts stated—1. That the "times of the Gentiles" are a period allotted for taking out a people. 2. That when this period closes, the Jewish nation will be reinstated. 3. That the restoration and conversion of the Jewish people will be immediately followed by the evangelization of the whole world. It cannot fail to appear, how that the words of Christ and those of the Apostle are in perfect accord. Jerusalem is no longer trodden down of the Gentiles when their times are fulfilled, says Christ. After the dispensation of the Gentiles is over, the tabernacle of David is raised from its ruins, says the Apostle.

Those who have given some attention to the question of Jewish restoration will have discovered, from the predictions of the Bible, that the descendants of Abraham will be at the first restored in an *unconverted state*, i.e., without having accepted Christianity. Their return to their own land, therefore, is likely to occur as the result of some commercial or political scheme. The repose of Europe has for a long time, been disturbed by what is familiarly known as the "Eastern Question."

In that question momentous issues are involved: and, because it is so intimately allied with the destiny of the Jews, therefore it is that Providence seems to give the nations no rest, until the mighty problem of the East is solved.

At this hour, a scheme is in course of active preparation, the outline of which remains now to be stated. Its author is Mr. Dunant, now a resident in Switzerland,—a gentleman who is already known to Europe as the “Founder of the International Convention in behalf of the wounded in time of War.” It may be remembered that this convention was entered into by the leading nations of Europe, and was successfully carried out in the recent war in Germany. The scheme in reference to the East is thus designated,—“Organization of the International Society of the Orient.” A gentleman, writing from Basle, Switzerland, as correspondent of one of the American papers, states:—“The society is being rapidly formed, with the strongest influences, financial and political, at its back. The Rothschilds, Sir Moses Montefiore, and other great capitalists among the Jews, are actively in sympathy with the undertaking. The plan has the favour of more than one crowned head in Europe, among them the Emperor Napoleon, of whose especial theories of nationalities it is a welcome development. Several noblemen of England, and the leading names of the Faubourg St. Germain, are also among its friends.”

The scheme contemplates the obtaining from the Sultan of Turkey a concession of Palestine for a moneyed consideration. Such are the exigencies of the Sultan's exchequer that money, come from whom or where it may, is not to be refused. In this fact the society place their hopes of success, and that they will succeed is more than a mere surmise. Having obtained a concession of Palestine, the society will immediately construct a port at Jaffa, and a good road or railroad from that city to Jerusalem. At the same time, by the aid of special committees, Jews of Morocco, of Poland, of Moldavia, of Wallachia, of the East, of Africa, &c., would be forwarded to the newly conceded territory, their colonization there being facilitated by the well-known religious sentiment of the Jews in reference to the Holy Land. These colonies of Jews would then have distributions of land made to them at cost prices, while the city of Jerusalem would be rebuilt in a style to rival the cities of the

West. And while thus developing the resources of that magnificent country, and turning it into a financial success, it is intended at the same time to settle this portion of the Eastern question, and by an international act to neutralize Palestine, as has been done already in the case of the Lower Danube. Such is a brief outline of the scheme, of which more will be heard presently.

In Europe and the East it is computed that at the present time there are about 7,000,000 Jews—no insignificant number with which to recommence national life. While diplomacy is thus about to prepare the land for the Jews, the Jews are actively preparing for the land. From all quarters news is to the effect that the Jews are ready to emigrate, believing that the day of restoration is at hand. The following lines from the *Jewish Chronicle* are indicative of their hopes and aspirations:—

He is coming, and the mountains of Judah
ring again;
Jerusalem awakens, and shouts her glad
amen.

He is coming! wastes of Horeb, awaken and
rejoice;
Hills of Moab, cliffs of Edom, lift the long
silent voice.

He is coming, sea of Sodom, to heal thy
leprous brine—
To give back palm and myrtle, the olive and
vine.

He is coming, blighted Carmel, to restore
thine olive bowers;

He is coming, faded Sharon, to give thee back
thy flowers.

Sons of Gentile-trodden Judah, awake, behold,
he comes!

Landless and kingless exiles, re-seek your
long-lost homes;

Back to your ancient valleys, which your
fathers loved so well:

In their own now crumbled cities, let their
children's children dwell.

AMERICAN SUBSCRIBERS TO ANASTASIS

Will please communicate their orders and remittances to Bro. J. Donaldson, 242,
Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich., U.S.

DR. THOMAS AND HIS MISSION.—No. 12.

(Continued from page 10.)

HAVING thus made a new start, the Doctor determined to visit Baltimore, New York, and Buffalo, with the object of laying before his acquaintances in those parts, his perfected apprehension of the truth which he had from time to time proclaimed, in certain of its elementary constituents, but without taking the attitude he was now prepared to assume as to the importance of its being received, in order to justification unto life eternal. He first went to Baltimore. There he called on his old friend (now dead) Mr. Richard Lemmon, and stated he had called to see if he could get an opportunity of speaking at the meeting-house of the Campbellite friends, with whom he was connected. He wanted an immediate answer, because the return train started soon, and if he could not have the opening desired, he would go back at once. Mr. Lemmon asked him to walk in, and talk the matter over, which having been done, the two went out to see "Deacon Sands," for the purpose of ascertaining if the meeting-house could be had for the purpose mentioned. The result was that Sands and Lemmon between themselves assumed the responsibility of deciding to give the Dr. a hearing, and issued announcements, advertising the Dr. to speak on the following Sunday. When the day came, the Doctor went to the place with his friend Lemmon. After the preliminary services had been got through, an individual arose in the meeting, and protested against the Doctor being allowed to speak. This provoked an

angry discussion, which was terminated by a vote being taken, when the individual in question was the only person who held up his hand against the Doctor proceeding with his discourse. In the afternoon and evening, the Doctor addressed an audience of tolerable dimensions, on what is now familiarly known as "the gospel of the kingdom." The effect varied with the capacities and inclinations of the hearers. Some spoke against the word, as of yore; others (a very small minority of course) were stimulated to investigation, and in one or two instances, induced ultimately to abandon Campbellism for the "new doctrine." Friend Lemmon (who had lent the Doctor a portion of the 400 dollars that he lost under circumstances already detailed) was amongst the latter. Next morning, he said "We are very much obliged to you for your visit, and in order that you may know that it is not mere words, I would request you to consider that your obligation to me for the money lent is entirely cancelled; not only so, but if ever you are in a tight place again, let me know, and I will do the best I can to help you out of it." The Doctor thanked him, and was about taking his leave, when he was stopped on the door step by another member of the congregation (Mr. W. P. Lemmon, a brother of the Doctor's entertainer), who placed 50 dollars in his hand, remarking that the congregation wished to express their sense of the obligation he had laid them under by his visit, by asking him to accept the sum mentioned, as a contri-

bution toward his expenses. He added that he hoped the Doctor would never pass Baltimore without paying them a visit.

Encouraged by this manifestation of kindness, the Doctor proceeded to New York. There he obtained the use of the hall in which he spoke on the occasion of his first visit, and, in several lectures, laid before his Campbellite acquaintances, and such of the public as chose to attend, the gospel of the kingdom in its several prophetic and doctrinal features. The result was that several individuals laid hold of it somewhat precipitately, and commenced agitating it, more on account of its novelty (as afterwards appeared) and the opportunity it gave for the notoriety that ever attends the promulgation of new things. There were, of course, others of a better class, who accepted the truth in sincerity and love. The result of the lectures was a great disturbance in the Campbellite congregation. Those who were favourably affected by them, broached the new views in the meeting. This gave great offence, and ended in a resolution that such should no more speak of these things. This caused the withdrawal of the Doctor's friends, who started a meeting of their own in the house of George B. Stacey, the ringleader of the party. This was the origin of the Christadelphian ecclesia of New York, which has since that passed through somewhat chequered fortunes.

From New York, the Doctor proceeded to Buffalo, where he obtained the use of the Millerite meeting-house, through the influence of one Francis B. Scott, a sort of Milleo-Campbellite. His labours here were without visible result. The Doctor's acquaintances could not endure the

restoration of the Jews. Nothing would satisfy them short of a glorious conflagration of the globe, with all its wicked inhabitants. Unwilling, however, to leave that part of the country without a further opportunity of laying the truth before the people, the Doctor wrote to Joseph Marsh, a Millerite elder in the city of Rochester, N.Y., then editing a paper called the *Millennial Harbinger*, stating, that on the supposition that he (Elder Marsh) did not believe he had obtained the perfection of knowledge, and that there was still some truth to be learnt which he had not discovered, he should propose (Elder Marsh having no objection) to call and speak at his meeting place. Elder Marsh wrote the Doctor a reply to "come." The Doctor went, but his visit was unpalatable to the congregation; only about sixty persons turned out, and on these the Doctor's arguments on behalf of the new doctrine, seemed to have as little effect as on their brethren at Buffalo. The Doctor returned to New York, and from thence home to Richmond, and thus brought to a close his first tour for the proclamation of the gospel of the kingdom.

The year 1848 having arrived (memorable for revolutions in Europe which overturned almost every throne on the Continent) the Doctor concluded that the opportunity would be favourable for visiting England, and laying before his countrymen (should an opportunity occur) the glorious doctrine of the coming kingdom, which should quell all turbulence and establish righteousness and peace on the earth. The idea was prevalent that the tide of democracy would sweep away absolutism in every form, and lead to the establishment of a universal republic on the model of the United States. The

Doctor was anxious to show that the political speculations in which the country was indulging, would certainly turn out illusory, and that though the thrones of Europe were being shaken by democratic upheavings, their final destruction would not be accomplished by any popular outbreak, but that they would be reserved for a final and terrible overthrow, to be effected by Christ and His saints at the appointed time. Accordingly, on the 1st of June, in the year in question, he left New York for Liverpool, in a sailing vessel, accompanied by his daughter Eusebia, having left his wife at Richmond. In 21 days the vessel reached her destination. From Liverpool the Doctor went to Manchester, where he staid a few days. He then went to London, arriving most unexpectedly at the house of his brother, No. 3, Brudnel Place, New North Road. At this time the Doctor knew very few persons in England, and those were friends of his father, and not his own. The truth was known nowhere. Campbellism prevailed to a considerable extent, but "the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ" had no abiding place, either in any person or community, then or since known. This state of things was destined, in the providence of God, to change. The means of accomplishing the change were at that time highly problematical. The Doctor had no acquaintances amongst the Campbellites as he had in America, to take him by the hand, and give him opportunities of presenting his convictions to considerable bodies of people, to a certain extent prepared by Campbellism (a slight improvement on orthodoxy) to exercise their judgment independently and intelligently on the truth. True, he had

been heard of by some in England, but in a way calculated to excite distrust and aversion more than anything else. The way, however, opened in a singular and effective manner. A few days after his arrival, a notice appeared on the cover of the British organ of Campbellism, published at Nottingham, stating that Doctor Thomas was on his way to England, and warning "the brethren" to have nothing to do with him, and to be careful not to afford him any facilities of speaking and doing mischief. The immediate result of this was, *an invitation from a Millerite congregation to visit Nottingham.* This came about in the following way:— Mr. Wallis, editor of the Campbellite paper and leader of the Campbellite body in Nottingham, had cultivated acquaintance with the Millerites, and established amicable relations between them and the Campbellites; but in process of time, this good understanding was disturbed, and the two parties became antagonistic. This happened shortly before the appearance of the notice already referred to, and when the notice did appear, the Millerites saw it was a good opportunity of spiting the Campbellites, and, accordingly, to gratify their spleen against Wallis, they sent for the Doctor to come to lecture at the very head quarters of Campbellism in Britain, and in the very place whence the warning against him had been issued to the whole country. The Doctor, who only sought the interests of the truth, accepted the invitation, and arrangements were made for a series of lectures. The congregations were too large for the Millerite place of meeting, and a hall in the town was engaged in which the Doctor delivered thirteen lectures to large audiences. The result was a deep impression on behalf of the truth. But

through another singular development of Providence, the Doctor's labours in Nottingham were made to have a much wider effect than this. There was published in the town, a rival Campbellite paper, which circulated throughout the country. It was conducted by a man of the name of Hudson, whose rivalry to Wallis originated in the following way. He formerly worked in the office where Wallis's paper was printed, and while Mr. Campbell was in England the year before, he asked and obtained that gentleman's permission to republish articles from his works in tract form, upon which he opened an office for himself and issued the tracts. Upon discovering this, Wallis, who considered himself the only legitimate channel of Campbellite literature in England, was highly indignant, and refused to countenance or tolerate any such schismatic proceeding. This attitude on his part naturally made friends for Hudson, and enemies for himself, and, in due time, the project of a rival paper was mooted, and successfully carried out. The new paper was called the *Gospel Buzzer*, the other was most inappropriately entitled the *Millemial Harbinger*. When the editor of the *Gospel Banner* perceived the spirit of hostility evinced by Wallis toward the Doctor, he conceived a favourable disposition to the Doctor, and, at the same time, availed himself of an excellent op-

portunity of baffling Wallis's policy, by throwing open his pages to the Dr., and inviting him to write freely in them. In this way, the Dr. was favourably introduced to the Campbellites throughout the country, and the way was paved for extensive lecturing operations, which under other circumstances would have been impracticable.

(To be continued.)

[In answer to several enquiries, we may state, for general information, that the narrative of Dr. Thomas's life, which is in progress in the *Ambassador*, is written by the Editor from materials taken down by him from the Doctor's mouth, when the latter was in this country four years ago. The suggestion that it is written by himself is, therefore, "off the mark" entirely, while, at the same time, the story being mainly dictated by himself, it has all the value of an autobiography. It is, of course, amplified to some extent, and interspersed with comment that would be out of place in a man's account of himself, but which, in a story told by a second person, is necessary to elucidate the bearing of the facts and incidents recorded. We may state that its appearance is contrary to the Doctor's wishes, but greatly in accord with the desire of a wide circle of friends.—EDITOR.]

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES.

AMBASSADOR SUPPLEMENT.—Since writing the note of acknowledgment on page 33, we have received further contributions to the cost of the Ambassador Supplement. J. Mullholland, Glasgow, 6s.; J. Milne, Dunkeld, 1s6d.; W. Ellis, Edinburgh, 1s. (additional); J. W. Moore, Devonport, 2s9d.; Martin, Devonport, 3d.; J. K. Ramsey, Galston, 10s. In consequence of this further influx of liber-

ality, our readers will find 12 extra pages of matter instead of 8.

THE BOUNTY TO DR. THOMAS.—Since the contributions on this behalf mentioned on page 33, the following sums have come to hand:—J. J. Andrew, London, £1 1s.; Sister N— £5; W. Ellis, Edinburgh, £1; J. K. Ramsey, Glasgow, £1.

**TRINITARIANISM AND THE TRUTH,
CONSIDERED IN RELATION TO THE FIRST THREE VERSES OF
JOHN'S GOSPEL.**

THE "PRE-EXISTENCE" OF JESUS CHRIST—HIS BEING THE WORD MADE FLESH.

(Continuation of "The Bible as a Law of Life and Immortality," from page 17.)

COMING then to the pre-existence of Jesus Christ, the same Platonic system of ideas presents itself as the groundwork on which Antichrist, the "Man of Sin,"* also, founds this doctrine. Gibbon, the historian, makes mention "That four different opinions have been entertained concerning the origin of human souls. 1st.—That they are eternal and divine. 2nd.—That they were created in a separate state of existence before their union with the body. 3rd.—That they were propagated from the original stock of Adam, who contained in himself the mental as well as the corporeal seed of his posterity. 4th.—That each soul is especially created and embodied in the moment of existence." And continues he, "The last of these sentiments appears to have prevailed amongst the moderns; and our spiritual history is

grown less sublime, without being more intelligible." By this then, we are instructed as to the opinions which are more sublime and less modern; we are directed to the two first, as those which had prevailed in the primitive ages of Christianity, and so led to the source from which the now-prevailing opinion concerning the pre-existence of Jesus Christ originated. "All those who believe the immateriality of the soul must confess," says Gibbon, "the incomprehensible union of mind and matter. A similar union is not incompatible with a much higher, or even with the highest degree of mental faculties; and the incarnation of an æon, or archangel, does not involve any positive absurdity."—*Gibbon*. Hence, Jesus Christ, the æon in Jesus Christ the flesh! It is not for us, therefore, to believe that the origin of the doctrine of

* NOTE.—This MAN symbolises a multitude of men, mainly represented by the numerous sects of Trinitarians, both Papist and Protestant. The Roman is the Mother, the Protestant, her harlots. They hate each other with a perfect hatred, as is common for harlots and their mothers to do, so natural to illegitimacy. But, notwithstanding this, they each pursue on their own footings, the same course of opposition to the Christ of Deity, as is evident from Scripture. It is by this they are known, as it is not so much the ritual ceremonies of a sect that constitute it Antichristian, as it is the theological doctrines inculcated in opposition to the truth. The ponderous weight of ritualism only gravitates the power of man from the probability of ever grasping the truth, by chaining the mind to ceremonies, whose outside pomp and pantomimic mien reveal a slavery so degrading that those entangled therewith are helpless. They are slaves, and hence more fit for pity than for scorn. But those who acknowledge the right of private judgment for themselves, whether they recognise it as necessary or not for others, and teach for the doer, or anti-ritualistic, of High Church or Low Church; whether of cool judgment and of unobtrusive piety, or of fanatical enthusiasm, and of the "revivalist" character—these are the men, be their names what they may, Episcopalian or Presbyterian, Baptist or Methodist, Independent or otherwise—these are the men, who, as angels of light, reveal in their united aspect, though in apparently divided, and

oft opposing factions, the Satan of Christendom, the Offence unto Deity, for savouring not the things that be of God, but those that be of men; since it is entirely to their teaching and preaching the Platonic or Grecian philosophy, as amalgamated by their fathers—the fathers of the so-called Church—with Scripture doctrine, we owe the predominating influence of all the religious heresies of the age. We do not doubt their good intentions; we do not question their earnestness; we do not accuse them of selfishness, nor deny them credit for their philanthropy; but are their intentions better, their earnestness greater, their selfishness less, their motives nobler, than were those of Peter, who in his heart would have his Master save his life? What could have been more praiseworthy of him, than to seek his Master's safety? what more humane than to desire "Be it far from thee, Lord?" "Were his intentions not good, his heart not sincere, his assurance "this shall not be unto thee" mere words without feeling? And yet did this human sympathy and goodness of his avail in screening him from the rebuke and name he received for his pains, "Get thee behind me, SATAN, thou art an OFFENCE unto me. For thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men." And so it is with the Man of Sin; he too manifests zeal for the cause of Jesus; he too would draw the sword—and does it—for the honour of his master; and he too is wonderfully kind, and good, and true; his heart sincere. But his sincerity, love, and zeal are without knowledge, and there it is. They follow him as Peter had up to then done; they know him, but understand him not, and so, necessarily, stand in the then Peter's position.

the pre-existence of Jesus Christ is traceable to the Scriptures, but to the Platonic doctrine of the pre-existence of souls. We do not mean that it is founded on what moderns now believe concerning souls. We mean that its origin is of a more distant date, and hence must be considered *not* so particularly in relation with what *now* obtains concerning souls, but with what *did* obtain. The opinions that did obtain in Jesus' lifetime, both long before and after it, were these: 1st—That they are eternal and divine. 2nd—That they were created in a separate state of existence before their union with the body. Hence, in the combination of this teaching with Scripture, we are hereby informed that Jesus Christ, as existing now, existed also from all eternity, ere his body was formed in the womb. This was the original idea, and differs nothing from the current one, save in the premisses on which it is based. It

satisfied those, as it was natural to do, who believed the opinions which we have stated, but as it foiled ultimately to exalt Jesus Christ sufficiently in the estimation of some, above the level of man, there remained the necessity for modifying the ideas which then obtained concerning souls; and so it may have followed that the 3rd and 4th opinions were adopted, which, according to Gibbon (who believed in none of them) "are less sublime without being more intelligible." This modification makes a distinction between Jesus Christ and man that the two former opinions do not, and if this distinction is taken for granted, as the fact of Scripture, rather than the invention of philosophy, the assumed fact presents a very plausible proof in the current age, that as he was pre-existent, therefore he must be Deity. But, when we come to bring to bear on it the evidence of Scripture* against the immateriality and immor-

NOTE.—It will be useful here to present a summary of the most important evidence of Scripture against the immateriality and immortality of the soul. Nothing more clearly refutes it than the doctrine of the resurrection, and the argument of Jesus concerning it with the Sadducees.—(Matt. xxii, 21, 32.) "But, as touching the resurrection from the dead, have ye not read," &c., "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." Jesus said this only as touching the resurrection from the dead. He did not say it as touching anything else. The statement in its connection, does not prove immortality of the soul, but rather tacitly refutes it. It is only put to prove the resurrection which is so certain, that God is therefore Abraham's God in view of it. God is not done with Abraham yet; he will raise him again. Hence, in view of this, Abraham is *not*, and yet is. God calleth him alive though dead, *not* because he liveth as an immortal soul, but because He will raise him again; because "He quickeneth the dead," that is in the resurrection, and, therefore, now "calleth those things which be *not*," or not presently existing, "as though they were."—(Rom. iv, 17.) Abraham's life, therefore, is not destroyed, but simply suspended. It is hid with Christ in God, in view of the resurrection—Jesus Christ being the resurrection and the life, or He to whom the power of both is committed. But, if there is no resurrection, then his life has perished.—(1 Cor., xv, 18.) But, on the other hand, if Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are now living, if they are living according to the Platonic idea as immaterial spirits, the words of Jesus Christ—had He not put them to the purpose he uses them for—the words "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living," would have been appropriate enough to prove it. But what happens? They cannot prove both the resurrection from the dead and the immortality of the soul. If they prove the one, they disprove the other; and hence, Jesus' use of them to prove the resurrection, is as clear a contradiction of the immortality of the soul as could be wished for. If "God is not the God of the dead but of the living," is to be taken

as a proof that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob now live, it is of no use whatever as a proof that there will be a resurrection of them. There is no point in it; but when we take it to prove the resurrection, it is the most potent of all the arguments that has ever been used against the immortality of the soul, and the immateriality of spirits; and, coming from the mouth of Jesus, it is inestimable. What if the Sadducees had believed in the immortality of the soul—they did not, but if they had—others believed the one and not the other, and Swedenborgians do the same still. If they had, they would have laughed to scorn the argument of Jesus Christ for the resurrection, and turned away more obstinate than ever in their unbelief of a resurrection. "That argument," they would have said, *as is said now*, "is the one we base our belief upon that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob now live; what need then for a resurrection? They would have resisted the authority of Jesus Christ to alter their minds on the matter. But now it is different. The authority of Jesus Christ is in a certain sense recognized; and so the statement "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living," having reference, by his authority, only to the resurrection, should shut the mouths of all who profess to recognize his authority (while they, nevertheless, contradict him) from taking the same words to prove the immortality of the soul. "Man is an earthly being, and as a worm."—(1 Cor., xv, 47; Job xxv, 6.) "Dust he is, and unto dust shall he return."—(Gen. iii, 19.) "He dies and returns to the ground from whence he was taken." He was made a living soul, *not* an immortal soul. This living soul in sinning, therefore dies."—(Ezek. xviii, 4.) "The soul that sinneth it shall die." Hence, "Fear Him who is able to destroy both body and soul" (the life) 'in hell,' (or the grave).—(Matt. x, 28.) Both are here destroyed, the one not less literally than the other. Man can destroy the body only, and with it, necessarily, the life. But then, God can raise to life again; and so man's destruction of the body can go no further than this life. It cannot ut

tality of the soul, and recal the fact that at one time all men were considered to have had the like pre-existence, the distinction created is at once exposed, from either point of view, as the mere invention of modern times. This fact proves that at one time pre-existence was no proof of his being in this iota more than a man; it shews that this modern distinction did not then exist.* The Scriptures prove the doctrine of the pre-existence to be every way false; Gibbon proves its origin from the Grecian philosophy; hence, with the doctrine of the immateriality of the soul, as now believed, it is inseparably connected, let Trinitarians seek to base it on what of Scripture they will: they can only do so in

vain. For, as the doctrine of the personality, immateriality, and immortality of the soul presents the soul as a creature, pre-existent to, or distinct from the body: that man at his birth or conception is made to possess this soul, and that the soul thus possessed is man's proper self: it follows fairly enough, and quite logically, as consistent with the doctrine of the transmigration of souls here unmistakably indicated, whether believed or not, that "the most sublime and virtuous of human spirits was infused into the offspring of Mary and the Holy Ghost; that his abasement was the result of his voluntary choice," in his previous state of existence, "and that the son of a virgin, generated by the ineffable operation

the life beyond the power of God to restore it again; but God's destruction of both implies his intention of not quickening again the life he so destroys, unless it be to destroy a second time. Some, doubtless, will be raised again not to partake of everlasting life, but of everlasting destruction. These will be raised to a second death, which amounts to much the same thing as destruction now; their eternal destruction being as inevitable as the eternal destruction of those not to be raised is complete. In these circumstances, the soul or life of man at death is either destroyed or suspended. It is destroyed if there is no resurrection to eternal life; it is suspended if there is. But in the condition of both before the resurrection, there is no distinction in reality between the state of suspension and that of destruction. Both are in one unconscious, or rather non-existent state. It is but the resurrection which makes the distinction, in view of what will take place with the one class of persons and not with the other. They are both equally destroyed for the time being, only the one is temporarily destroyed, the other everlastingly destroyed; but in the temporary destruction the resurrection is so certain that it can scarcely be called destruction or death, and hence, suspension or sleep. Such was the meaning Jesus applied to it in the case of the maid when he was about to restore her

alive: "She is not dead but sleepeth;" and he was laughed to scorn for it, because she was indeed dead. Such also was the meaning he applied to it in the case of Lazarus, "our friend Lazarus sleepeth"—"*Houbert, Jesus spake of his death.*" And such also again is the meaning attached to it in the case of those who die in the hope of a blessed resurrection, "they fall asleep in Jesus."—(Acts vi, 50; 1 Cor. xv, 6, 18; 1 Thes., iv, 13, 15; 2 Pet., iii, 4.) They die natural bodies, and rise again the same, to be changed into spiritual bodies, not less material, however, than the other, but of heavenly material as contrasted with earthly material. As they bore the image of the earth, so shall they bear the image of the heavenly. The first man, Adam, was made a living soul—earthly; the last Adam, a quickening spirit—heavenly. The last Adam bore the image of the earthly; he now bears the image of the heavenly. So likewise his brethren; as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly, but, nevertheless, as material as ever, Jesus Christ being the example. He is a spirit, but not a bodiless one; and so shall they be spirits likewise. He was sown, or dying, died a natural body; he was raised and made a spiritual body. He was sown in corruption, dishonour, and weakness, and raised to take on incorruption, glory, and power.—(1 Cor., xv, 49 to the end.)

* Note.—Gibbon writes: "In the age of religious freedom, which was determined" (brought to an end) "by the Council of Nice (A.D. 325) the dignity of Christ was measured by private judgment, according to the indefinite rule of Scripture, or reason, or tradition. But when his pure or proper divinity was established, on the ruins of Arianism, the faith of the Catholics trembled on the edge of a precipice, where it was impossible to recede, dangerous to stand, dreadful to fall; and the manifold inconveniences of their creed were aggravated by the sublime character of their theology. They hesitated to pronounce that God himself, the second person of an equal consubstantial Trinity was manifested in the flesh; that a being who pervades the universe had been confined in the womb of Mary; that His eternal duration had been marked by the days, and months, and years of human existence; that the Almighty had been scourged and crucified; that His impassible essence had felt pain and anguish; that His

omniscience was not exempt from ignorance; and that the source of life and immortality expired on Mount Calvary. These alarming consequences were affirmed with unblushing simplicity by Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea, and one of the luminaries of the church. The son of a learned grammarian, he was skilled in all the sciences of Greece; eloquence, erudition, and philosophy, conspicuous in the volumes of Apollinaris, were humbly devoted to the service of religion." Let the reader mark the character Gibbon gives of this profound doctor, and see the parallel in the characters of the Doctors of Divinity of these days. They too are skilled in the sciences of Greece: they too devote their eloquence, erudition, and philosophy to the service of religion. And sure enough it is to this alone we owe all the religious heresies of the age. Out from the amalgamation of Grecian philosophy with Scripture doctrine springs the Man of Sin, the Satan that savours not the things that be of God, but those that be of men.

of the Holy Spirit was a creature without example or resemblance, superior in every attribute of mind and body to the children of Adam"—his flesh immaculate, his Spirit, the Deity Himself; ordinary man's spirit being a particle of the divine essence (according to the current heresy), *his*, the whole of it, or third part. Jesus Christ in this way was made a pre-eminent example, and an historical illustration of the ideas once entertained concerning the pre-existence of souls; but now it is otherwise, and we submit with Gibbon, "less sublime." According to the present belief, the doctrine of the pre-existence of souls is not permitted or entertained. Man's soul is now alleged to begin life with conception or birth, and hence, in alleging pre-existence only of Jesus Christ, it is made to stand out as a new and conspicuous proof of his being Deity! A pretty proof! How came it not to stand on Scripture before? Well did Solomon say "God made man upright, but he has sought out many inventions."

It follows from this then, that the pre-existence of Jesus Christ, as founded on the doctrine of the pre-existence of souls, is quite a different thing from the same, looked at from the modern belief

concerning souls. With the former, Jesus Christ in this particular is placed on the same level with man: but now, it is only believed of Jesus Christ, and repudiated as regards man. Man, in the early stages of the doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ, was considered a being who had pre-existence as much as Jesus Christ had, but now while the pre-existence of all men is rejected, that of Jesus Christ is retained. And so we must not forget this fact, that had the doctrine of the pre-existence of souls never been entertained, the doctrine of the pre-existence of Jesus Christ would never have been fabricated. And as pre-existence now, can be as legitimately affirmed of all men as before, and as of Jesus Christ, the rejection of it in the one case as well as in the other, can alone be justified by Scripture; but as this cannot be done. we will, in the consideration of our subject, affirm that what is proved of man in this matter is proved of him, and so in the first place trace his history from birth, and prove him a man, though the Son of Deity, and next show on what base we are to understand those passages in Scripture which seem to affirm *his* pre-existence.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE AMBASSADOR SUPPLEMENT, DOWIEISM, AND OUR CORRESPONDENTS.

We make the following extracts from letters received, in reference to the subject-matter of the *Supplement* we issued with the December number. The extracts are arranged in the alphabetical order of the names of the writers.

W. BIRKENHEAD, late of Rochester, New York, U.S.—"I for one am very glad that you appended the *Supplement* to last month's number of the *Ambassador*, thereby giving us such an insight into the condition of the spiritual standing of the Dowieites. I was completely astounded and deeply pained (on reading the report of the discussion) at the manner in which George Dowie endeavoured to evade the questions, which he ought to have answered candidly and cheerfully. Little did I think that the editor of the *Messenger of the Churches* stood in such a terrible condition, in relation to the great first principles of the truth. Does the Ruler of all the

earth, in the coming age, want men whose position, with regard to the truth of the gospel, is so flexible as to admit doctrines directly antagonistic to the emphatic word, whose resolutions are so loose and wavering, that they are settled on no point? I say, does the great King want such men to form his cabinet, and to place in responsible situations? Nay, verily; those who are to be kings and priests, must be firm; they must be bold in defence of the Word of Truth, and not be afraid of shewing their colours. They must not be afraid to speak what they believe on Scripture topics. It shews a lack of confidence when a man is afraid to tell what he believes. And is not a lack of confidence sufficient to betray a lack of faith? "He that wavereth is like a wave of the sea, driven of the wind and tossed." This is a bad condition to be found in at the appearing of our Lord and Master. I think it is well that the false position of some who claimed to be members of the Anointed Body has been so fully exposed. I hope

they will be led to see and understand the unsoundness of their understanding; and that they will resolve to build upon the rock instead of the sand."

T. BISSETT and OTHERS, London.—"The report of a discussion among the professors of the truth, meeting at Union Hall, 98, South Bridge, Edinburgh, published as a *Supplement* to the Dec. *Ambassador*, so clearly indicates their anomalous position in relation to the truth, that we cannot define their condition in fewer words than that there appears little or no truth in them. Happily for many who have and might be beguiled by their sophistry, they are now, to a certain extent, divested of the garb of deceit; henceforth to appear in their true colours; and from these disclosures we consider that silence on the part of *our* or *any* ecclesia might be construed into a fraternal feeling of sympathy, for and by the self-exposed and would-be professors of the gospel; and in the event of any of them appearing in our midst, we desire it to be clearly understood that we disclaim all connection with them, and any who recognize them as brethren in the Christ. Deeming this sufficient to prove our appreciation and love of the truth, embodied in a right conception of the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus the Christ,

We remain, dear brother,

Yours affectionately,

In the hope of that profession,

(Signed)

THOMAS BISSETT, JOHN GREENWOOD, ANDREW MASON, J. J. ANDREW.	}	for selves and Ecclesia.
--	---	--------------------------------

S. DIXON, Leeds.—"In looking over your tour in Scotland, I see you have had a meeting with G. Dowie and his followers—for I cannot call them followers of Jesus the Christ. I really am surprised how any man believing the gospel of the kingdom, and the things of the name of Jesus the Christ, can be undecided about the mortality or immortality of the soul. I am satisfied in my own mind that it is impossible for any man to understand the realities of the gospel, and hold that he has something within him that will not be unconscious even in death. I believe this to be a strong delusion, that has made all nations and peoples drunk, and unless they get sober and get it out of them, this wine of fornication, they will never see the truth."

J. DONALDSON, Detroit, Michigan, U.S.—"The *Ambassador* for December is just received, and a most welcome number I assure you it is. The *Supplement* is highly prized; it will place Dowie where he should be placed. What do such people want in fellowship with us? You have the thanks

of many; yea, all the true and faithful, for your dogged pertinacity in putting these men to the true test."

W. ELLIS, Edinburgh.—"I am glad you have published the unsettled discussion of the professed friends of the truth in Union Hall. It will do good service in helping to shear off the wool. They have yet to learn the Apostolic exhortation to "Prove all things, and hold fast what is good." I think your description of the meeting with the Philistines wonderfully correct—stript of the noisy and abusive clamour of the various Delilahs, who argued in their own peculiar way. Your remarks must have a healthful tendency wherever they reach. Our watchword must be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, without tradition or dilution."

J. GRANT, Carrbridge.—"I believe you have done us a good turn in taking the cloak off Dowie and his followers. It must be evident to all right-minded Israelites that they are playing a double game. They are either ignorant of the truth, or trying to serve *two* masters, a course we all ought to shun if we expect anything in the day of Christ."

T. HAINING, Auchinlech.—"I beg to enclose you P.O. order for the sum of five shillings, as a little assistance toward defraying the expenses incurred in publishing the very strange discussion which took place among the people in Edinburgh. Professing to be wise, which if ever they were, the discussion has now brought out, in a manner unmistakable, that they have again become fools. I see it would be hoping against hope to expect "betterness." Nevertheless, we would expect that if there is among them any honest-hearted, that they will now be able to see their way, and separate themselves."

W. D. JARDINE, Dublin.—"I got the *Ambassador*; it appears full of interesting and really useful matter. I haven't devoured it this time, but I have eaten it, nevertheless, with the voracious appetite with which I generally fall to the reading of it. I see it all clearly enough, and have to say you have done *great* service to the church, in reporting your doings in Edinburgh, and in publishing the *Supplement*. Why, both are a storm—a gale—just the thing needed to purify that atmosphere, and clear the infectious vapours away. The exposure you have made will give to the indifferent some reason for being different, and tend to impart such a view as will enable them to see distinctly which way to turn. The best fruits of your mission to Scotland will appear more among those at a distance, than amongst those whom the battle took place. You have done well indeed, and that thoroughly. May the Lord give you strength to accom-

plish more. The publishing of the *Supplement* demands to be paid for. Intrinsically the thing itself is worth nothing. It served no end, and began with no beginning. Its end and beginning are of the same character. Just an evaporation from the green damp soil, and then an absorption back again, but the publication is worth paying for."

T. KIDD, Dundee.—"The firm way you have advocated the truth against those men in Edinburgh, Dundee, and elsewhere, deserves our thanks. It is shameful to see the equivocating insincerity that is manifested by G. Dowie and party on the very fundamentals of the faith."

J. McMILLAN, Rochester, New York, U.S. (to Brother Bingley, at present visiting in Birmingham).—* * * "Dowieism, as it is called, we did not know, but, supposing all was right (and to know) I sent for two copies of the *Messenger*, and have now become satisfied they stultify the truth, * * *"

P.S.—Just as I was about to seal up this letter, the postman came in with your valuable gift, the *Ambassador*. My eye caught the *Supplement*; I sat down and read every word. O brother, I thank you and the Editor for this. I am glad I had said "Stop the *Messenger*;" I have no fellowship with it or the Dowieites. I see in this discussion more than enough; you and I have never so learned Christ. I repudiate *in toto* such wilful ignorance and sophistry as I see in their deliberations. What have we to do with them, or any individual that tolerates them? Truth demands this. George Dowie wrote me in 1865 a very good letter, but a very careful one. I answered him, believing all right. I will now write my mind in full. I see his secretiveness of the serpent. Oh, how truth suffers in the hands of its professed friends. I fear more developments, both in this country and other places. Let them come, those who do know the Lord, let them be valiant for the truth at every sacrifice. Please thank our brother Roberts."

[We are glad to perceive from the foregoing that the ecclesia of Rochester, N.Y., are of a more faithful stamp than we had occasion to surmise about fourteen months ago, when giving our reasons for refusing to publish a letter emanating from them to certain in this country. We are sorry we should for a moment have cast a cloud upon their profession. Our attitude on the occasion was owing to the Rochester friendship for the Dowieites; which, if based upon knowledge, was a sufficient condemnation

of those in Rochester entertaining it. It now appears that it was based upon ignorance of the Dowieite position, and that friendship, in the sense of recognition and fellowship, has dissolved before the light thrown on the position of the Dowieites in their own published words.—EDITOR.]

J. MULLHOLLAND, Glasgow.—"You are earnestly contending for the truth. I rejoice to hear of the manner in which you are exposing the religious jugglers in Edinburgh, and I will contribute my mite as soon as possible to assist in defraying the expenses. I hope you will be long spared to be the instrument in God's hands of bringing sinners to repentance, and also to witness against the perverters of the truth."

J. NESBIT, Berwick.—"Your opponents (among them George Dowie), are men of worldly wisdom and might. It is long since I saw through his cunning way of expressing himself."

R. PATERSON, Edinburgh.—"Your *Ambassador* has given general satisfaction among ourselves. I think you have given a very fair report, all things considered, of the meeting in Beaumont Place. I have no doubt, however, that the *union-ists* of Union Hall will find much to quibble at. W. Norrie's report of the discussion you publish in a supplement, conveys to the mind a shocking picture. It is worse than I expected, I think that a great crisis in our position has come to pass, we should not allow it to drop quietly; but sound the warning note of the certain trumpet of the truth in every place where dwell those who have named the name of Jesus, so that these cankerous principles may not stealthily enter and corrupt and eat out the living purity of the scattered remnant of God's people."

JAMES ROBERTSON, Turrif.—"We are interested in your efforts for the truth. A collection among us was made, which I forward, aiding you in defraying the expenses of the publication of the Discussion that took place in Edinburgh, the publication of which has given us at a distance a peep into what was behind the scene, and thus given us an opportunity of ranging ourselves on the side of the truth."

Z.—"I am always pleased with the *Ambassador*, but this time I have been unusually so. The supplement is the special source of gratification. How grandly it confirms my private measure of Messrs. Dowie and Cameron, held now for some years, and for the mild expression of which sometimes in my former connections, I brought down hail and fire upon my pate from the heavens of Dowieism. "Marmalade, singing, and praying," I told brother Tait some

years ago at his house, seemed to me to be the chief delight of that tribe; what might be termed ecclesiastical socialism. Well, there is no reason to say I was not right, but the expression then seemed to some who now see differently, uncharitable. In a certain sense the truth, and therefore its adherents, are very much so.

I wish I had been with you at Mr. Dowie's to help to fire an occasional volley into the enemy, who seem to have been bent on anything but fair fighting. Craft and cowardice are their true insignia. The annotations are daggers into them. In reading them I insensibly kept ejaculating—Good! Hurrah! Go on! That's it! and so on. There is neither time nor space here to go into detail."

Your correspondent "R.P." is of the right stamp. May the Lord help all such Jonathans. You see, now, that the let-them-alone policy is not the thing. A man may often feel strongly inclined for that, but it won't do while we are in the field. We should not be "valiant for the truth," nor "good soldiers of Jesus Christ." Fall on! No quarter! "In this manner they *must* be killed!" It is a "good fight," then fight the good fight of faith, by which alone we "lay hold of eternal life." Now the saints are commissioned to "hew," to "slay," and so forth, "by the prophets," and so to put to silence the ignorance of "foolish men," who pretend to be working with so much tenderness and filial regard to the flock of God. What unspeakable conceit! for the fact is they do not, with all their cleverness and versatility, understand the A B C of the truth, as that conversation amply testifies. "I decline to answer," time after time this self-made shepherd coolly replies, when it is patent to all who do know the truth that had he, the shepherd aforesaid, been "of the truth," he would have rejoiced to have opportunity before all to identify himself with

the faith. The "agreement" come to is another incontestable proof of their determination to stick in the mud while ever they can. Let no man be deceived by the said "agreement," but let him look forthwith to the terms thereof, and I venture to affirm he will conclude that the word is decidedly elliptical. To harmonize with the contest, or "discussion," it must be written **DISAGREEMENT**. Mr. Dowie agreed to go on as he always had, and Norrie, Wilson and others agreed to disagree with the continuance of such going on. But what is Mr. Norrie doing? that puzzles me. He appeared hearty in the good cause, but the conclusion shew this, so far at least, to be an appearance. He knows what has been done, and what they intend to go on doing; and he knows also that those things are unwarranted—nay, condemned outright by the truth—and yet he sticks there. What a strange proceeding this seems. There was a point in the discussion—which, as it is, "settles nothing"—when boldness on his part would have divided the wheat from the chaff. Dowie would have been upset, and a good start made. In common parlance, Mr. Dowie "smelt a rat," and put Norrie off the scent, by boldly confronting him. As though he had said, "Well, and what then, if we are found guilty of fellowshiping and baptizing immortal soulists?" This was the point to have taken advantage of. What is the good of a man vehemently shouting his "reprobation" of certain characters, while he is entering into an "agreement" to remain with things in the "as you were" position? The prophets did not do so; the Apostles did not do so; neither do any of their school. If any man love father, or mother, &c., more than me, he is not *worthy* of me;" and that "ME" is the author of incorruptible life."

TOUR IN SCOTLAND.

(Concluded from page 7 of the last number.)

FROM Edinburgh, we journeyed by sea to Aberdeen, where, after a somewhat tempestuous passage in the *Prince Consort*, paddle steamship, we arrived safely. Here there is an ecclesia numbering sixty souls. This is a large community to be possessed of the truth, and ought to make its influence felt in the town where it exists. This it would be sure to do, if every member of it possessed the same earnestness and enterprise in relation to the truth which they realize toward the concerns of ordinary life. It would not appear that in this instance, this is the case. With a few excep-

tions, the brethren and sisters generally do not appear to have caught up the Nazarene fire: they take the matter altogether too coolly. They do not yet seem to have been entirely emancipated from the old chilly orthodox notion, that religion is an affair of dressing decently on Sunday, and putting "a ha'penny" on the plate, and attending to business and "the family" all the rest of the time. They seem not to have realized the idea of being Christ's zealous partizans, Christ's stewards, Christ's servants, Christ's witnesses, instant in season, out of season, labouring diligently with reference to

the promised inheritance, fighting the good fight of faith, holding forth the word of life, testifying to all whether they will hear or forbear, that God commandeth men to repent, because he has appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness. Of course, business must be attended to, and the family must be provided for and made comfortable; this is the first duty; for "Whoso provideth not for his own, and especially they of his own house, hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel." But this can be done in two ways. Man may do it with the instincts of the natural man, who knows no higher good or supream obligation than the provision of "this world's good." In this he sows to the flesh. On the other hand, a man may do it as a son of God, from the motive of duty, and with a keen sense of his obligations to the cause of Christ in every form in which it may present itself to him, whether in the need of a brother, the call of the truth, or the supremacy of Christ's commandments. Such a man's daily labour is consecrated; it is sown to the spirit, even if outwardly it lie in the same channel of occupation as his fleshly neighbour. Such a man will be industrious and diligent, but will never let family or business come between him and Christ's more immediate claims upon him. He knows too well that Christ demands the first, and the best, and the highest service.—That if any man prefer the whole circle of his fleshly relations and property of any description to him, Christ esteems him unworthy. It is always possible to know the man who "in these things serves his Lord Christ." There are some of these in Aberdeen, but their whole number seems inadequate to give energy to the body, which is more sluggish than Christ's servants ought to be. However, while there is life there is hope. Some reaction may quicken the circulation, restore action to the heart, invigorate the general frame, and qualify the ecclesia, as Christ's strong man, to bear his name before the somewhat narrow-minded, cold-souled, shrewd, and calculating Aberdonians, from whose ranks it may be God intends, by their means, to gather a further harvest of sons and daughters, before the times of the Gentiles fairly close.

In the matter of testifying the truth on the occasion in question, they "did what they could." The Editor could only spend a Saturday and Sunday in the town, and for that short time, they arranged for the delivery of four lectures in a large room in connection with the Music Hall capable of accommodating 600 people. The first lecture (Saturday night), was attended by about 60 or 70 persons; the second (Sunday morning), by about 150; the third (Sunday afternoon), by about 250; and the fourth (Sunday evening), by an audience which filled the place. The

attention was marked on all occasions, but whether anything resulted beyond a testimony on behalf of the ecclesia, and a confirmation of the faith of the brethren, it is of course as yet, impossible to say. In this matter, it often happens that bread cast on the waters reappears in unexpected times and places. May it be so in this case for the comforting, strengthening and invigorating of the ecclesia which only wants a little extra fire to rekindle anew. There is fuel, but a lack of healthy combustion. The fire sulks. The poker and the bellows are needed. May they be found and successfully applied in due time! That every man and woman in the ecclesia may become brightly incandescent in their ardour in the great cause in the service of which they have enlisted.

Early on Monday morning, we booked at the railway station for Beith, a small country town about a hundred miles to the south west in a straight line, and over twenty miles from Glasgow. Here, there is a rustic population of about five thousand people, who are mainly under the dominion of that sour-visaged, red-nosed, and bigoted section of the apostacy know as Presbyterianism. This is not a likely soil for the germination of the truth. There are, doubtless, qualities in the old Puritan character that are valuable adjuncts to a profession of the truth, and indeed indispensable to a successful "walk and conversation therein." These, however, in most cases are imbedded in such a flinty stratum of prejudice and ignorant zealotry that it is impossible to excavate them for the ornament of the king's household. It is saddening to see so much good purpose squandered in wild-goose enterprise. If all the energy and money that are expended in chasing the shadows of orthodoxy were concentrated on the work of studying and propagating "the principles of the oracles of the Deity," as revealed in the Bible, what results might not be developed to the praise and to the honour of Jehovah, and the liberation of many a benighted intellect now groaning in a spiritual bondage, from which they see no escape, but by plunging into the dark waters of atheism. But this is not, and cannot be. There is no interference on the part of the Deity with the free agency of his intelligent creatures. His purpose is to bring the free agency in as many cases as possible into *voluntary subordination* to his mind and will, and thereby to secure the double results of the highest good to the creature, and the highest glory to the Creator. This purpose narrows down the triumph of the truth to a very small compass, and involves the existence of a class who, with the most laudable motive, will pursue their own misguided ways, and spend money and enthusiasm on that which is not bread. We can only pity them and do the best we can to show them "a more excellent way." If we fail, no demerit attaches to us. We can only

do our duty and abide the result. We can only sow the seed, leaving it to the providence of God whether it will find its way into good soil, or lie barren on the hard surface of unimpressible hearts, to be quickly picked away by the myriads of evil birds that infect the air of the present order of things. "Paul may plant, and Appollos water, but God giveth the increase." Recognising this, Brother Gillies, who found the truth in a very incidental way not many years ago, has addressed himself to the work of doing what he can to impart it to others. Though there are but two in Beith in the faith besides himself, he has been courageous enough to engage a room for public exposition of the word every first day of the week. This is the "lodge" of the "masons," a body of men held together throughout the world by the ties of the flesh in their highest degree of development, under the specious guise of virtue, goodwill, and glory of God. This is not exactly the place Christadelphians would prefer as a matter of course for the head quarters of the truth in their own particular locality, but the truth has little choice in such matters at present, and is often obliged to put up with disagreeables. To put up with these is better than quitting the field, or hiding the light under the bushel of a dwelling-house, when a more prominent if less agreeable place can be had. Brother Gillies has acted in this spirit, and gives the little public of Beith an opportunity every Sunday of hearing the glad-tidings contained in "the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus anointed." His efforts are not rewarded with a great amount of appreciation or public patronage. This is never to be expected. A man must make up his mind for up-hill work all the way. Dogged perseverance in the *discharge of duty* is the great virtue to be cultivated; this relies not upon accessory circumstances for stimulus, but works against wind and tide, having in view the "great recompence of reward." Brother Gillie's audiences are small—infinitesimally so. He is occasionally encouraged by the company of brethren who reside in adjacent parts; but on the whole, his position is that of Lot and Noah,—a steady, untiring attitude of testimony and faithfulness. May he be found in this way to the end! and God grant that he may be rewarded meanwhile by the accession of a few, at any rate, who shall join with him, to the comfort of his heart and strengthening of his hand, in the faithful service which, tho' rendered in weakness, tears, and darkness, will have a glorious end when the sun of righteousness breaks through the blackness of the heavens now over our heads, and fills the earth with resplendent glory.

The Editor, by arrangement, delivered three lectures. The room was full each time, and some interest seemed to be taken in the

matters set forth. More than this cannot be said.

From Beith the Editor went to Galashiels. In doing so, he had to pass through Glasgow. Here, under favourable circumstances, he would have made a stay for the truth's sake; but this was rendered impossible by the state of things obtaining among those who profess the truth in that city. Chaos reigns. This is attributable to two causes—first, a superficial apprehension of the truth on the part of many professing it, admitting of the admixture of divers elements of the apostacy. This breeds fermentation and disunion. Those in any part of the world who are disposed to be faithful can never finally adapt themselves to the treacherous laxity that finds favour among such a class, and the consequence is that union is ultimately impossible. Attempts at compromise between two such elements are sure to end in failure. This result is inevitable and proper. Good and evil, light and darkness, truth and error should not live in concord. They should divide, and they will do it where the two are brought into contact. This is the result exemplified in Glasgow, on the supposition that there are some faithful men there, and surely there are some! Division has become chronic. This rather favours the supposition than otherwise, that there are some who love the truth and desire to be faithful to it in all things. It does not amount to proof, since there are other causes of division which may operate in Glasgow as elsewhere, and of which, we have heard say, they are not unknown there. Yet it admits of the charitable supposition, that out of the sixty or eighty persons, in and about Glasgow, professing the truth, but assembling Sunday after Sunday in four or five hostile bodies, there are some whose minds are enlightened, and whose hearts are captivated by the great things which are spoken of Israel's King. If there are such, let them come out from all corrupters, and constitute themselves a distinct and well-knit body, on the clearly-defined basis of "the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ." Let there be no compromise with error. Let the truth without adulteration be the standard. To this, let those who take their stand upon it, devote their best purpose and affections; let it be their hobby; let them hold aloft the banner; let them "do what they can" for the great cause entrusted to their hands, in the providence of God. If they thus purify and re-arrange the household, they will remove the great obstruction that now lies in the way of the truth's progress in their city, and give joy to the brethren everywhere, who at present can only think of Glasgow as a blank, but who then would descry from afar the electric ray of the Spirit's light, shining out upon the surrounding darkness, inviting the passing pilgrim to a friendly shelter,

and guiding the stranger into the paths of peace.

In Galashiels, there is a small but apparently efficient ecclesia of seven persons. A comparatively short time ago, a light had not been struck in this part, but now the candle is lit, and shines with steady flame. There is another company of Christadelphians, not many miles off, at a place called Innerleithen. Between the two there is frequent intercourse of a happy and profitable character. The best feature among them is a warm interest in the truth, and everything relating to it. It is refreshing to see such an exhibition. When the truth is loved for its own sake, steadfastness in all its good fruits will result as a necessary consequence. It is when objects of a secondary character are pursued in connection with the truth that evil comes. There always will be those who aim at inferior ends—people who do not realize God and the future sufficiently to forego present profit and fame for the truth's sake; who are not sufficiently in love with it to make sacrifices in its behalf; who are not sufficiently animated by its spirit to serve it disinterestedly and with humility. There are some who will even make it an instrument of personal objects. Such cause shame and trouble. Such in the end defile many. Such are to be avoided. The small company who rejoice in the truth in the neighbourhood of Galashiels appear at present happily, free of all such disturbing influences. They are united in the knowledge, love, and service of the truth, which has made them free and happy. May they long continue so. One thing they lack, so far as Galashiels is concerned, and that is efficient organization for manifesting the light to outer darkness. They meet in a private dwelling-house. This is a hindrance both to brethren and strangers; the former are most at liberty on neutral ground; the latter cannot possibly be attracted within even the sound of the truth, if they have to go over a domestic threshold to hear it. In some cases, this disadvantage has to be patiently endured, for want of the possibility of doing better; but, in this case, we were given to understand a different state of things might exist, were it

not for a good brother, whose lack of hopefulness and confidence in the ability of the brethren to sustain themselves in a public way, deters him agreeing to a more enterprising policy. This is to be regretted; for if better things are never attempted, better things will never be done. Men should always do what they can. A number of men united in the truth would do better in having an open door for the truth, if their efforts were ever so feeble, than in concealing themselves and the gospel within the precincts of a private house. In the former case, there is some slight connection between the ecclesia and the great world in which they are called upon to labour; some slight opportunity for the good and honest-hearted to "turn in" to wisdom's prepared feast; while, in the other case, they deprive the community of the most ordinary facilities, and shut themselves up in isolation and secrecy. Sometimes this has to be borne with and made the best of; but where better is possible, better ought to be done.

The Editor lectured five times in the Corn Exchange, and the audiences were considerable, rarely amounting to one hundred people, except on Sunday night, when the number present would be about two hundred. There does not appear to be much intelligence or interest in higher things among the Galashiels people, who number in all about eight thousand. They are principally composed of English workpeople, attracted from the woollen districts of England, by the development of the woollen manufacture in Galashiels. This may account for the low state of intelligence prevailing, for it is a fact beyond dispute that among Scotch workpeople, there is a higher average degree of education and intellectual capacity, than among the corresponding class in England, who have largely imported themselves into the districts in the south of Scotland. At any rate, little impression seemed to be made.

From Galashiels, the Editor journeyed to Edinburgh, whence, after spending a few hours with some of the brethren, he returned to Birmingham, having been absent about three weeks.

"HOW READEST THOU?"

A WORD ON INTERPRETING BIBLICAL FIGURES OF SPEECH.

WIND.—This figure is frequently employed to represent words, persons, and influences; and cannot, any more than those already considered, be uniformly received in its literal sense. "How long shall the words of thy mouth be like a stormy wind?"—(Job viii, 2.) "The speeches of one

that is desperate, which are as wind."—(Job vi, 26.) The words of Jehovah, by the prophets, concerning the nations, will one day take the form of wind, "destroying wind," to "fan and to cleanse," and to suppress into forgetfulness "the refuge of lies." Words may be "only wind,"

but they are not altogether harmless on that account, and this, the nations, who have thus treated the words of the Lord of Hosts will certainly experience. "Even a full *wind* from those places shall come unto me. * * * Behold *he* shall come up, * * * and his chariot shall be as a *whirlwind*."—(Jer. iv, 12, 13.) "The prophets shall become *wind*." This is the condition of those who "have not the word in them."—(Jer. v, 13.) When the word dwells with power, the possession is not light and windy.

Wind, in the following texts seems very plainly to stand for "influences." "*Terrors* pursue my soul as the *wind*."—(Job xxx, 15.) "And there came out two women, and the *wind* was in their wings." This was the influence which carried these symbolic women of Israel into the symbolic Shinar.—(Zec. v, 11.) Wind has brought kingdoms into existence, and it is wind that will take them out of it. "I saw, and behold the four *winds* of heaven shone upon the great sea, and four great beasts (kingdoms, verse 17) came up from the sea." And, concerning the same, Daniel says, "and the *Wind* carried them away."—(Dan. ii, 35.) These influences are loosed or bound according to the work to be accomplished; hence the phrase, "holding the four winds of the earth, that the *wind* should not blow on the earth, nor on the sea, nor on any tree." The reason of the "holding" or restraining of "the wind" was, that the time had not arrived to "hurt" those things indicated by "the earth, the sea, and any tree." So it may be plainly seen, that in a figurative or spiritual sense, Jehovah can "bring the wind out of his treasuries," to cause the destruction of His enemies.

Let us now take another figure, MOUNTAINS.—We take it in the singular or plural, as it may present itself in the word. In pronouncing judgment upon Babylon, the prophet says, "Behold, I am against thee, O, destroying mountain, * * * and will make thee a burnt *mountain*."—(Jer. li, 25.) In the "burden of Babylon" Isaiah also says, "lift ye up the banner on the high *mountain*."—(Isaiah xliii, 2.) And again, the destruction of the last Babylon by the antitype of Cyrus, is predicted by Zechariah in the same style, "Who art thou, O, great *mountain*? before Zerubabel thou shalt become a plain."—(Zech. iv, 7.) It can only be in this sense that the following testimony is to be understood, "every *mountain* and island were removed out of their places."—(Rev. vi, 14.) The

final overthrow of kingdoms is described by Isaiah as follows: "The day of the Lord of Hosts shall be upon all the *high mountains*, and upon all the *hills* that are lifted up."—(Rev. ii, 12, 14.) In this "day of Jehovah of armies," "the high mountains and hills" will be reduced to "chaff" by "threshing." The Jewish forces, led by their own commander, Jesus, will give the kings and their armies a "threshing" that will utterly subjugate them. The event is thus described in figurative terms: "Behold, I will make thee a new sharp threshing instrument, having teeth; thou shalt thresh the *mountains* (empires) and beat them small, and shalt make the hills (kingdoms) as chaff."—(Isaiah xli, 15.) This is in strict harmony with the prediction of Daniel concerning the fate of the Image-kingdoms. But Micah uses great plainness of speech, and says, "thou (Israel) shalt beat in pieces many *people*; and I will consecrate their gain unto the Lord, and their substance unto the Lord of the whole earth."—(Micah 4, 13.) Micah, however, does not always use the plain style; for instance, in chapter vi, 1, 2, "Hear ye now what the Lord saith; arise, contend thou with the *mountains*, and let the *hills* hear thy voice. Hear ye, O *mountains*, the Lord's controversy, and ye strong *foundations* of the earth; for the Lord hath a controversy with his people, and he will plead with Israel." When all the mountains or kingdoms are overthrown, "all the foundations of the earth will be out of place."

It appears plainly from various passages—some of which may be quoted—that a corresponding use is made of *rivers*; in fact, one may ask, why should not any object be used figuratively? Amongst other features which should mark the land of Israel in the latter times, the prophet Isaiah noticed that of spoliation by rivers. "A nation meted out and trodden down, whose *land the rivers* have spoiled."—(Isaiah xviii, 2.) Now, I am not aware that this statement can be literally applied to the land of Israel, and if it could, I should be still at a loss to perceive a proper connection between such a condition and the main subject of the prophecy. But, from a figurative point of view, there does appear something strikingly appropriate in the language. Everybody knows how that land has been spoiled—that it has been spoiled times many by overflowing armies. These are figuratively styled "rivers." "Now, therefore, behold,

the Lord bringeth upon them the *waters of the river*. * * * even the *king of Assyria*, and all his glory." The phrase, "the river," is mostly used in Scripture, I believe, with reference to the river Euphrates, and it seems to be so used in the text cited. It was the principal river in the Assyrian kingdom, and, therefore, fit to represent the strength of that kingdom. In the destruction of the Roman Babylon, we find the river Euphrates mentioned. It surely must be clear to every one at all acquainted with geography, that the drying up of the literal Euphrates could have no reasonable relation to the overthrow of the Eternal City. But here, again, looked at figuratively, the force of the word is immediately seen. The geographical Euphrates lies within the limits of the Power to be dried up, and in its relation to Babylon is the distinctive feature. In the divine programme, the evaporation of the Ottoman waters is just as necessary to the sack and destruction of the City of the Seven Hills—Babylon the Great, (Rev. 17, 9, 5,) as was the diversion of old Euphrates' stream to the overthrow of the Chaldean capital

"The gathering together of the waters called he seas." It is not pretended that this passage was to be figuratively understood, but it must be allowed from what has presented itself concerning rivers, that such language may be so used. Seas stand for the largest assemblages of peoples, in fact, for nations, and is a fit term to represent peoples in attitudes in which they could not be by other figures. "*The wicked are like the troubled sea*."—(Isaiah 57, 20.) The dirty condition of a troubled sea must figure the opposite state to that of a crystal sea. Hence in the Apocalypse, the sea of glass, or mirror-like sea, stands for a purified world. The beasts which Daniel saw "rise up from the sea," were forms of government developed, or cast up from the sea of nations by the agitation of its waters. In what other sense shall we attempt to read "upon the earth distress of *nations*, * * * the *sea*, and the *waves* roaring?" Is not the "roaring" produced by the "distress?" To these troubled and miry waters, Jehovah had issued the decree. "Woe to the multitude of many people, which make a noise like the noise of the *seas*; and to the rushing of nations, that make a rushing like the rushing of mighty waters! The nations shall rush like the rushing of many waters; but God shall rebuke them, and they shall

flee afar off, and shall be chased as the chaff of the mountains before the wind, and like a rolling thing before the whirlwind."—(Isaiah xvii, 12, 13.)

TREES are very largely used in a figurative sense in the Scriptures, old and new; and it would be no wonder if some of the most ingenious and rigid literalists should become entangled in the branches. For my part, I cannot imagine how such readers can possibly extricate themselves from the wood. Nothing can be clearer, or perhaps more beautiful, than the figurative use of trees in the sacred writings. They serve, in a most striking manner, to portray both the good and the wicked. The righteous are compared by David to a *tree* planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season; his *leaf* also shall not wither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper."—(Psalm i, 3.) A collection of such unfading, unwithering trees, would form a "*wood of life*," a "paradise of God."—(Rev. ii, 7.) "I am the vine" (*tree*,) said Jesus, "Ye," (my disciples) "are the *branches*."—(John xv, 4.) The wicked are likened unto trees ready to be felled. "The axe is laid to the root of the trees; every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire." This was John's denunciation against the corrupt trees of Jehovah's vineyard. In nature a mass of uncultivated trees is styled a forest. And this term is applied in Scripture to vast numbers of uncultivated men.—"And the rest of the trees of his *forest* shall be few." This text describes the fate which awaited the Assyrian army. A tree sometimes represents a kingdom. "I saw," says Nebuchadnezzar—but some cannot see it, or "*don't see it*," as the phrase goes—"and behold, a *tree* in the midst of the earth, and the height thereof was great." Then said Daniel, "the *tree* which thou sawest, * * * * it is thou, O king; thou art grown and become strong, * * * * and thy *dominion* reacheth unto the end of the earth." This great tree, then, stood for the king and the dominion of the king.—(Dan iv, 10, 20, 22.) "Behold, the Assyrian was a *cedar* (tree.) * * * * with fair *branches* * * * * his top was among the thick *boughs*. * * * * The *cedars* in the garden of God could not hide him, the *fir trees* were not like his *boughs*, and the *chestnut trees* were not like his branches, * * * * all the *trees of Eden* envied him."—(Ezek. xxxi, 3, 8,

9.) It is easy enough to see that the above trees were capable of "clapping their hands," when set in motion by delightful winds. Something might be said upon the birds that dwell in the branches, but time will not permit at present. They must be left to themselves and the reader.

Let us now come down from the trees, and pay a visit of enquiry to the flowers, grass, and such like. "As for man," says the Psalmist, "his days are as grass; as a flower of the field, so he flourisheth."—(Psalm ciii, 15.) "The field is the world," and mankind are the grass and flowers thereof." "Woe to the crown of pride, to the drunkards of Ephraim, whose glorious beauty is a fading flower."—(Isaiah xxviii, 1.) Could there be a more striking figure to express the foregoing characters? "The voice said Cry; and he said What shall I cry? *All flesh is grass*, and all the goodness thereof is as the *flower of the field*. The grass withereth, the flower fadeth, because the spirit of the Lord bloweth upon it; **SURELY THE PEOPLE IS GRASS.**"—(Isaiah xl, 6, 7.)

I shall now conclude this sketch of figures by a few quotations and remarks upon *metals*. The largest display of metals in the Scriptures is seen in Daniel's Image. Metals are there to represent kingdoms, and their comparative qualities. By the silver Nebuchadnezzar was made to understand that "after him there should arise another kingdom, *inferior* to his." It is but natural that the precious and lasting metals should stand for precious things, and *vice versa*. The reorganization of Israel is thus spoken of: "I will turn mine hand upon thee, and purely purge away all thy dross, and take away all thy *tin*." This smelting implies a mixture of the good and the base, and, to effect a separation, the process must be of the most searching kind. The altar of sacrifice and the altar of incense were of different metals—brass and gold, and seem clearly enough to prefigure different states or qualities in regard to "the body" typified, "which is of Christ."—(Col. ii, 17.) "Son of Man, the house of Israel is to me become dross; all they are *brass*, and *tin*, and *iron*, and *lead*, in the midst of the *furnace*."—(Ezek. xxii, 18.) Egypt was a furnace for melting purposes—"an *iron furnace*."—(Jer. xi, 4.) So will Jerusalem again be; for it is written, "whose fire is in Zion, and his *furnace* in Jerusalem."—(Isaiah xxxi, 9.) The vast mines from which the material is dug out

for the building of the city have yielded at the same time a great deal that is not suitable. The testing of the metals is very severe, and not a grain will be passed without it will bear the test. The choosing therefore, is not of a smooth and silvery nature, but, on the contrary, very afflictive or trying to the chooser. For thus it is written, "Behold, I have refined thee, but *not with silver*; I have chosen thee in the *furnace of affliction*."—(Isaiah xlvi, 10.) This is only saying figuratively—and certainly in a very beautiful way—"through much tribulation we must enter the kingdom." Every citizen is chosen in Egypt, or "the furnace of affliction," I mean everyone who shall become a citizen of the City of pure gold like unto *clear glass* (Rev. xxi, 18.) in which will be reflected perfectly the Great Increate.

"*How Readest Thou?*" is the result of a consideration of the following texts, which are given in one view, for the benefit of all who may be disposed to "search and see whether these things be so."

HEAVENS.—Dan. iv, 26; Luke xv, 21; Job xv, 15; Rev. xii, 1, 7, 8, 9, 14; Isaiah xiv, 12; Gen. xxviii, 17; Deut. xxxiii, 1, 26, 28; Psalms lxxvii, 24; Isaiah xlix, 13; Rev. xviii, 20; Jer. v, 8, 15; Ezek. xxxii, 7, 8; Dan. iv, 35; Dan. vii, 2, 13; Matt. xxiv, 30; xxvi, 64; Luke xv, 18, 21, 26; Rev. vi, 13, 14; xi, 6, 12, 19; xvi, 17, 21; xx, 9, 21; i, 10; Luke x, 18; Isaiah xxxiv, 4, 5; Dan. viii, 10; Matt. v, 12; vi, 20, 19, 21; Philip ii, 10; Rev. iv, 1, 2, viii, 1; xv, 1, 5; xix, 14; Isaiah xiii, 10, 13; Job xiv, 12; Psalm viii, 3; xix, 1, 1, 6; Isaiah li, 6, 16; lxvi, 17, 22; Jer. ii, 12; Joel ii, 10, 30; iii, 16; Zec. vi, 5; 2 Pet. ii, 3, 5, 7, 10, 12; Psalm lxxxix, 2; Isaiah v, 30; Heb. ix, 23.

EARTH.—Gen. vi, 11, 12, 13; xi, 1; Psalm xcvi, 1; Deut. xxxii, 1; 1 Chron. xvi, 31, 33; Psalm xcvi, 11; xcvii, 1; Prov. xxx, 21; Isaiah xxiv, 20; xlv, 22; xlix, 13; li, 6; Micah vi, 2; Rev. xi, 6; Psalm lxvi, 1; Isaiah x, 14; Hab. ii, 20; Zec. i, 11; Rev. vi, 4; xiv, 3; Job. xxxiii, 24; Rev. vi, 13; xii, 4, 13.

CLOUDS.—Isaiah xix, 1; Ezek. xxxviii, 31; Luke xxi, 27; Rev. x, 1, 11, 12; xiv, 14; Heb. xii, 1; Prov. xxv, 14; Isaiah xiv, 14; Jer. iv, 13; Dan. vii, 13; Matt. xxiv, 30; 1 Thess. iv, 17; Jude 12; Rev. i, 7.

RAIN.—Deut. xxxii, 2; Job xxix, 23; Psalm lxxii, 6. **WIND.**—Job viii, 2;

xxx. 15; Prov. xxv. 14; Dan. ii, 25; Zec. v. 9; Rev. vii. 1.

MOUNTAINS.—Isaiah xl, 4; li, 25; Dan. ii, 35; Zec. iv, 7; Isaiah ii. 14; xli, 15; Micah vi, 2; Zec. vi, 1; Rev. xvi, 20; Jer. iii, 23.

RIVERS.—Isaiah viii, 7; Rev. xxii, 1; Ezek. xxix, 4; John vii, 38; Rev. xvi, 12.

SEAS.—Job vii, 12; Isaiah lvii, 20; Hag. ii, 6; Luke xxi, 25; Rev. iv, 6; vii, 1, 2, 3; xv, 2; xxi, 1; Isaiah xxvii, 1; Rev. viii, 8, xvi, 3; xiii, 1; x, 5, 8.

TREES.—Psalm i, 3; Prov. iii, 18; xiii, 12; xv, 4; Isaiah lvi, 3; Jer. xvii, 18; Ezek. xv, 2; xvii, 24, xxxi, 8; Dan. iv, 10, 11, 20; Rev. ii, 7; vii, 1; xxii, 14; Num.

xxiv, 6; Judg. ix, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13; 1 Chron., xvi, 33; Psalm xcvi, 12; Isaiah x, 19, lv, 12; lxi, 3; Ezek. xxxi, 5, 9; Matt. iii, 10; Jude 12; Rev. vii, 3; viii, 7.

FLOWERS, GRASS, &c.—Job xv, 33; Psalm ciii, 15; Isaiah xxviii, 1; xl, 6; 2 Kings, xix, 26; Isaiah xxxvii, 27; xl, 6, 7; li, 11; James i, 10.

METALS.—Job xxii, 25, xxiii, 10; Psalm xlv, 9; Lam. iv, 1, 2; Dan. ii, 35, 38, 39; 1 Pet., i, 7; Rev. iii, 18; xxi, 18; 2 Tim., ii, 20; Jer. li, 17; Dan. vii, 19; x, 6; Micah iv, 13; Zec. vi, 1; 1 Cor., xiii, 1; Rev. i, 15; Psalms xlvi, 4; Jer. vi, 28; Dan. iv, 15.

Z.

ERRATA IN OCTOBER ARTICLE.—Page 194, line 21, "vastness of the labour," not "latter;" ditto, line 47, "springs to light," not "life;" page 195, line 10, "striking example," not "likely;" ditto, line 12, "with fire," after "mingled;" ditto, line 85, "and murky," after "thick."

ERRATA IN BROTHER JARDINE'S ARTICLE, LAST MONTH.

Page 16, col. 1, proposition 2, for "omnipotent," read "omnipresent;" col. 2, line 35, for "is the book of nature," read "in the book, &c.;" page 17, col. 1, line 15, for "invented" read "inverted;" line 38, for "affirmed this security," read "affirmed the security;" line 59, "we need not wonder," should be read as a continuation of the previous sentence; col. 2, "three kinds of one Deity," should be read "three thirds, &c."

THE NEW EDITION OF ELPIS ISRAEL.

Up to the present date (January 25th), we have received payment for 76 copies of the new edition of Elpis Israel, from the following subscribers, whose names we give in the order of remittance. R. C. Bingley, Birmingham, 5 copies; J. Brown, New Zealand, 4; W. Holland, Birmingham, 1; Sister N———, 10; D. White, New Zealand, 4; J. Rhodes, Huddersfield, 1; G. B. Finday, Fraserburgh, 1; W. Birkenhead, Manchester, 2; A. Moss, Earlsaterdale, 1; H. Dyer, Bradford-on-Avon, 1; W. Clark, Glasgow, 1; G. Dick, Glasgow, 1; D. Atkins, Barnstaple, 1; H. Dean, Birmingham, 1; S. G. Hayes, Jersey, 12; W. Milne, Galashiels, 4; Mary Drawhill, ditto, 1; J. J. Andrew, London, 10; R. Lees, Innerleithen, 1; J. Turner, ditto, 1; W. Milne, Dunkeld, 3; W. Ellis, Edinburgh, 7; W. Martin, Devonport, 1; J. K. Ramsay,

Galston, 1; J. Turney, Birmingham, 6.

The following have yet to remit—W. Bane, Dundee, 1; J. Butler, Birmingham, 2; D. Clement, Mumbles, 45; J. Coombe, Toronto (who, we presume, will remit direct to the Dr.), 6; J. Eccles, Scarborough, 1; W. Ellis, Edinburgh, 9, additional to those already paid; H. Evans, Swansea, 1; Flemming, Glasgow, 1; S. Fletcher, Nottingham, 1; M. Fidler, South Shields, 1; T. Fuller, Headingly, 1; J. Grant, Cambridge, 1; J. Griffith, Kingston, 1; R. Goldie, Swansea, 3; J. P. Haire, Liverpool, 1; J. Hughes, Kingston, 1; F. Jones, Birmingham, 1; J. J. Kitts, Plymouth, 1; W. Mitchell, Edinburgh, 1; James Pettigrew, Dalry, 1; E. Raekham, London, 1; C. Rayer, Birmingham, 1; W. Rooke, Sydney, 4; F. R. Shuttleworth, Halifax, 9; Mary Taylor, Birmingham, 1; J. G. Tomkins, ditto, 1.

THE POLITICAL HEAVENS AND THE SIGNS THEREOF.

We append scraps from the press—home and foreign—indicative of the progress of events on the Continent. It will be observed that the "Eastern Question" is growing in magnitude and peril. This is one of the principal centres of interest to those who look for the appearing of the Messiah. Turkey must go, Russia must encroach, France must wane, Rome must get into trouble, and the Jews must rise in importance and interest. These are the five sign-

constellations of the political heavens, all of which are in full process of development, and acquiring, month by month, greater brilliancy and distinctness of outline. Now for the scraps.

The Austrian troops in Galicia, (writes the Berlin Correspondent of the *Times*) are being pushed forward from the centre of the country toward the Russian frontier. The province is crowded with horse and foot; the price of provisions has

risen, and the movements of travellers, especially in the vicinity of the troops, are watched by a lynx-eyed police. Inter-course between Russian and Austrian Poland, if not absolutely prohibited, has been rendered exceedingly difficult by the two neighbouring Governments jealously warning off visitors from either frontier. Both believe they have sufficient grounds for protecting themselves against emissaries sent for each other's supervision. An unmistakable symptom of what is brewing, is the issue by General St. Quentin, the new Commander-in-Chief in Galicia, of a general order enjoining his officers to keep a vigilant eye upon Russian priests, and prevent their enticing any more soldiers to desert and run away to the Russians. As a fitting supplement to this intelligence, we hear from Warsaw that the despatch of troops in a southern direction has been resumed. There is no doubt as to the direction taken; but whether they are placed on the Gallician frontier, or sent farther down to Bukovina and the country of the Pruth, remains to be ascertained. In all probability they are destined to increase the corps stationed not many miles north of Lemberg.—*Globe, December 29th.*

The Paris *Pays* of last evening says that the news, according to which a rupture between Turkey and Greece is imminent, may unfortunately be considered only too probable. European diplomacy, which fortunately is now relieved of a certain number of important questions, may yet, the *Pays* maintains, avert danger; but it must be quick, as there is not a moment to be lost. * * *

The Russian papers pretend to be greatly disquieted by the rumoured despatch of French and English troops to Egypt. They will not believe that, if really sent, the most natural way to account for it is, that some may be destined for India, the others for Corea. In the present suffering condition of the Sick Man, every European approaching his couch with a sword at his side, in Russian eyes, seems to be bent upon inflicting the *coup de grace*.—*Globe, January 1st.*

France is certainly striving to hush up the incipient movement on the Balkan Peninsula, or rather to put off its outbreak to a more convenient, and unless her preparations are altogether premature, not very distant period. Let the Turks once evacuate Servia, and it will be the more easy for a power speculating on the speedy demise of the sick man, to follow up her plans in this

the most important centre of Rayah opposition to the Sultan. Austria desires to insure temporary repose by concessions; Russia looks upon any accession of strength to the subject nationalities, as increasing their facilities of demolishing Turkey. In mid-winter, the works of the fortified camp at Cracow have been resumed. The towns along the line of railway between Cracow and Lemberg, especially Bochnia, Tarnow, Rzeszow, and Przemysl, are being filled with troops.—*Globe, Dec. 27.*

If we look toward the East, where the political horizon is most obscured, we see abundant cause for the general fear that peace cannot be long preserved. To outward apprehension Austria appears falling to pieces, and this popular estimate of her position, whether erroneous or otherwise, destroys for the time that *prestige* of power which constituted her strength. Russia, till within the last few months, knew that any attempt to extend her frontiers to the Danube would be resisted with all the force of the great Austrian Empire. There is no longer any certainty of the kind; and though we have no reason to imagine that the Government of St. Petersburg has any intention of making a renewed effort to seize the Principalities, it is clear that the considerations which would restrain her from sending her armies across the Pruth are now materially weakened by the real or supposed exhaustion of Austria. The success which has attended the efforts of Italy to reconstitute her nationality, has rendered the Greeks more anxious than ever to overthrow Turkish dominion. Greece, in common with every other European state, believes that with the defeat of Austria, the European balance of power, which guaranteed the permanence of Turkish rule in Europe, has received its death blow.—*Telegraph, January 2.*

A Berlin correspondent says the papers of the various parties interested in the East, have already begun skirmishing, and are carrying on wordy warfare as inveterately as if a crisis were at hand. The *Russische Correspondenz*, a semi-official organ of the St. Petersburg Government, published an article, to which the Bucharest *Romanul*, organ of the moderate Liberals in the Danubian Principalities retorts as follows: "What are the old traditions referred to by the *Correspondenz*? Is there anyone so ignorant as not to know that their real meaning is subjection to Russia, and acknowledgment, exclusive acknowledgment of the power enthroned at St. Petersburg?"

We are possessed of facts derived from an official Russian source, clearly foreshadowing what is in store for us. There is no doubt that Russia has taken the Eastern Question in hand, and is about to solve it. She is urged on by an irrepressible fear that the East may escape her grasp, and the Polish Question now pressed upon her by Rome, will be revived."—*Globe*, Jan. 7.

It would be vain to deny what is passing in the dark: partage of the Ottoman Empire between Russia and England, both of them cordially allied with Prussia, their instrument, not disinterested. To England, Egypt; to Prussia, all Germany; to Russia, Turkey, subject, however, to the cutting out of it a kingdom of Greece for King George, brother-in-law of the Prince of Wales, heir presumptive of the British crown, and brother-in-law of the Grand Duke, heir of the Muscovite crown, and consequently a bond of union between England and Russia. Turkey, who is beginning to suspect the fate that awaits her, is taking her measures. But where can she find the money to pay the new troops she is about to raise? No money, no troops. Thus is explained how it is that Italy takes toward Turkey such a haughty attitude. Italy begins the game."—*La Liberté*, quoted by the *Globe*, January 11th.

THE CANDIAN INSURRECTION.—As was in a measure to be expected, the Porte has complained to the Protecting Powers of the "aid and comfort" which it alleges the Greek Government has given to the Cretan rebels. On Wednesday last A'ali Pasha addressed a note to London, Paris, and St. Petersburg, charging the Athens Ministry not merely with conniving at the assistance given to these insurgents, but also with directly favouring the revolutionary movement along the frontier of Thessaly and Epirus. In this communication—copies of which have been received by Lord Lyons, Bourrée, and Gen. Ignatieff—the Porte invites the interference of the three Powers to put a stop to conduct which if persevered in must, it affirms, lead to a breach between the two Governments. Particular instances are mentioned in which the troubles in Roumelia have thus been fomented, and the Note affirms that the whole bearing and action of the Greek Cabinet clearly point to a desire to provoke a rupture. It states, however, that the ministers of King George may at once abandon all hopes of profiting by these intrigues, as both the Sultan and

every class of his subjects. Christians as well as Mussulmans, are resolved in no event to cede an inch of Ottoman territory. It further remarks that while the Porte has no wish for a collision with Greece, if the latter forces war upon it, the Turkish Government is prepared to accept the challenge.—*Levant Herald*, quoted by the *Globe*, January 14.

"In the Note which the Turkish Government addressed to the Court of Athens, it was plainly stated that if the Greek Government did not alter its conduct with respect to its neighbour, hostilities would certainly ensue. We are now informed that the Pasha in command of the Turkish Troops stationed in Thessaly and Epirus has been summoned to the War Office at Constantinople, and has had several interviews with the Minister for War. It is also rumoured that the Porte is about to make a military levy to the extent of 150,000 men." * * *

THE WAR IN CRETE.—The *Esperanza* of Madrid yesterday asserts that Garibaldi has left the island of Caprera, and adds that he has probably gone to Candia. A public ball has been given at St. Petersburg in aid of the funds for the relief of the distressed families of the Cretan insurgents. The Imperial family and Diplomatic body were present."—*Globe*, Jan. 14.

The *Avenir National* presents the following to be the situation of affairs in Candia, in its correspondence from Athens, dated Jan. 3: "Of the 40,000 men sent from Turkey and Egypt against Cretans, there are scarcely half left. The real strength of Mustapha Pacha consists of a corps of 3,000 native Turks (they were originally 5,000 in number), who have distinguished themselves on every occasion. The Cretans can bring into line 8,000 combatants, well armed, of whom 2,000 are volunteers. But this is only the kernel of the organized resistance. There are besides a number of guerillas, whose evolutions around the Turkish empire are incessant, and do immense damage. The 6,000 Cretans have arms, provisions, and munitions at their disposal. They have entire confidence in the success of their enterprise. Even should the Porte be able to send 10,000 fresh troops to Crete, they would not be sufficient to repress the revolt. In Epirus and Thessaly, events are marching with the greatest rapidity. The insurgents have invited the Greek general Kouzzomilla and Colonel Kaska to put themselves at their head, and it is reported in Athens that they have already

left for this purpose, and fresh recruits leave every day to join the insurgents. The Provisional Government of Epirus has issued a proclamation, inviting the Thessalians to make common cause with them, and to unite under a common government. *Globe, January 17th.*

In other words, the insurrection is where it was when Mustapha set out, except, as we shall soon find, that it has acquired better arms and concentration, besides having gained time. I asked an Albanian officer in the service of the Government, the other day, how long the war was likely to last? He replied, "Three or four years, as things are now going on." How active the insurrection may be for the next few months I can't say, but I am assured that it will continue to show sufficient signs of life to prove its actual existence until the movements in Albania, Epirus and Thessaly are ready for development into the combined and general insurrection of the Christian provinces of the Turkish Empire—Cretan correspondent of the *Telegraph*, Jan. 17.

These extracts indicate the extent and seriousness of the political fermentation which is going on all over the Continent. Denials are occasionally given to the statements made by the independent portion of the press, but these are not of the slightest value. The *Globe* of December 29th, has a few remarks on this very point. It calls attention to the fact disclosed in official documents, laid before the Italian Parliament, that although in the early months of last year, the Italian Government had deliberately planned a war with Austria, in conjunction with Prussia, it solemnly and explicitly denied, through its diplomatic representatives, that such was the case. It remarks: "The homage which vice pays to virtue in the shape of hypocrisy, has been remarkably displayed in the diplomacy of Europe of late years. * * * No one has forgotten the duplicity of Napoleon III, in affecting a desire for peace during the eight months which followed the conspiracy between himself and Cavour, at Plombières; nor the memorable falsehood

of the Emperor in his statement 'that France has not armed,' only a few days before the French army was crossing Mount Cenis, and disembarking on the quays of Genoa." "Official" disclaimers of current intelligence are therefore of little weight.

A notorious feature in the present crisis is the strong current of public opinion in England against intervention in foreign affairs, on any plea whatever. So universally is this the sentiment of the nation, that even government has adopted it as the guiding spirit of their foreign policy. This is of much significance at the present time. Thirteen years ago, England went to war in defence of Turkey against Russia. This she would not now do. The press, with one voice, are against it; characterising the general dread of Russian ambition as a bugbear, a myth, &c., which ought for ever to disappear before enlightened (?) public opinion. These sentiments reflect the feeling of the government, and thus the greatest obstacle in the way of Russia's designs in the East, and the greatest support of decaying Turkey, are withdrawn. A short time ago, France made overtures for a renewal of the Anti-Russian alliance with England, in view of a revival of the Eastern question, but they were discouraged, and events are taking their course, in the direction we are led to expect by the "sure word of prophecy."

As to Rome, the news of the month may be summed up in two words. The Scotch Presbyterian chapel has been suppressed, and the authorities have instituted repressive measures (religious and political) of the utmost rigour, tending to fan the flame of discontent and hate which is smouldering among the people. The political committees, in other parts of Italy, recommend the Romans to be patient and

submissive to the last moment, in the hope of effecting the transfer of Rome to Victor Emmanuel without bloodshed, but assure them at the same time that should things get too hot for endurance, they will

be assisted in their efforts to free themselves from the clerical despots who grind them to the earth. Doubtless, there will be an explosion soon.

January 26th, 1867.

EDITOR.

INTELLIGENCE.

The responses in behalf of Brother ROBERTSON, of Turriff, amount in all to seven.

We have to acknowledge a further contribution of £1 toward the expenses of fitting up the Athenæum, Birmingham, for the service of the truth.

ABERDEEN.—Writing on the 24th of December, brother GILL announces another immersion, which took place two days before the date of his letter, the subject being the wife of Brother W. GILL, of Fraserburgh, at which place there are now three in the truth.

BIRMINGHAM.—During the past two months, there have been three additions by immersion, the subjects being WILLIAM ALLEN (39), joiner, formerly a Methodist; Mrs. SMITH (36), brought up in "the church;" and WILLIAM DAVIS (21), son of Brother T. DAVIS. The ecclesia has also received an accession by the removal of brother W. J. TURNBY, from Nottingham to Birmingham.

CHRISTADELPHIANS ON THE CONTINENT.—Brother HAYES, who has, with his wife and sister, been travelling on the Continent for some time, writes as follows from Jersey, on the 18th of December: "I am happy in being able to report myself arrived in this part of the world after an absence of about four months. We reached London on the 30th of last month, and were there a fortnight, meeting with the brethren * * * In the course of our wanderings, we visited the Seven-hilled City, and saw the reigning Pontiff twice. On both occasions we were very close to him. His appearance impresses a stranger very favourably. One can hardly look on his mild, benevolent countenance and imagine he is the author of such documents as those lately issued from the Vatican. While in Rome, I sought for some sign that its overthrow is near at hand, but could discover nothing. All is perfectly tranquil. The faithful drop on their knees as the Pope drives by, but beyond this, no notice is taken of him, and

no public feeling manifested either for or against him. I am anxiously watching the news now that the French troops have left His Holiness to his own resources. Surely the time of our redemption draweth nigh."

EDINBURGH.—Writing on the 10th of December, brother ELLIS says that the public meetings of the brethren for the proclamation of the truth, continue with encouraging results, though the audiences are not large. He mentions brethren SMITH, PATERSON and himself as the speakers, and states that the ecclesia is "happy, harmonious and united." He announces the death of Brother W. OLIVER, who fell asleep at the age of 21, remarking that young as he was, his apprehension of the truth was "distinct, comprehensive and decided."

GALASHIELS.—Writing on December 19th, brother W. MILNE says: "I have much pleasure in stating that my daughter Anne (16) has cast in her lot with the small number here, who are "earnestly contending for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints." She was immersed on the 19th current. She has been for a good while past diligently searching the word of life for its hidden treasure. I need not say that it gave me great delight to assist her. Unlike the folk in Dundee, I made it a matter of the first importance to instil into her mind a correct idea of the Scriptural doctrine of eternal life. While I led her to those Scriptures which teach that immortality can only be obtained through union with Christ, I took care that she understood her present mortal condition, "In Adam all die;" "In Christ all shall be made alive." I was careful that she understood what was "involved" in these two statements; for I am more than ever satisfied that the life in Christ cannot be understood unless the death in Adam is understood also."

HALIFAX.—Brother SHUTTLEWORTH, writing January 21st, announces the obedience in immersion, of JOSEPH FIRTH, of Rochdale, lately from America. He also remarks: "The lectures are still going on, and, God willing, are likely to do so. One brother has paid for advertisements in the two Halifax papers for six months to come, and we get reports in every week. The attendance varies; sometimes only a few come; at

other times, there is a tidy room-full. This fluctuation arises from several causes, such as varying degrees of attraction in the subjects, changes in the weather, and occasional counter attractions elsewhere. But more anon. Our salvation nears. Meanwhile, let us fight valiantly, sow bountifully, and endure patiently."

LONDON.—Brother D. BROWN, of London, writing on the 14th of December, announces the immersion, on the previous Sunday, of the wife of Brother Aspin, meeting in fellowship with him; and her addition to the ecclesia.

NEW BARNET, (London).—Brother J. J. ANDREW, who resides at this place, delivered two lectures in the local Temperance Hall, on Tuesday, January 1st, and Tuesday, January 8th; subjects: first, "The second appearing of Jesus the Christ in relation to believers of the gospel, the Jews, and the world at large;" second, "The gospel and the kingdom as revealed by Moses and the prophets, and proclaimed by Jesus the Christ, and his apostles." The lectures were given by way of reply to three delivered in the same place about six weeks before, by an Irvingite evangelist, who, as usual, encumbered that little truth he uttered, with a great deal of the nonsense peculiar to that section of the apostacy. Brother ANDREW'S object was, of course, to embrace a favourable opportunity for discharging his duty as a witness of the truth to the neighbourhood in which he resides. The meetings were fairly attended considering the unpopularity of the subjects treated. At the close of each lecture, considerable discussion ensued, Baptists, Methodists and Plymouth Brethren taking part. Brother ANDREWS, each night, distributed slips containing references to the scriptures quoted under the several heads of the lectures. These we shall publish next month, not having room this month. He remarks, "Whether any good, will come of it or not I cannot say. I have not much hope of any becoming interested sufficiently to embrace the truth, for this is rather barren ground. (And where is it not barren? Cheer up, brother Andrews; we know not which shall prosper, this or that.—EDITOR.) Nevertheless, I am glad to have had the opportunity of publicly proclaiming it in the place where I reside."

NEW ZEALAND.—We have five letters from this part of the world, reporting a

surprising and encouraging state of activity in the neighbourhood of Dunedin and Greenisland in relation to the truth. Several have been immersed, and many are enquiring. In one district, one minister is said to be on the point of having to lament an "occupation gone," through the defection of the people from orthodoxy to the truth. These results are consequent upon the labours of one who has already been introduced to the notice of our readers, JOHN GRAHAM, who is reported to exhibit great energy and enterprise in the cause of the truth in the way of speaking and distributing books.

SWANSEA.—Brother GOLDIE, writing on Dec. 14, announces the immersion on the previous Monday evening, in Swansea, of Mr. THOMAS RANDELS, master shoemaker, and his wife, and also Mr. GEORGE DELL and his wife, in all four souls, whose addition to the ecclesia is a welcome and refreshing event. Brother DELL, formerly camped among the Campbellites; brother RANDELS was connected with the Independents. The same letter conveyed an invitation to the Editor to revisit South Wales during Christmas holidays. This invitation was accepted, and the Editor delivered two lectures in Swansea and four in Mumbles to audiences of fair dimensions. Since that time, the brethren in Swansea have been deprived of their place of meeting in consequence of its engagement by a larger and more "respectable" body. They are on the outlook for another.

TURRIFF.—Brother ROBERTSON, writing under date December 19, reports a visit to Feterangus and Crimond, at the close of October and the beginning of November, resulting in arrangements being made for a second visit in December, which commenced on the 14th day of that month. On the 16th two were assisted in obedience to the faith, viz., ALEXANDER TARVES, police constable, Crimond, (formerly connected with "the Reformation" in Fraserburgh, who after two or three years investigation, has come to the persuasion of the truth), and Mrs. GEORGE CAMPBELL, wife of Brother CAMPBELL, of New Pitsligo. Brother ROBERTSON mentions that there are several others of whom hope is entertained that they will ere long become obedient.

THE AMBASSADOR

Of the Coming Age.

"A wicked Messenger falleth into mischief, but a faithful Ambassador is health."—PROV. xiii, 17.

No. 33.

MARCH, 1867.

Vol. IV.

THE JUDGMENT SEAT OF CHRIST;

OR THE SECOND ADVENT IN RELATION TO THE HOUSEHOLD
OF FAITH.—No. 4.

In proceeding to consider the arguments urged against the conclusion presented last month, we cannot do better than quote the remarks of a dissentient correspondent,* who wrote from New Zealand twelve months ago. He summarizes the adverse evidence as follows:—

“Men are initiated into Christ by the ceremony of faith and obedience, but should they nullify or repudiate such ceremony of faith and obedience, by polluting themselves with abomination, they no longer remain *in* Christ. Having destroyed *the cause* or means of introduction into Him (faith and obedience)—they lose *the effect*—(their standing in Christ.) Thus a man having put on Christ, if he afterwards reject the faith, he no longer remains in Christ. Now, as to resurrection, the disputings rest, I might say, wholly upon the Scripture meaning of that word. I believe that it implies simply a rising from the grave. As proof, I quote the following testimony: “And many came out of the grave after his resurrection.”—(Christ’s rising from the grave.—Matt. xxvii, 53.) “One was ordained to be a witness of His (Christ’s) resurrection, (that is, his rising from the grave.)—Acts i, 22; also, Acts iv, 33; Rom. vi, 5, and many others. This idea excludes the four elements contended for by those who believe in mortal resurrection (viz., first, the formation of a mortal body from *debris*; 2nd, rising from the grave as a living mortal body; 3rd, standing before the judgment seat; and, 4th, birth of spirit consequent upon approval.) Jesus was constituted a spiritual body, being born of the Holy Spirit from the grave, and Paul says: ‘We shall be also in the

*D. White, Dunedin, Otago, New Zealand

likeness of his resurrection." In the resurrection of the just, or first resurrection (rising from the grave), there can be no wicked raised, for they are all pronounced 'blessed and holy,' and exempt from the hurt of the second death.—(Rev. xx, 6) Lastly, we must annihilate the 15th chapter of the 1st Corinthians, or give a reliable new translation. 'It is sown a natural body; *it is raised a spiritual body.* * * * *The dead shall be raised* INCORRUPTIBLE." The saints rise exclaiming 'O, grave, where is thy victory? O death, where is thy sting?' Now, if they be resurrected mortal, they must undergo a death, or its equivalent, when transformed to spirit body. Again, the saints shall not see Christ in their mortal bodies, because 'when he appears, they shall be like him, for they shall see him as he is.'—(1 John, iii, 2.) I am open to conviction if these objections be scripturally removed, but cannot, under present circumstances."

This is a brief but tolerably complete compendium of the arguments usually advanced in support of the view that the resurrection at the coming of Christ will be confined to the accepted, who, it is contended, will awake in a glorified state, and come forth, not to judgment, but to welcome by the king. Before discussing them, we will add one or two others of the same class, so as to make the list as complete as possible, and, if possible, leave nothing on this side of the question unnoticed. David's words are relied on to prove that the dead come to life in a state of incorruptibility: "I shall be satisfied *when I awake with THY LIKENESS.*"—(Psalm xvii, 15) The form of speech employed by Jesus and Paul in the following statements is intended to sanction the idea that all who emerge from the death state at the coming of Christ are blessed and immortal: "Those who shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and THE RESURRECTION FROM THE DEAD." * * * (Luke xx, 35.) "If by any means, I might attain to the resurrection of ("FROM AMONG," more exactly) the dead." (Phil. iii, 11.) The argument on these testimonies is that to come out of the grave at all at the appearing of Christ is to be included among the accepted; hence Paul's desire to attain to the simple act of resurrection. A point is also made of the distinction between the phrase "resurrection of the dead" and "resurrection *from* the dead," both scriptural forms of speech. The argument is, that the former points to a general final resuscitation of the race of Adam from the grave, while the latter relates to a preliminary and partial out-gathering of those to be accepted, leaving the great mass of the dead behind to be dealt with by resurrection at the close of the thousand years. Paul's declaration in Thess. iv, 16, is also quoted in confirmation of this view, "*The dead in Christ shall rise FIRST.*"

The whole of these arguments and testimonies, and any others that may arise, we shall review *seriatim*, in the order in which they are presented in the foregoing letter and statement of difficulties.

1.—*That apostacy from the faith destroys a man's position in Christ.* This is true as regards ultimate results. No apostate will enter the kingdom of God, but will a man's apostacy screen him from the shame of rejection in the presence of the angels and of his accepted compeers? Our correspondent evidently thinks that it will. He argues that a faithful standing in Christ will alone procure resurrection at the coming of Christ, and that a departure from the faith will necessitate a man's imprisonment in the grave during the thousand years' kingdom of God. His contention seems to be that a man can only have resurrection by connection with Christ, and that apostacy dissolves such connection, and remits a man to his Adamic lifelessness in which there is no resurrection. But if this argument is good for the beginning of the thousand years, it is good for the end also. If because an apostate is not "in Christ," he cannot rise when Christ comes, then for the same reason he must continue under the power of death when the thousand years have passed away, and ever after. How should he rise at one time and not at the other? Time makes no difference to the operation of the laws of Deity. It may be said in reply, that a man out of Christ may rise to condemnation, though not to life; but to this, the obvious answer is, that if he can rise to condemnation at the close of the thousand years, there is nothing in principle to prevent him rising at the commencement. Time makes no difference. Our correspondent, doubtless, rests his conclusion on the point upon certain statements which he thinks affirm it, and which we shall consider by and by. He cannot deduce it from the argument about apostacy. Again, let him consider this. If the unworthy are to lie undisturbed in the resurrection that calls forth the accepted servants, they will be rejected in their absence, without trial and without judgment, deprived of even the fair dealing they would experience at a human judicature. They are candidates for the kingdom of the thousand years, and to leave them out of the resurrection at the beginning of that period would be to enforce a decision upon their candidature without bringing them to account. On the other hand, to admit the accepted by the simple act of resurrection would be to deprive the epoch of the advent of every element of judgment. Our correspondent's theory cannot be maintained without denying the judgment. Is there to be judgment or not? This is the question. If there is, what is it? An allotment of rewards or a dispensation of destinies according to desert? This question we endeavoured to answer last month. There is no doubt upon the point. "Jesus Christ shall *judge* the quick and the dead AT HIS APPEARING." "He shall give to every one according to his works" (Rev. xxii, 12,) "*whether good or bad*" (2 Cor. v. 10,) to them who have earned it by patient continuance in well-doing, ETERNAL LIFE, but to those who do not obey the truth, *tribulation and wrath and anguish* (Rom. ii. 6 8). If this is the case, how can the resurrection at the

coming of Christ be confined to the accepted? With such a resurrection there could be no judgment, for judgment is not the settlement of different degrees of merit, but the official public separation of the underserving from those who shall be accounted worthy. The tribunal of Christ would not be a judgment seat if only used to hold a sort of reception levee at which his friends of different rank should be introduced. It is said "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that we may receive in body according to what we have done *whether good or bad*," and that "he (the Lord) will bring to light the *hidden things of darkness*" (1 Cor. iv, 5.) Is our correspondent prepared to go in the face of these testimonies? Is he prepared to deny the judgment? This is the issue. Both righteous and wicked are raised to appear in the presence of Christ at his coming, or there is to be no "judging of quick and dead at his appearing of his kingdom." There is no escape from this.

If our correspondent admits the judgment, it is not difficult to deal with the case of apostates. Their conduct disinherits them, but it does not destroy the yoke of Christ that is upon them. Christ is judge as well as king and elder brother, and his jurisdiction once assumed cannot be thrown off; we *must* give an account to him on the day of reckoning. Israel of old illustrates the principle. The national contract of allegiance was voluntary in the first instance. The people were invited at Sina, to enter into it, and they accepted the invitation (Ex. xix, 3-8.) By this act, they placed themselves under law, and though afterwards they forsook the Almighty and turned aside to worship the gods and follow the practices of the heathen, they could not get rid of God's claim upon them. It lay heavy upon them in all their backslidings. The voices of the prophets cried after them, and the judgments of God visited in severity their sins. The principle upon which this took place is indicated in the words of Amos (iii 2.) "You only have I known of all the families of the earth, *therefore will I punish you for all your iniquities.*" This now holds good with the class who have become fellow-citizens of the commonwealth of Israel; God "knows" them as he knew Israel, and with an extension of the "knowing," there is an extension of the responsibility attached to it. He sent an invitation to the Gentiles by the apostles; and all who "come out from among them," and take upon themselves the name of Christ by the belief and obedience of the gospel, put themselves under the yoke of a responsibility which they cannot afterwards rid themselves of. Hence "it is better for men not to know the way of righteousness, than after having known it to turn away." 2 Peter ii. 21. For such, "there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin, but a fearful looking for of judgment and of fiery indignation which will devour the adversary." (Heb. x. 21, 27) It is therefore a fearful thing, by transgression, to fall into the hands of the living God. (31). Judas is an example. Of him, Jesus says, "It had been good for that man that he had not been born" (Matt. xxvi 24 .

Those who fall away from the faith undoubtedly detach themselves from all beneficial connection with the Christ, but they do not, and cannot, undo the tie that links them to the judgment seat. They are still "in" Christ in the sense of being subject to his jurisdiction. They can never revert to the irresponsible position they occupied in the days of their original darkness. They are still his servants though they may be unfaithful, as in the case of the rejected servant of the one talent. Christ is either a saviour or a destroyer to all his household. He will dispense either wrath or kindness to all who have placed themselves under the institutions of his house. Apostacy cannot elude his justice; it can only forfeit his favour.

But even supposing our correspondent's arguments were allowed to have the fullest effect as regards apostates, what would he do with those who are not apostates? those who hold on to the faith, but are unfruitful therein? those who retain the theory of the gospel, but are defaulting in the practice? who profess the name of Christ, but do no more than say "Lord, lord?" Are they cut off from resurrection? If cut off at the beginning of the kingdom, why not at the end? If they cannot rise at the beginning, why ever? Our correspondent would get rid of the difficulty by giving way to the force of Paul's declaration that Christ will "JUDGE the quick *and the dead* at his appearing." It is the most natural and reasonable arrangement that could be conceived that Christ at his coming should convene the whole of his professed disciples to "take account of them," and deal with them in accordance with the facts which he will extort from the mouth of each; before proceeding with the work which has reference to the ruling of the world in righteousness. It is specifically declared in the language of the apostles that he will do so, and Christ's parables irresistibly teach the same fact. There is consequently every reason for abandoning the suggestion that the wicked dead will not be raised at the appearing of Christ but left over to the end of the thousand years.

2nd. *Resurrection simply means rising from the grave.*—This is not altogether correct. "Resurrection" involves the act of rising from the dust; but comprehends more than this in many parts of the word. For instance, the Saducees-asked Jesus, "IN THE RESURRECTION, whose wife shall she be?" (Matt. xxii 28), that is, *in the state to which the dead will rise*. How would the question read if construed "whose wife shall she be in the act of rising from the grave?" Again, "IN THE RESURRECTION they neither marry nor are given in marriage," (Matt. xxii 30), that is, *in the state to which the dead rise*. Again, "they that have done good (shall come forth) to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of condemnation," that is, one class come out of the grave to one resurrection-state, and the other to another resurrection-state. Read in any other way, the passage is absurd, as may be seen at a glance; "They that have done good shall come forth to the act of rising from the grave!" One of the very passages cited by our correspondent for a con-

trary purpose is another illustration of the comprehensive use of the word "resurrection" (Acts i. 22). None of the Apostles saw Christ *come out of the grave*. They saw him after he rose, and could testify that *he had risen*. They could state that he was alive, after having been dead. This in fact is the account given by Festus of Paul's proceedings. "The Jews had certain questions against him of their own superstition and one Jesus who was dead whom Paul affirmed to BE ALIVE." To affirm that Christ was alive is styled "giving witness of his resurrection," showing that "resurrection" in its use as a word extends beyond the mere act of rising from the grave, of which the Apostles could give no personal witness, not having seen it. Again "Because he preached Jesus and the resurrection." (Acts xvii 18). This could not mean that Paul simply preached the act of rising from the grave. The mere act of rising from the grave is not necessarily a good thing. Lazarus and the son of the widow of Nain rose from the grave, but not to the resurrection (state) preached by Paul. They merely received a renewal of mortal life. The wicked of a certain class will rise from the grave, but the act of rising will not be to them a gladsome event, but the contrary; they would prefer to be left in the oblivion of the tomb. Everything depends upon the STATE to which the rising from the grave is the introduction. Paul preached the resurrection-state of incorruption and immortality. To this state the dead have to rise. The mere act of rising is not the resurrection. It is involved in it; it is a part, but as employed in the Scriptures, it requires the state after coming out of the grave to be added before the idea expressed by the word resurrection is complete. Another illustration of this is to be found in a passage on which the opponents of this idea rely, "I saw thrones and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them; and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus and for the word of God and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads or in their hands, and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again till the thousand years were finished. THIS (what? The state of things that John witnessed—the reigning of the accepted for a thousand years)—THIS IS THE FIRST RESURRECTION." (Rev. xx. 4, 5). There is no mention of the act of coming out of the grave. John merely sees certain persons who had been dead, occupying a certain position with Christ; and describing the scene as a whole, he calls it THE FIRST RESURRECTION. Evidently, the word resurrection cannot here be restricted to the act of rising from the grave. Many will have a part in it who will never go into the grave at all, viz., "those who are alive and remain." "Resurrection" here broadly covers a state and a time to which the persons seen are introduced by rising from the death state, whether in that state they are below the sod or walking above it in mortality. But both living and dead will have to appear before the judgment seat before they take the position in which John saw them, and when they appear at the judgment seat, they will have companions whom they will never see again, for to some Christ will "say unto them in that day, I never knew you; depart from

me ye that work iniquity." (Matt. vii. 22, 23). Such will be "ASHAMED before him at his coming." (John ii. 28 : Dan. xii. 2)

3.—*If we are planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection,*" (Rom. vi. 5) Our correspondent finds in this a proof that the dead will awake in an incorruptible state. In order to make it such proof, he assumes that Jesus was spiritual in nature when he came out of the tomb. Now, it is altogether doubtful whether this assumption can be sustained. The contrary supposition appears much more probable. So far as Christ's intercourse with his disciples, during the forty days, is concerned, there is nothing to countenance the idea of his having been glorified. His appearance and actions were those of a man in the flesh, with the single exception of his sudden appearances and disappearances, and these are referable to the action of Christ on the senses of his disciples, rather than to the peculiarity of his nature. He was "flesh and bone" (Luke xxiv. 39), ate and drank, and held familiar intercourse, to which there was no obstacle in his personal appearance or condition. It was very different when Paul saw him while on his way to Damascus. A great light, above the light of the sun, shone round about him, blinding him, and felling him to the earth. In John vii. 39, it is given as a reason why the spirit was not given at the certain time there spoken of, that "Jesus was *not yet glorified.*" Now the spirit was not given till the day of Pentecost, ten days after Christ's ascension. Does it not follow that Christ was not glorified till his departure from earth? Why did ten days elapse after his ascension before the spirit was given, if he was glorified at his emergence from the grave of Joseph? He said, before he suffered, "If I go not away, the comforter (the spirit) will not come unto you." It would appear from this, in connection with the statement quoted from John, that the "going away" of Christ and his glorification were synonymous. If so, he was not glorified till he ascended, and therefore, was at least forty days in the flesh after he came out of the grave. This conclusion is borne out by the types of the law. The highest token of the divine acceptance of a sin offering was consumption of the victim by the flashing forth of supernatural fire. Now, Christ was the anti-typical lamb slain, and the question is, how, and by whom was he presented in the anti-typical holiest of all—heaven itself, (Heb. ix, 24), to have the offering of his mortal body accepted and endorsed by the flashing forth of the spirit-fire upon him, to change him "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye," into a "life-giving spirit." The history of the case affords a simple answer; He ascended to the presence of the Father, both as the victim and the officiating priest, and when the offering was accepted and consumed by the out-shedding of the spirit upon his substance, that is, *when he was glorified,* he transmitted the spirit to his disciples on the day of Pentecost. This is Peter's account of it on the occasion: "*Being by the right hand of God EXALTED,* and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit; he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear," (Acts ii. 33.) Again, when accounting to the wonder-stricken crowd for the miraculous cure of "a certain man,

lame from his mother's womb," he says, "Why look ye so earnestly on us, as though by our own power, or holiness, we had made this man to walk? The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers HATH GLORIFIED HIS SON, JESUS," (Acts iii. 12-13). From this, it would follow that Jesus was not glorified till after his ascension, and that, therefore, our correspondent's assumption, that he came forth from the grave in spiritual nature, is unfounded.

But even supposing it were to be allowed that his assumption is correct, his argument is far from logical. The words he quotes from Paul, ("planted together in the likeness of his resurrection,") while they apply to the resurrection of Christ, do not apply to the resurrection of the saints. This will be obvious on a moment's consideration. Paul is talking of a resurrection likeness, antithetically to a death likeness. Now, when men are "planted together in the likeness of Christ's death," are they nailed to a cross? It would require that they should, before our correspondent's argument could be allowed any weight, because he insists upon a literal construction of the resurrection likeness, and should therefore be prepared to accept a literal construction of the death likeness. No, men are not transfixed on a wooden cross when "planted together in the likeness of his death." They are merely immersed in water; this is a LIKENESS, a resemblance to his death. What is *the likeness of his resurrection*, of which Paul is talking. He makes this point clear in the following words, found in the very place under consideration: "That like as Christ was raised-up by the glory of the Father, we also should walk in NEWNESS OF LIFE," (Rom. vi. 4.). His argument is that as in immersion, we go through a likeness of the death of Christ, so in our life subsequent to immersion, our life, morally, ought to be as new, in relation to former life, as Christ's actual life, after glorification, was different from that which he had when in the flesh. "Knowing this that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, *that henceforth we should not serve sin*," (Rom. vi. 6).

4—"Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such, the second death hath no power. (Rev. xx. 6). Hence, says our correspondent, none of the wicked can be raised at that time. This appears to follow, but it does not follow. What is it to "have part in the first resurrection?" The word translated part is *meros*, and this is defined, by Parkhurst, to mean "a piece, part, portion, fellowship, lot," &c., hence, to have part in the first resurrection, is to have a "piece, portion, fellowship, or lot," at the coming of Christ. There will be many at the judgment seat who will be dismissed without a "part, piece, portion, lot, or fellowship." The King will refuse to own them. On such, the second death hath power, but on those who attain to the condition of things that John witnessed and described as "the first resurrection,"—viz. a living and reigning with Christ a thousand years—"the second death hath no power." As Jesus says, "*Neither can they die any more, for they are equal unto the angels.*"

But suppose we take our correspondent's view, we should be committed to something which he is not prepared for,—viz. that the second death

will prevail over everyone at the end of the thousand years, except those who have been immortalized at the commencement; and consequently that Christ's work in abolishing death is to be limited to those who are raised at His coming; that is to say, that the thousand years' reign is to pass away without any permanent result. Mankind are to be made happy under righteous and immortal rulers for a thousand years, and then enshrouded in the blackness of universal death! How is this, it may be asked. A moment's reflection will show it. The argument is that to have a part in the first resurrection, is to be raised at the beginning of the thousand years, instead of the end. On such the second hath no power. If so, it hath power on all raised at the end of the thousand years. This does not follow, it may be said. How can it be otherwise? If to have a part in the first resurrection means *to rise at the beginning of the thousand years*, and if the peculiar blessedness of that privilege is that the second death hath no power over those attaining to it, it is clear there can be no exemption from the second death at what would be considered, numerically, the *second* resurrection. On the other hand, if there is a class who will escape the second death at the end of the thousand years, or "second resurrection," so considered, then there is no meaning in connecting this blessing with the "first resurrection" as its peculiar attribute. Either there is no resurrection to life at the end of the thousand years, or the blessedness of the "first resurrection" has reference to the fate of a class contemporaneous with itself. There is no escape from this. If there is an escape from the second death at the end of the thousand years, obviously the blessedness mentioned in connection with the "first resurrection" is not peculiar to it. The real fact is that there will be a class at the resurrection who will have no "part" in it. They will come forth, not "to the resurrection of life," which is the first, (or chief, highest, best,—see *Lexicon*), resurrection, but to "the resurrection of condemnation." AT THAT TIME, many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and *some to shame and everlasting contempt.* (Dan. xxii. 2.).

But the principal obstacle is found in the words, "The rest of the dead lived not again till the thousand years were finished." This is assumed to apply to the unfaithful servants of Christ, but this is evidently a mistake, because at the time when that is developed which John styles the "first resurrection,"—viz. a living and reigning with Christ, the judgment which disposes of the unfaithful and rewards the worthy, is past. The "rest of the dead" cannot apply to the unfaithful amenable to the judgment seat of Christ, inasmuch as if they are to be raised at that time, their resurrection and condemnation are accomplished facts at the time when these words are used. If they apply to a specific class, it is a class not amenable to the judgment which Jesus brings to bear on His household, and a class undealt with until the general closing of the account between God and the human race at the close of the thousand years. Possibly it may refer to men like Nero, and others great in wickedness who are unpunished in the present life, and who though outside of specific law to God, have acquired a degree of moral respon-

sibility by external contact with divine things. Rejectors of the word, who do not come under law to Christ by belief and obedience, may be reserved till the close of the thousand years. It does not seem reasonable that those who put away the counsel of God from themselves should be passed over without judgment, and yet since they do not become constituents of the household of faith, their resurrection at the time when account is taken of that household would be inappropriate. May they not be dealt with at the end? This may be the significance of the language under consideration. It may have a more general meaning than this,—viz. that there is to be no further resurrection of dead people till the end of the kingdom; that though power to raise the dead is upon earth for a thousand years, it is not to be exercised till the close of that period. This would not necessarily mean that there are people left over from the present and previous dispensations, who will be called forth at the end of the thousand years. It may only be intended to teach, that the remainder of the dead divided from this dispensation by the advent, and related entirely to the dispensation of the kingdom, will not be dealt with till the close of the kingdom, when the resurrection will possibly be confined to those who live and die under the reign of Christ. All that it really proves is that there is to be a resurrection of dead people at the end of the thousand years, (and from the sequel of the chapter we learn that a class of these will enter into life). We cannot be certain whether its bearing is retrospective or prospective, whether it relates to people actually in death when the saints begin to reign, or to the dead comprehensively of whom a remainder will exist during all the thousand years. This much is certain, that it is not intended to teach, and as we have seen, does not teach, that there will be no resurrection of unjust at the coming of Christ. No one part of the Scriptures can violate the unequivocal testimony of the other parts. To admit the common interpretation of Rev. xx. 6, would be to abandon the great doctrine of judgment with which the Scriptures (the New Testament, more particularly,) teem in an emphatic form. It would also necessitate the most violent and unnatural treatment of testimonies quoted in the course of these articles.

(To be continued.)

THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE DOCTRINE OF THE DEVIL AND THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST.

BY R. C. BINGLEY.

AMONG those who profess to be obedient believers of the Gospel of the Kingdom and the name of Jesus Anointed, are to be found some who do not regard the subject of the devil in the light of a doctrine, but consider it a speculative question of no practical moment, whereas others hold that it is a doctrine that materially affects our understanding of the mission of Christ. Two

such opposite conclusions cannot be drawn from a *unity* of perception of the principles involved in this subject, but result from *two* distinct views being entertained, *both* of which cannot be scriptural. The one is, that the devil is but a modification of the popular idea, depriving him of immortality, hoofs, horns, and pronged sceptre; but leaving the imagination to deck him in a more

becoming garb, yet jealously retaining his personality, believing him to be a superhuman being, may be of flesh and blood of a previous creation, and of mortal nature, as he is believed to be destined to be eventually destroyed. In short, this pre-Adamite devil is thought to be a being of some kind, who acts in opposition to God in his dealings with men, and that he was the *primary* cause of the fall of our first parents; and his existence is strengthened from entertaining the old superstitious idea that the "unclean spirits" or "devils" alluded to by the evangelists were beings(?) devoid of substance, as they were only found possessing men in their day, and these "evil spirits" were under the subordination of the pre-Adamite devil, but supposed from some unknown cause to have withdrawn them, almost, if not altogether, in this enlightened age! As to when the devil first inhaled the breath of life, no feasible suggestion is offered by those who believe in his existence.

Others of the "household of faith" repudiate such teachings as but "old wives' fables," and declare that the Scriptural devil is *Sin* in the flesh, and regard the *doctrine* of the devil as *one* of the most essential elements of the truth necessary to be understood prior to immersion.

The word Satan means adversary, without reference to quality. *Badness of character* is not an essential part of the word, as is evident from the fact that the word Satan is applied to the angel of Jehovah. "Balaam perceiving the angel of the Lord, bowed himself, and the angel said unto him, wherefore hast thou smitten thine ass these three times? Behold I went out to be an adversary (Heb. *Satan*) unto thee, because thy way is perverse before me." Num. xxii. 32. Much less does the word Satan convey the idea that it is a pre-Adamite devil of superhuman power. People think that because they read of "Devil" and "Satan" in the Bible, therefore there is a malign personal being of the popular description. By such reasoning, one might as easily conclude that because the word "soul" is frequently found in the Scriptures, therefore, they teach the immortality of the soul. The fundamental idea embodied in the word Satan (*adversary*) is an *adverse state of mind*.

"Unclean spirits" or "daimons" are to be found in the present day, as then, in the form of physical and mental disease.

The "casting out" of them by Christ we can see to have been the exertion of his

power in the ejection of these disorders; but, doubtless, the superstition of the age supposed there was an expulsion of personal demons. The employment of this form of speech, however, in gospel narrative is no proof that Jesus or the Apostles endorsed the superstitious view.

Do not the names of things continue, even in modern experience, after the *belief* in the existence of things named has long ceased? Because persons use the phrases *lunacy*, struck by the moon, St. Anthony's fire, St. Vitus's dance, should it be inferred that they believe in the moon power, the St. Anthony's power, or the St. Vitus's power? This would be extremely absurd; yet, not more so than to imagine, because the gospel historians use the phraseology of the time in regard to possessions, that we are therefore bound to believe in possessions, *which the apostle Paul in his Epistles never alludes to*.

Moreover, is it to be supposed that because Christ used the word "Beelzebub," (a Philistine god, which the Pharisees, in their ignorance, believed in), the Lord also believed in such a being? It seems that Christ thought fit to use the common phraseology, even in regard to daimons; to have taught the natural truth would have been useless and incomprehensible to them.

It appears that when a man was brought before our Lord, having the phenomena of madness, or even dumbness, Christ removed the phenomenon, restoring the man to his right condition, by which the Jews ignorantly supposed he had cast out the demon. For it is evident that the Jews held the same superstition that the Greeks and Romans did, namely, that individuals were influenced by supernatural power.

The word "devil," *diabolos*, has various meanings. It is often applied to the serpent (John viii. 14.) the Pharisees, &c., and political organizations, but nowhere applied to the *supposed* pre-Adamite devil; in the Epistles more frequently applied to *Sin*.

The befogged theory current among those whose influence works as a leaven detrimental to the truth, is, that the devil of unknown birth, introduced sin into the world in direct opposition to the plain declaration of Paul, that "by ONE MAN *sin entered the world, and death by sin*." Their monstrous theory presents to the mind the unscriptural order, namely, that the devil existed first, *then* the serpent, and afterwards our first parents; whereas, the Scriptures teach that the serpent was created *first*, man next, woman afterward, and *lastly* the

devil (or diabolos). As an anonymous writer says, "There is another point of view, in which the absurdities of the belief in the existence of a being called the devil, becomes apparent. It is this, that there is no necessity for a devil. A heathen writer remarks, the Deity should not be called in unless he is needed. This principle is an excellent one. Let us seek its application to the present instance. There is a certain recognized source of evil, of sin. It is the flesh: that is active by itself, and not in conjunction with the higher faculties. The works of the flesh are described to be these, "For the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary one to the other, so that ye cannot do the things that ye would. Now the works of flesh are manifest, which are these: adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings and such like; of which I tell you before as I have also told you in past times, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Now, may it not be asked, with confidence, if the flesh is capable to produce all these, what is left for the devil to do? Is there any vice, any deviation, which will not come under one or the other of these heads? The phrase to "suit like" is very expressive. Let anyone detail a vice, a suggestion of Satan, which is not a suggestion of the flesh, and then will be time for calling in the aid of the being called the devil. If the flesh does it, why have recourse to the devil? Why go a begging after a supernatural agent, when a natural agent is efficiently causative? Is it possible to conceive of two causes simultaneously operative to the same result? Let those who believe in the pre-Adamite devil show in what "his works" consist of Christ is to destroy?

It is further presumed that because the personal pronoun is often employed in connection with the "devil," it must therefore allude to the personal devil. The few following phrases are usually cited in proof of the personality of the Bible devil, "to destroy *him* that hath the power of death, that is the devil"; "destroy *HIS* works"; "resist the devil and *HE* will flee from you." But to the discerning mind there is no weight in such phrases, so far as proving the point in question is concerned. The Holy Spirit is also personified, and if the personification of sin prove its personality, the same mode of

expression with regard to the spirit will prove that the Holy Spirit is a person distinct from God and Christ. "But if I depart, I will send *him* unto you, and when *he* is come, *he* will reprove the world of sin," John xvi. 7, 8, xiv. 26; xv. 25. We also find that principles—good and evil—are personified. "*Sin* slew me," Rom. vii. 11 13. "Know ye not not that to *whom* ye yield yourself servants to obey, whether of *sin* unto death or of *obedience* unto righteousness,.....ye became the *servants* of righteousness, servants of *sin*?" Rom. vi. 16-20. "Lie not one to another, since that ye have put off the *old man* with *his* deeds," Col. iii 9; Eph. iv. 22. "No man can serve *two* MASTERS.....ye cannot serve God and *MAMMON*," Matt vi. 24. The Father is represented as one master—*Sin*, or devil-principle, the other master. Wisdom is also personified, Prov. iv.

The pre-existence of Christ is founded on passages *apparently* favouring the idea as easily as the false doctrine of the personal devil is *apparently* found in a few isolated passages and believed in, resulting from a mere superficial reading of the Scriptures, to the exclusion of *all* collateral testimony. Taking all things into account, we are able to arrive at the truth. Paul states that, "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also, himself likewise, took part of the same; that through death he might *destroy HIM THAT HAD THE POWER OF DEATH, that is the devil*" Heb. ii. 14; this clearly shows that the mission of Christ is intimately connected with the devil of the Bible. The doctrine of the one bears upon the doctrine of the other. Hence, not to scripturally comprehend the doctrine of the devil is not clearly to understand the doctrine of the Christ, who came to destroy the devil and his works. We present the following table of parallel passages for the reader's comprehension of this argument:—

Heb. ii, 14.—Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of the likeness of sinful flesh, flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same.

that through death and for SIN (in the margin, by a sacrifice for sin.)

he might destroy HIM condemn SIN in the flesh, put away sin.—(Heb. iv,

that had the power of death

that is the DEVIL
(diabolos accuser)

By one man (Adam)
SIN entered into the
world.—(Rom. v. 12.)

So SIN hath REIGNED
unto death.—(Rom. v. 21.)

NOW THE WORKS OF
THE FLESH are manifest,
which are these: Adultery,
fornication, uncleanness,
lasciviousness, idolatry,
witchcraft, hatred, variance,
emulations, wrath, strife,
seditions, heresies, envyings,
murders, drunkenness,
revellings, and such like.—
(Gal. v. 19, 21.)

FOR ALL that is in the
world, THE LUST OF THE
FLESH, AND THE LUST OF
THE EYES, and the pride
of life, (no personal
devil)—is of the world.
(1 John 1, 16.)

It seems scarcely credible that some among us should hold the existence of a personal devil, before the creation of man, who "hath the power of death;" from Adam to the close of the Messianic age. Paul further declares, "For if by one man's offence death reigned by ONE; (not by the pre-Adamite devil); much more they which receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by ONE, Jesus Christ." As a sacrifice, He became the sin-destroying power, that "he MIGHT destroy" sin personified, in everyone who believes the gospel of the Kingdom, "that the body of sin MIGHT be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin," Rom. vi. 6. For being in Christ by baptism we become doctrinally new creatures, "made free from SIN;" and when He appears the second time unto salvation to those who walk worthy of their high calling, "that he

SIN hath reigned unto
death.—(Rom. v. 21.)
SIN bringeth forth death.
—(Jas 1, 15.)

The STING of death is
SIN.—(1 Cor. xv. 55.)
Death by SIN.—(Rom. vi.
12.)

THE WAGES of SIN is
death.—(Rom. vi. 23.)
The CARNAL MIND is en-
mity against God, it is
not subject to the law of
God, neither indeed can
be.—(Rom. viii. 7.)

The Lamb of God taketh
away the SIN of the
world.—(John.)

He (Jesus) was mani-
fested to take away our
SINS.—(1 John iii, 5.)

So might grace REIGN
through righteousness unto
eternal life by Jesus
Christ our Lord.—(Rom.
v. 21.)

For this purpose the Son
of God was manifested
that he might destroy
THE WORKS OF THE
DEVIL (diabolos).—[1
John iii, 8.]

He that soweth to the
FLESH shall of the FLESH
reap corruption, and he
that soweth to the spirit
shall of the spirit reap
life everlasting.—[Gal.
vi, 8.]

MIGHT destroy" in them that which "had the power of death, that is the diabolos," when their "sinful flesh" shall be changed physically—our vile bodies "fashioned like unto his own glorious body," the first-born of that new creation, Col. i 15-18. Then shall be brought to pass the saying, "O death, where is thy sting? (or power) O grave, where is thy victory?"

The royal cabinet of the Messiah when manifested will not be formed of individuals preparing themselves to hunt up a pre-Adamite devil to destroy him, bent on the inglorious mission of seeking a myth, whom the Prince of Peace never knew, and as disappointed men give up their fruitless search, and then begin to assist Him in setting up the Kingdom; his faithful Saints will be composed of those who understand the doctrine of Christ, that the establishment of the Kingdom of God, the great salvation, will prove the instrumental means of suppressing the works of the devil, as shall then be found in the political organizations of this world, as symbolized in the Apocalypse, as 'the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil and satan;' the Seed of the woman triumphing over the seed of the serpent, restraining all evil, by establishing righteousness in the earth. And when the devil or sin-principle existing, embodied in men, bringing forth the works of the flesh, shall manifest the old spirit of disobedience, "fire shall come down from God out of heaven and consume them," then "death and hades" will forever cease to exist. Then and not till then will the mission of Christ be fully completed, the race of Adam—"swallowed up of life," by Christ destroying in them the devil, which is, the Lamb of God taking away THE SIN of the world.

Those who accept not the scriptural teachings concerning the doctrine of the devil, reject one of the "first principles;" in reality undermine the doctrine of Christ itself; therefore it behoves those who in doctrines show uncorruptness" to try the spirits, whether they be of God, and withdraw themselves from "men of corrupt minds," who have crept in unawares, or, since their fellowship with us, have departed from the doctrine of Christ," consenting "not to the wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ." It becomes those who earnestly contend for the FAITH once delivered to the saints, to shun all who cannot: "endure sound doctrine." "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good."

**TRINITARIANISM AND THE TRUTH,
CONSIDERED IN RELATION TO THE FIRST THREE VERSES OF
JOHN'S GOSPEL.**

THE "PRE-EXISTENCE" OF JESUS CHRIST—HIS BEING THE WORD MADE FLESH.

(*Continuation of "The Bible as a Law of Life and Immortality," from page 45.*)

WE have already said that all the religious heresies of the age are due to the amalgamation of Grecian philosophy with Scripture doctrine. Each system has been modified by man to suit the other; each extenuated. The immortality taught or brought to light by Jesus Christ has been confounded with the immortality of the soul taught by Socrates: the logos of John has been taken for granted as the logos of Plato: the doctrine of the pre-existence of souls so long believed by all men, has been set aside; the doctrine of the pre-existence of Jesus Christ retained in its room: and so, according to those ideas, is Scripture scholastically handled. In the matter of pre-existence the system of Plato is stripped of an exuberance too palpable for an adaptation to the letter of Scripture, and the letter of Scripture is made to furnish an exception in the case of Jesus Christ. This affords a *specious* proof of Christ's pure divinity. To believe the pre-existence of Him and not to believe it of man, is a sure recognition that he could not be man, and so must be Deity. The fixing the beginning of the soul of man at conception, or birth, adapts the Platonic system more readily with the Scriptural account of man's creation and propagation. Without this modification the doctrine of the pre-existence of Jesus Christ in the use to which it is now put as a proof of his divinity could not have been sustained. Thus mixed up then, a new system is produced. The truth is marred; the Platonic philosophy enhanced thereby. The facts on which the truth is based are made to support the latter. From these facts by this means, a new worship is developed, and in place of the elevating influence which in their proper place those facts should exert on those who understand the truth, the mind of man is degraded to an adoration of them so superstitious, that they have become within this superstition, fables to be denounced, and their influences, vices to be shunned. Antagonistic of the truth,

and contrary to the worship which, upon these facts, the Deity has established in the world, men from their Platonic ideas have imparted to them a different character from that which in truth they possess, and made themselves in consequence anti-christ, the man of sin, by their so doing. They view the same Jesus Christ which we view, but they view him through a glass blackened with the smoke of Grecian philosophy: they sit in Plato's seat and view him thence; from the Pagan point of view; *not* from the view Moses and the Prophets give of him, *not* from the view Jesus took of himself, nor from that the Apostles have taken. Through Platonic ideas the farther remote the history of Jesus fell back, the more wonderfully mysterious his history grew; and now, amidst this superstition, his life is clothed and hid within the mystic folds of a mythical dress, whose fabric, both warp and woof, is purely imaginary. The Man who was both crucified and pierced to death, another history is given of Him than that which is *written*: the Man who in his lifetime was both rejected and despised is set forth as being then the Deity himself: and as distance lends enchantment to the view, the retrospect of an event so markedly noted in the history of the past, pictures the little babe born of a virgin and cradled in a manger, as one not human. The joy with which the shepherds hailed his birth, and the gifts and honour which the wise men offered him, present indications of no common occurrence, but the event is magnified by the Man of sin into a mysterious picture of a babe reflecting the image of Deity—the Deity Himself in the form of a babe. But such ideas it must be remembered did not obtain in the minds of the shepherds, nor emanate from the thoughts of the wise men who paid him the homage due to eastern royalty, nor did they alter the natural impressions of the woman who bore him, or her husband who stood to him as his earthly parent.

Such ideas only sprang into being in the earliest ages of the Church, and did not prevail until the lapse of centuries. It was not until the fifth or sixth centuries, after much wicked disputation and bloody strife, they became the standard ideas of the Roman Church—the prominent feature in her prevailing creed. The Apostles did not entertain such a belief. They spoke of Jesus Christ as a man, and Jesus himself did the same. Jesus himself did not place himself above man, though he placed his authority. The words he uttered in his dying agony on the cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me." are most significant of the fact. And nothing more clearly indicates the kind of relationship he stood to Deity than the message he sent to his disciples after he rose from the dead, "Go, say unto my brethren I ascend unto *my* Father, and *your* Father, unto *my* God and *your* God." He distinguishes his brethren by the same kind of relationship to Deity as he distinguishes himself. Even were there nothing else to quote, these quotations from Jesus' own mouth, sufficiently refute the Trinitarian creed. They testify at least that it was not to his being the Deity was due the interest attached to his birth. It was not that his conception was miraculous, and his person a marvel, his cradle and infantine days were surrounded with tender and surpassing interest. It was not that he was an uncommon babe, as a child not flesh and blood, as a child not born from the womb, as a child not human; it was not because of anything of this sort he was so singularly regarded, for though miraculously conceived, he was still flesh and blood, bone of our bone, flesh of our flesh, a baby human, born of a woman, born with like passions as all men are born with, born to live, to suffer, and to die as all men are born to. The interest attached to his birth had its source from something altogether different from these ideas. We will come to it shortly. The babe presented nothing in his features to distinguish him from other babes. The shepherds were not told to go to see a child, whose brilliant face would at once tell its own tale, that a halo of light encircled his brow, and another that of his mother: no, but they were told to distinguish him by the clothes he was wrapped in, and the manger he lay in. Luke ii. 12. He was nursed as other babes are, his instincts were the same, and he grew up a boy without developing an appearance in any wise different from

other boys, and the while evince nothing in his conduct to mark him supernatural, nothing but what was promising or a noble life, nothing but what is noticeable as eccentricities—it may be—in the boyish days of all great characters, prophetic of their destiny, nothing but what has made boyhood in all ages the father of manhood. That he was miraculously conceived is no ground of evidence to assume he was not like other men, both in mind and body. Nay, rather, it was just because he was indeed man, that his conception so remarkable, was miraculous. Had he not been as other men, his conception would have been as equally remarkable, but not in the received sense miraculous, while his birth in such a case would have been against the order of nature, as never a miracle has yet been. In such a case he would have appeared different from ordinary flesh and blood, he would have appeared as so singular a conception would have suggested to the human mind, he would have appeared just as Trinitarians say he appeared in a form of flesh not common to man, in a form surpassing other men, he would have appeared as "a creature without example or resemblance, superior in every attribute of mind and body to the children of Adam" (Gibbon) he would have appeared as naturally remarkable as his conception was remarkable—as the natural fruit of so remarkable an alliance as that of the Holy Spirit with woman; so much so, that it would have been impossible for the Jews to have doubted his paternity, and mistaken him for one whose father and mother, and brethren they knew. But his conception was miraculous, his birth natural, and hence of flesh and blood common to all men. The miracle lies not in the immediate antecedents to his conception, but in his being conceived a man with such antecedents; and had he not been conceived such, the conception would have been an argument against his being a man in any sense save in the form of a man. So, here it is our faith is exercised, and the unbelief and hatred of the Jews accounted for. They could not believe the man they saw before them was the son of Deity by birth, and they were the more obstinate in their unbelief from the fact they knew his mother, her husband, and their children, and saw nothing in his countenance and nothing in his works to distinguish him above Moses and the Prophets, with whose history they were acquainted. But had he been dif-

ferent from other men, had he appeared as we have said, with as remarkable a likeness suppose—"his face shining as the sun, and his raiment white as the light," as what might have been expected as the probable result of so remarkable an alliance, then he would have been a demonstration which no eye could have been deceived with, nor tongue could have denied. But then, his birth would have been against the law of nature, and hence not so much a miracle, as a phenomenon unprecedented, unexampled, in all the operations of Deity. The conception presents nothing contrary to either Scripture or nature; it presents a harmony with Scripture, and a something supernatural, but nothing unnatural, nothing antagonistic to either moral or natural law, whereas, had he been born a being not exactly man, not of his nature and instincts, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," would be contradicted, a fig tree could bear olives, and a vine figs, and his countenance in compelling conviction that he was the son of Deity, would have disjointed his teaching from the whole tenor of sacred writ. The senses of man would have then rested on an unmistakable similitude of Deity without the necessity of an exercise of faith. Faith in Deity would then have been supplanted by the power of sense. Reason would have for ever been suborned to the bodily instincts, and the mission of Jesus Christ made of none effect in creating repentance toward God and faith toward Jesus Christ. But otherwise this is secured. The testimony of Moses and the Prophets is confirmed. Jesus Christ that now is, having been once in the flesh, having been at one time a man as his brethren now are, notwithstanding his being the son paternal of the Deity, is the brightest spot in the page of human history. In him a man, the "seed of the woman," the "seed of Abraham," and the "fruit of the body of David;" we see one of ourselves, brought up by his parents, a boy, a youth, a tradesman, and next a teacher. We see him live as other men, suffer as other men, and die. We see him buried, raised, exalted: and if he had not been man, to what purpose, according to the Scriptures, would all this have been to us? Wherein should we have seen an example of man living, dying, rising again, and taken up to heaven; wherein should we have seen the power of God manifested as certain and important evidence to ourselves that

we too may also live as he lived, die, rise, and reign with him. Why, it is because he was man that our faith in the Father is invited. He was a man, he died, and rose again, and the self same spirit that raised him—he did not rise of himself—shall also quicken our mortal bodies at the resurrection. Romans viii. xi. It is by this confession that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh, we are made to know of the Spirit of God in man. "Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God, and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God, and this is that spirit of anti-christ," that would make him Deity and *not* man, that would make him equal with Deity, and yet man. It is this confession that makes the Christadelphian's hope secure. It is Christ's flesh and blood-life we have to believe in ere we can believe in him at all. In believing this we acknowledge the power of God to raise man from the dead, we acknowledge the doctrine of the resurrection, we acknowledge the future restoration of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob to the kingdom of Israel, the promised land, and in the elevation of the saints as the kings and priests unto God in the future world. Jesus Christ being now one example *already* of this—of God's power exercised on man; he is the firstborn of these many brethren, the first fruits of the new creation from the dead, the earnest of the whole matter, it is the most potent reason for believing the whole of sacred truth. In believing Jesus was one of ourselves, we believe in God, and find security in the hope of our own resurrection and exaltation; we believe that as Jesus Christ *now is*, so shall we be, on the condition we hold fast our faith in the gospel he preached, unto the end.

The opinion some hold that Jesus was the son of Joseph, and not the son of Deity is as anti-christian a doctrine as that he was the son of Deity and son of man, and therefore, both Deity and man. The one opinion is as subversive of the truth as the other. The evidence against his being the son of Joseph is irresistible. The evidence is as clear from the general tenor of Scripture, as it is clear from the detail of his birth, that he was *not* an adopted son, but *the* born son of Deity. He is nowhere spoken of as having been while in the flesh, an adopted son. Now, however, he is the son of Deity after another fashion. He is the son of Deity by a resurrection that

dead, by a birth not of the flesh but of the spirit, and hence is a spirit or spiritual body on the same principle he was while on earth, a fleshly body. Because, "that which is born of the flesh *is* flesh, and that which is born of the spirit *is* spirit." And this is as much related to his brethren as it is to himself. They too at their resurrection shall be made sons like as Jesus now is. They will then be sons not by adoption but by birth—the birth of the spirit. Now they are flesh and only sons by adoption. They are not sons exactly as Jesus was while on earth—they are not born of virgins without the will of man as Jesus Christ was, but nevertheless in being adopted into the family of God, they are thus made sons "not of blood nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man," but by the grace of God, or spirit of adoption, through the belief of the truth. John i. 12 13, Romans viii. 15. And being thus chosen of God, as brethren to Jesus Christ, they become heirs with Jesus of the same inheritance, they are admitted to the same privileges, and so manifest and declare the same name as Jesus did. All the difference between the two is simply this—Jesus was the fleshly son of Deity by birth, his brethren the fleshly sons of Deity by adoption. There is no difference between them as to flesh and blood. The born son possessed the same instincts and passions as the adopted do, and adoption does not change the fleshly nature, but simply the fleshly mind, or thinkings induced by the flesh. The adopted war against the fleshly instincts. They walk not after the flesh but after the spirit. They turn themselves to God, whereas Jesus did not need to *change his* mind. He did not need to turn himself from the love of the world to love God. The love he had to his Father grew up out of the natural relationship which his conception and birth had created. It was a love naturally filial, engendered by a heavenly paternal care involved in the relationship the miraculous conception established. The relationship he bore to Deity at birth and from birth up to his baptism was purely a fleshly relationship, much on the same footing as had he been the son of Joseph he would have stood to Joseph. Hence in this we see the germ of all that he afterwards became as the inheritor of his Father's love, and the honourer of his Father's name, exactly on the same principle we should have seen him inherit Joseph's love and honour him had Joseph been his father. He was the

immediate son of Deity by Mary the Virgin, espoused by Joseph, and hence through Mary, "the seed of the woman," "seed of Abraham," and "the fruit of the body of David," but nevertheless the son of Deity. The Deity was his father according to the law of procreation in the natural course of things; and so thus being his father, He condescended to care for him as an earthly parent would do, and with a love such as a father cherishes toward his immediate offspring. Hence Jesus was greatly beloved and greatly cared for, and therefore trained in the way he should go in keeping with the law the Deity Himself gave to his people, and so made the example of what a son will become who *is* so trained. It is an example, an illustration from Deity Himself of his own precept, "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it." But in these things we refer more particularly to Jesus' history before his baptism.

For the Deity thus to create a special Son of Man for Himself argues nothing against Jesus having been purely a man. As much might it be objected that Adam who was not born of a woman, was purely a man. Nay, rather apart from other evidences, the objection seems weightier against Adam having been like his posterity than against Jesus having been a man. But mark the evidence. It is said Adam was made a man, and is the same not said of Jesus that he was born a man, that he "was made in the likeness of men, made like unto his brethren?" He too was a man, bone of Adam's bone, and flesh of Adam's flesh. They were only differently brought into the world, the one not less miraculously than the other, or, rather, the one more naturally as far as accounts go than the other.

Jesus Christ by being thus a son of Deity became the head of a new family of sons—for all men are in a certain sense the offspring of God (Acts xvii, 28, 29.) and therefore sons, but they are simply fleshly sons whose sonship ends with their destruction. But this son, born of a virgin, without the will of man, presents something new. This sonship, or family of sons, is increased not by a fleshly birth, but by adoption. The flesh profits nothing, either in the case of Jesus, or that of the adopted, save as it is the medium of life for the time being. "It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing." The Spirit did not quicken Jesus at birth more

than it did any man. It was only at his baptism he was the more quickened, or endowed for a time with a higher power; and again at his resurrection, from which he became a new creature entirely. He performed no miracle before his baptism. The flesh did not profit him in making him the son God, the Head of this new family. It was his obedience to the Word of God in the first place; next, the possession of the spirit in a supernatural manner during which his obedience was perfected (Heb. v., 8, 9); and lastly his birth by the spirit at the resurrection. The flesh was but a medium, a means by which he negatively attained his inheritance. It was against him, not for him; he opposed the flesh, the instincts of it; he did not profit by it, save in that he conquered it. So with the adopted. Adoption puts the flesh out of the question. It destroys the fleshly relationship: it takes no account of it. It places in its stead a spiritual relationship to Deity, and so necessarily places the adopted in the same relationship to Deity as Jesus Christ stood while a fleshly son. A son by birth and a son by adoption must be partakers of the same privileges *without respect to birth*, otherwise the two cannot be brethren. The only difference is, the one is partaker by right, the other by favor. God first loved Jesus because he was his *only* son, "His only begotten." Jesus could not have been an *only* son, had he been simply adopted; he therefore loved him supremely, and gave him the pre-eminence by right of birth, but he did not respect his person above the persons of others, he did not regard the flesh of the one as of nobler or higher blood than that of others, otherwise he could not have increased the family save by a repetition of births after the same fashion as Jesus was born; or, like as it will happen at the resurrection. For as the person of Jesus is respected now above that of man, and as adoption cannot change the flesh, and make man as Jesus is, the birth by the Spirit at the resurrection is thus rendered necessary to make the adopted on this side of it the born sons of Deity on the other side of it. Adoption simply places on equal terms with one's own, and provides and cares for those adopted, as for one's own, and such is the case with the brethren of Jesus while in the flesh. They are received into the same circumstances as Jesus Christ was while in the flesh, but this adoption can elevate no further. And therein lies all the difference between Jesus Christ as

he was and his brethren now. They are all sons of God through the *one spirit*, and all joint heirs of the one inheritance. If the flesh were to profit anything, that is to say, if a blood relationship had been respected by Deity, adoption then could not have taken place: but as all are of one blood with Jesus Christ, and as the Deity paid no more respect for his person as flesh and blood, than he has done or does to any other person, for "God is no respecter of persons," adoption secures to those believing the truth not so miraculously conceived as he, the same privileges which this circumstance, this fleshly relationship in which he stood to Deity, secured to him. He was loved on this account as no other man was loved. It was the accident, the fortune of His birth; but, he obtained by obedience a nearer, dearer, and everlasting relationship than that which the flesh secured, and it is of this relationship the adopted partake—Heb. v., 8, 9, compared with Heb. ii., 10, 11.) It was not the flesh that made Jesus what he was, but the Word of God, and so it is not in being one in flesh with Jesus, it is not in being partakers of *his* flesh and blood, we become his brethren, but it is in partaking of the words he spake, of the spirit he manifested, and of the life he brought to light through the Gospel. But had he not been by birth Son of Man and Son of Deity at the same time, or had he been only the son of man, by what means could adoption have taken place according to the Scriptures? Adoption would have been impossible in either case. Had he been son of Deity only, his flesh would have been of nobler and purer blood than man's, and have demanded a more fitting respect, and hence he could have had no brethren, sons of Deity, save by birth like as he was born. And had he been the son of man only, he would have needed to have been adopted himself ere he could have been a son, but where in all Scripture have we the remotest hint of this, and again, through what sacrifice could he have been adopted? The adoption of him would have been an impossible thing according to the Scriptures. His sacrifice of himself was a pure offering. He did not offer himself up *first* for his own sins—for "he was without spot"—and next for his brethren. He offered himself up for his brethren alone. But had he been only the son of Joseph he could not have done this, and hence there could have been no means toward an adoption. It is therefore to

his being both son of man and son of Deity, and yet purely a man, though without sin, we owe redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, and the adoption of sons. Our being flesh was the necessity for him being the same, and as this was the cause of his suffering and of his being on the cross forsaken by the Father, our fleshly relationship is of no service in making us his brethren—far otherwise. His fleshly relationship was of service to us but not to himself. But his spiritual relationship to the Father and our spiritual relationship to him, is quite a different thing, and is that only on which adoption is based.

The grounds on which the opinion is founded that Jesus was but the son of Joseph by birth and *not* the son of Deity save by adoption, are these,—

- 1.—That the original of Matthew's Gospel was Hebrew, and this Hebrew original did not contain the first two chapters now extant; therefore, the first two chapters are not genuine.
- 2.—That the term "virgin" was in use amongst the Hebrews for a young woman whether married or not.
- 3.—That the verse Isaiah, "Behold the virgin shall conceive," &c., hath reference to the son born of the prophetess to Isaiah the prophet.
- 4.—That in 1 Tim. iii. 16, the word "God" should be translated "which"—"Great is the majesty of Godliness which was manifest in the flesh."

To these we reply—inverting their order—First, that the "which" is a clearer interpretation of the sense of the passage, and of our faith than otherwise, inasmuch as Jesus was more a manifestation of Deity than Deity. Second, that the verse in Isaiah includes both the son of the prophetess and the son of Mary. Both were for "signs and wonders in Israel" and the greatest came last. The one sign prefigures the other. The duplicate meaning of the term "virgin" embraces both the prophetess, and the mother of Jesus. The detail of prophecy as revealed in its fulfilment presents nothing new as it were, but simply the same thing over, and over, and over again, but each time enlarged with new developments arising more from the necessity of the enlargement, or sublimer scale on which the event is produced than from anything different in the principle or essence of the thing: as for example, "In Ramah was there a voice heard, lamentation," &c., a prophecy which was three

times fulfilled, and each time in somewhat different aspects. The principle is the same in the less notable event as in the greater, the panorama is only extended, new figures are introduced, and the idea and meaning of the whole expanded. So this prophecy of the virgin in its relation to the son of the prophetess rolls up with it, the virgin "with child by the Holy Spirit" and is then fully drawn out at the birth of Immanuel. The sign from the prophetess heralded the sign from Mary. Maharshalahashbaz signified Him "who shall divide the spoil with the strong" when the enemies of Judah shall be destroyed, as were "the smoking firebrands" who vexed it then; or, as significant of the destruction of Jerusalem prophesied by Jesus because the people refused him, as they did Maharshalahashbaz as a sign from the Lord, and were taken captives then. The minor events include the germ of the greater. Fourth, the fact of a Hebrew copy of Matthew having once existed need not be disputed, though now there is no trace of it. But the want of a trace of it is singularly unfortunate for those who would have us not to depend on the Greek. The evidence is, that this Hebrew copy was *NOT* THE ORIGINAL, but a translation from the Greek original. Greek was the ordinary language of the time, and this is strong circumstantial evidence in favor of the original having been Greek. Again, the evidence is "that the Hebrew was the original text of Matthew cannot be substantiated: but, on the contrary, this Hebrew has been drawn from the Greek text, and disfigured moreover here and there with certain arbitrary changes," to suit the creed of a sect of Nazarenes who in mixing up Jewish ceremonies and Jewish tradition with Christianity, regarded Jesus simply as the son of Joseph, and hence rejected the chapters which record the miraculous conception. (See "When were our Gospels written?" by Dr. Tischendorf, published by the Religious Tract Society, London.) But apart altogether from this, the internal evidence of Scripture is, itself, the most conclusive proof, as we have already indicated.

Again, "Jesus is declared by Paul to be the Christian altar." "We have an altar," says he in Heb. xii., 10, which in being cleansed by the blood of Jesus is made identical with him. He was the altar of earth, or of unhewn stone: and in his making, or generation, he was begotten "not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh,

nor of the will of man, but of the Deity. To affirm that in his generation he was begotten of Joseph is to "pollute him." In admitting his altarship, and at the same time affirming his paternity to be of Joseph, and not of the Deity, as related in Luke, is to make Joseph the builder of an altar of

hewn stone—a polluted altar, upon which a man's nakedness had been discovered." See Eureka, vol. ii., page 223, (THE ONLY exposition of the Apocalypse extant.) By Dr. Thomas, of New York.

W. D. JARDINE.

THE VISION.

HAB. ii.

The vision tarrieth not
At the appointed time;
It speaks, by man forgot,
God's purposes sublime.

Yea, though it tarry long,
And seemeth not to grow;
Let faith and hope be strong,
The word of God ye know.

That word in spirit-power,
Before the Father's face,
Awaits the promised hour,
To manifest the grace.

Ye weeping saints, rejoice,
"Redemption draweth nigh,"
Soon shall his glorious voice
Your mercy testify.

Ye watchmen of the night,
Anticipate the dawn;
Pray, pray for Zion's light,
Pray for Jerusalem.

Great peace have they who love
The city of "the King,"
Who to the throne above
For her pure offerings bring.

They shall obtain the rest,
And Paradise of God,
And evermore be blest
In sonship with their Lord.

The vision hath an end—
Yea, he who shall, will come;
The man, at God's right hand,
To build Jerusalem.

D. BROWN, 1867.

CORRESPONDENCE.

WALKERBURN, Feb. 5th, 1867.

MY DEAR BROTHER ROBERTS,—I regret that when I sent you the remittance for the *Ambassador* I did not record my thanks to you for the Supplement, containing the discussion which took place in Union Hall. Verily you have done good service to the truth in publishing it, and all who love the truth will thank you for it. The evasive and sophisticated answers of G. Dowie, given to the questions put to him evince but too plainly that there is guile in his heart, and by consequence his ways are crooked. A faithful follower of the meek and lowly Jesus is not afraid to commit himself when he is set for the defence of the truth. He sets his face like a flint against all opposition, with a determination either to conquer or be conquered. What does he care, though

through the infirmities of the flesh on his part the enemy may gain a momentary triumph and chuckle over it? He knows that his Elder Brother, now within the veil, is on his side, and was once in battle for the same cause with double-minded men who tried to serve God and Mammon, who with their tongues used deceit, the poison of asps being under their lips, but withal had an amiable exterior. Outwardly they appeared righteous, but within they were full of rottenness and corruptness, their throats being like open sepulchres, from which issued corrupt and corrupting doctrines, of which the faithful and true witness told the people to beware. And so would we say to all who have put on the saving name, beware of the teachings that emanate from Union Hall, Edinburgh, and all who are in fraternity with them. The double-dealing with the

truth, by Mr. Dowie and his confederates, being now unveiled, the woolly fleece that disguised the wolf is now shorn off, and it is seen now in all its native ugliness, devouring and maltreating the word of life by their sophistical juggling, like Israel's prophets of old, "They have fouled the green pastures with their polluted feet," and yet forsooth they seek to claim fellowship with those who seek to hold the truth in its purity. Nay, avaunt all such. Let the line of demarcation widen, widen. Even so may it do, my dear brother. The nearer we approximate to our divine Master, in whom is hid the treasure of wisdom and knowledge, the farther shall we be removed from all such absurd foolishness as is taught by them. But we would fondly hope that the moral leprosy in some amongst them is in sight not deeper than the skin, and therefore curable. Let these have the courage to divide the hoof and come out clean, and henceforth hate the leprous garments woven for them by Dowie and Cameron, and be clothed with change of raiment.

But I must close by expressing the hope that you may be spared to contend valiantly for the faith, until the Lord comes. I remain affectionately yours, yours for the truth's sake.

WILLIAM DEW.

HUDDERSFIELD, Feb. 6th, 1867.

DEAR BROTHER ROBERTS,—In the January number of the *Ambassador* appears a letter from certain in Huddersfield to the church in Halifax. Lest I should be thought to be one of such, I wish to make it known through the *Ambassador*, to the brethren everywhere, that I withdrew from them a year ago. I did so on account of the unsoundness of the doctrine taught, and the continued resistance to a full investigation of the points of dispute. After being alone for many months I was joined by brother Thomas Holroyd, who had removed from Ripponden to this town. A few weeks since, we were cheered by the addition of a Sister, from Aberdeen, who is come to reside here. Her name is Mary Smith, daughter of brother and sister John Smith, of Aberdeen. Her immersion is recorded in the first number of the *Ambassador*. There are now three of us forming an Ecclesia in Huddersfield. We take our stand on the side of truth, and intend to maintain and defend the faith once delivered to the saints. Huddersfield seems to be barren ground, so little fruit has yet appeared from the amount of labour you and others have bestowed in it. We duly appreciate your labour among the Dowieites. We approve of the bold stand you have taken in the defence of the truth, and say "Go on,

brother, in the noble work you have begun, until the ground be clear and the line of demarcation be strongly marked betwixt those who hold the truth and those who do not."—Yours in the one hope,

JOSIAH RHODES.

GLASGOW, Feb. 12th, 1867.

225, London Road.

DEAR BROTHER ROBERTS,—I enclose a P.O. for £1 8s. 0d., as payment for 14 copies of the *Ambassador* for six months, exclusive of postage. In reference to your remarks in last *Ambassador*, on the deplorable state of things in Glasgow amongst the professors of the truth, it certainly must be a cause of profound grief to every man who loves God and His truth. I can say in all good conscience that I do not believe there is a man who has grieved or still grieves more over it than myself. It is now nearly sixteen years since I believed with all my heart the glorious gospel of the Blessed God. During that time, the meetings in Glasgow have been to me only vexation of spirit. They have always been partly composed of men who still entertain some of the doctrines of the Apostacy, although these very men profess to have renounced not only the Mother of Harlots, but all her progeny. This having been always the state of things in Glasgow, the few faithful ones here have always had to contend not only with the *enemies* of the truth, but also with its professed *friends*. But, dear brother, what have you or any of the faithful elsewhere done to bring the faithful ones in Glasgow together? You may think you have done what you could, but I am sorry to say I do not believe you have. You passed through this city not long since. Now you *must* know that there are some true men in Glasgow, yet you never stopped to see any of us. Now, I will tell you what you might have done. Had you intimated in the *Ambassador* that on your tour in Scotland, you would pass through Glasgow, and that you would stop for one or two nights here, and would be glad to hold a meeting for conversation with all those in Glasgow who know and love the truth, I believe the result would have been that there would now be a meeting in this city composed *only* of those who know and love the truth. But I must close at present.—Your Brother in the love of God,

J. MULLHOLLAND.

[The cure must proceed from within. External applications seldom avail in organic disease. Counsel is always taken as presumption by some, and thus more evil than

good is done by interference. However, we shall be glad on the next occasion to see those who love the truth, and are desirous of remedying the state of things deplored by our correspondent.—EDITOR.]

31, South Street,
HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA,
Jan. 31st, 1867.

DEAR BROTHER ROBERTS,—I read with much interest and profit, and look-out monthly with pleasurable feelings for the *Ambassador*. Much valuable matter is contained therein. You have fairly set forth the position of the parties in Edinburgh, who meet in "Union Hall." I say so because I know by personal experience. I found them even as you judge them, or rather as the *Word Judges*. How similar to the professors in this place. I have found it impossible to have fellowship with them, it is worse than unprofitable to have disputings with men of perverse mind. I think I have told you that I am *quite alone, yet not alone*. I have fellowship with the Father and the Son, and how comforting to know that all the *perplexities, trials, and difficulties* of this life are known to Him, and that he makes all things work together for the good of those that put their trust in Him. With Christian regards, &c.,—I am, yours in the faith and hope,

C. B. HUME.

JARROW-ON-TYNE, Feb. 4th, 1867.

DEAR BROTHER ROBERTS,—I notice what you say on your tour to Scotland in reference

to your call at Aberdeen. What you say of the brethren is too true I am sorry to confess. Being an Aberdonian myself, it comes to me with more force. But I say to myself "Am I guilty of what you say of them?" Then you may say, "Why have you not made your voice heard? the Nazarene fire cannot be in you." I may not be all I should be, and I pray to God to be able to do more. But let one or two meet me in private conversation, they will soon see what dwells within. The one that knows me will bear me witness, that is brother Gill. I would to God there were more like brother Gill. I am lonely here without him. Your attacks on Dowie and party are looked upon by those with me, in Jarrow, as the fruit of personal feeling against them, and not the *love* of the truth. This I cannot see. Hoping that such does not exist,—I remain, yours in the hope of Israel,

GEORGE DAVIDSON.

["Personal feeling" would very much disincite for attacks on "Dowie and party," for "Dowie and party" are estimable people so far as personal quality goes. We never had a personal difference with any of them. There has only been one difference all the years over which the acquaintance has extended, and that is, difference of faith and sentiment in things pertaining to the truth. The difference has become more defined of late. This is the only change that has taken place. There always will be some who will take an oblique view of such matters. Wisdom says, "Never mind."—EDITOR.]

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

LETTERS.—In consequence of the pressure of various kinds of business, we are unable to answer letters that come to hand, except in urgent cases, and have therefore resolved, for the satisfaction of correspondents, to report from month to month, in the order of date, the letters received. Our correspondents will please accept this in proof that no discourtesy is intended by silence. The letters received since the issue of the last number of the *Ambassador*, are as follows:—

Jan. 26, A. Harman, W. Ellis, W. Dent; 28, W. Norrie, W. D. Jardine, D. Brown, M. McDonald, C. Appleby; 29, W. Gill, Dr. Hayes; 30, J. Finnie, A. Tait, J. Grant,

W. Ellis, E. Turney; 31, W. Ellis; Feb. 2, J. Donaldson (Detroit, Michigan, U.S.), J. Coombe (Toronto, C.W.); 4, C. Appleby, E. Rackam; 5, D. Brown, G. S. Murray (Newzealand), H. E. Bond, Mrs. Hage; 9, Davidson, R. Goldie, J. Alexander; 6, W. Mitchell, E. Hare; 7, W. Dew, D. K. Ramsay, J. Coombe (Toronto), Mrs. Hage, J. Nesbit, E. Phelps; 10, Mrs. Hage; 11, Mrs. Hume, C. Appleby, J. J. Andrew; 12, W. Dent, F. Willis, J. W. Moore, Dr. Hayes, W. D. Jardine; 14, J. Mullholland, J. Phelps, W. Paine (San Francisco), J. Donaldson (Michigan, U.S.); E. Roberts; 15, A. Tait, W. Norrie; 16, E. Phelps, C. Bennett; 18, W. Newport, J. R. Parsons; 19, F. R. Shuttleworth, J. J. Andrew, W. Clark; 20, W. Gill, T. Haining, J. Gillies, 21, P. Moss, J. Robertson.

We had commenced to write "Answers to Correspondents," of which there is a large accumulation, when we were informed by the printer that the space was all occupied. We are therefore compelled to abandon our intention of clearing off arrears in this department in the present number, and must reserve that accomplishment for April. From the same cause, we have been obliged to hold over the first of a series of interesting paraphrases of the Apocalypse, on the basis of Eureka II, by brother Andrew, of London. It is in type and will appear next month.

D.B.—We were not aware that the article on Resurrection, by H. Sharp, of Milwaukee, reflected the outlines of a theory which excludes the resurrection of the unfaithful at the coming of Christ, while admitting that the accepted come forth in the image of the earthly to be changed into the likeness of the heavenly. To a person ignorant of the existence of such a theory the article itself would present no evidence of it, although on a second reading, it is clear that the article in question is not incompatible with it. The writer, however, may not entertain it; a word from himself will set the matter straight. Had the article been put forth as the exposition of such a theory as that referred to, we should, of course, have felt it our duty to refuse its insertion, believing that the Scriptural doctrine of judgment is one of the first principles of the doctrine of Christ.

J.D.—We refer you to the foregoing as to H. Sharp's article on "Resurrection."—As to the Lectures, we are sorry to say the printer is making but slow progress with the new edition. We are not in a position to say exactly when it will be ready, but will in all probability be able to state next month.—

(NEW ZEALAND CORRESPONDENTS, J. Brown, D. White, J. Graham, and others will please accept of this intimation. We ought to have written them months ago, but have been waiting for definite information to communicate to them, and at the same time for more leisure than has been at our command for the last four or six months).

A.T.—We admit that "thrashing" a man will not improve him, but we deny the application of this to our procedure in reference to the Dowieites. We simply made manifest their true position. This was a service to themselves, if they are true men; a service to others who were being insensibly blinded by their pernicious axioms; and a source to the truth which is thereby defined in more striking outlines to the general cognition. The interests of the truth are supreme. If any man stand in the way of those interests, he has himself to blame if he receive some of the blows struck in their defence. This is the predicament of the Dowieites. Their influence has for years operated adversely to the truth, and no man can fight faithfully for the truth without fighting them. Warfare with carnal weapons is prohibited, but spiritual weapons we may use with unsparing, if with just rigour. In this there is no "vaunting" or thinking evil. It were treachery and cowardice unpardonable to shrink from duty in the matter. A false love animates the man who, from humanitarian reasons, would spare the delicate Agag when he ought to be hewn in pieces with the sword of the spirit. We admit a wrong feeling can be brought to bear on this work, and how far any of our correspondents may appear to go is matter of opinion. Some of them may evince the pugilism of the old man. This, however, does not exclude the fact that there is a zeal which is divine, and a contention for the faith, which is sanctified by the highest motives.

INTELLIGENCE.

ABERDEEN.—There is an error in the intelligence from this place, for which the printer is responsible. The person immersed was the wife of brother W. GALL, of Fraserburgh, not W. GILL, as stated.

BIRMINGHAM.—The advertised lectures continue well-attended, the Athenæum Hall being nearly full every Sunday evening. Two immersions have taken place during the month,—viz. ANNE ELIZA PITT (23,) wife of brother Pitt; and MARY SMITH (45,) wife of brother Smith, both of whom gave gratifying evidence of their intelligence in the one faith before they confessed Christ in the prescribed act of obedience.

NEW BARNET, (LONDON).—The state-

ment of references distributed by brother Andrew, in a printed form, at the close of his lectures, is in type, and was intended for the present number, but must be held over till next month.

NOTTINGHAM.—Three additions are reported from the ecclesia at this place, the particulars being as follows:—Brother D. Graham, from the neighbourhood of Leeds, removed to Nottingham, having obtained employment there; ELIZABETH ANN THURMAN (formerly Adventist) was immersed into the saving name on the 7th ult.; EMMA LUCY WILKINSON, who formerly met with a congregation in Pepper-st, was admitted after a careful examination, which discovered the

fact that she had previously been intelligently immersed into Christ. The letter (from Brother Phelps) containing the foregoing intelligence also states that in a previous letter (not received) the following items of information were communicated: the immersion of LIZZY BIDISON, the holding of a social meeting, and lectures by Brother E. Turney.

SWANSEA.—Brother Goldie, writing on the 4th of last month, says, "We have succeeded in obtaining the use of a hall for our meetings and have engaged it for twelve months. It is the club-room belonging to a public

house. This seems a little objectionable, but being well situated and having a private entrance to itself, few would think it is connected with a public house. It is well fitted up with gas and furniture, and we consider ourselves so far fortunate in getting possession of such a place under the circumstances in which we are placed. We intend advertising a course of lectures to begin on Sunday first, and to be delivered by Brother W. Clement, of Mumbles, when we hope a little good will be done in persuading a few of our dying fellowmen to eat of the bread of life that they may live for ever."

EUROPEAN POLITICS.—The preparations for an extended revolutionary movement in Epirus and Thessaly in the spring are being carried-out on an extended scale. Large supplies of arms and ammunition are being brought into the country and the movement is extending to Basnia and the Herzegovina.—*The Globe, Feb. 16th.* There are disquieting rumours from Paris. Notwithstanding the opposition it has encountered, the EMPEROR persists in his determination to increase the French army. In the words of the *Gazette de France*, he "takes everybody able to bear arms." The "revised" scheme is described as being worse than the first. The original draft in the *Moniteur* put the total number of the army at 1,232,000 men, which was afterwards reduced to 900,000. The plan finally adopted, however, raises the total to 1,460,000 men. This enormous "impost of blood" cannot be designed for defensive purposes. The rumour is—the *Daily News* gives it—that the EMPEROR really means to give France her "revenge" upon Prussia, with the intention of taking Belgium, Geneva, and the left bank of the Rhine.—*Birmingham Journal, Feb. 23rd.*

AN AMERICAN COLONY IN PALESTINE.—A colony of 156 Americans who are said to be the vanguard of a mighty host who are coming up to possess the Holy Land, arrived some time ago at Jaffa, the seaport of Jerusalem. They brought their houses with them, which they have set up on land procured for them, and are well supplied with money, and agricultural implements of the latest Yankee fashion. They are under the guidance of one who styles himself President Adams, and who is the chief officer of the peculiar religious sect to which they belong. The sect is called the "Church of the Messiah;" and holds, among other peculiar points of faith, that

its members are of the tribe of Ephraim, and that, as the curse is now taken off from Palestine, the time has come for the lost ten tribes to return to the land of their fathers. There is a similar or identical sect in this country, who claim that the entire Anglo-Saxon race are Jews of the ten lost tribes, if which conclusion be correct, and the return to Palestine takes place, the country will be rather densely populated. The Yankee representatives of Ephraim's seed are somewhat disappointed in the condition of their fatherland. Although they are quite sure that the curse has been taken off from it, they find that thorns and thistles grow on every hand—that the land is not flowing with milk and honey, inasmuch as milk is only to be purchased at two piastres per ope, and honey is hard to get at any price, and that they must live by the sweat of their brow, unless they go into the Ishmaelitic business, and live on the sweat of other men's brows. Nevertheless, they have set up their tents, or rather their wooden houses, and have gone zealously to work to prepare for the reception of their brethren who are to join them from America this year. The Turkish Pacha received them with great kindness, and gave them all facilities for settling in their new homes. They are strong in office-bearers, having one president and two bishops; and stronger still in their faith that they are the people destined to fulfil prophecy, and to restore the ancient glory of Palestine. They do not care about converting the Gentiles who now surround them, and who own the Ephraimitic inheritance, but say that they will in due time dispossess them.

THE AMBASSADOR

Of the Coming Age.

"A wicked Messenger falleth into mischief, but a faithful Ambassador is health."—PROV. xiii, 17.

No. 34.

APRIL, 1867.

Vol. IV.

THE JUDGMENT SEAT OF CHRIST.

The continuation of this subject is reserved to make way for other matter. Meanwhile, our readers will find more than a substitute in *Anastasis*, which deals with the main difficulties that will come under review; and sets forth the bearing of judgment on resurrection with the power which is peculiar to the gifted and experienced pen of the author.

For the same reason, we are obliged to hold over brother Jardine's contribution on Trinitarianism, for which a substitute will be found below.

ON THE NATURE OF CHRIST.

BY DR. THOMAS'S DAUGHTER.

NEW YORK, U.S.A, February 22nd, 1867.

DEAR BROTHER ROBERTS.—The story of your recent encounter with "Dowieism" has been read by several in this city with great interest, because of the light you have thrown upon the fortunes of the truth of God among some of its professed friends, and the fate it is likely to meet with at their hands. The truth in these latter days has, in many places, fallen in among a class of professed friends, like those of whom you have spoken, who seek to make a smoother path and a broader way, wherein to journey to the heavenly city, than that which is already marked out. The progress of truth in the first centuries, after the days of the Apostles, was also accompanied by a "falling away" from the purity of doctrine and practice delivered by them. It came very gradually, little by little; but when men once begin to step aside from the form of sound doctrine, they will continue to wax worse and worse, until they are found identified with a state of apostacy corresponding to

the Laodiceans of early times, thus putting themselves in a position to be spued out of the Spirit's mouth at his appearing in his kingdom. In him they will not find a champion to lead them on to glory and honour, as was the case in the days of Constantine, the first so-called Christian emperor. They will have to give place to their more humble and *truth-loving* brethren.

We rejoice to know, however, that the truth in its purity is gaining ground on this, as well as the other side of the great waters.

There are, at this time, some interesting points of doctrine in process of discussion among some in different places, and we do earnestly hope that all parties engaged therein will be enlightened in the end, and that no cause of strife may arise therefrom. I wish, in this letter, to mention and enlarge a little upon one of these points. It is about the nature and constitution of Jesus Christ. Some parties affirm that he did not possess the Divine nature in any respect; that he was constitutionally a sinner, like any other son of Adam; that when a child he was no more than any other child, and when arrived at years of maturity the Deity saw that his character was good and suitable for his purpose, therefore he made use of him, and filled him with the holy Spirit at his baptism. Others affirm that he was constitutionally righteous and *incapable* of sinning, and devoid of the propensities inherent in our nature. Now, evidently the truth of the matter is not wholly on either position according to the Scriptures. That Jesus was constitutionally good and righteous there can be no doubt, but, that he was *incapable* of sinning we do not believe. If this were so, there would have been no virtue or merit in withstanding temptation; consequently, the temptation, as recorded in the New Testament, would have been a useless performance. We learn from the testimony that Jesus was created by the Father out of the substance of his mother Mary, at the time appointed by Jehovah—according as it is written—“When the fulness of time was come, he was made of a woman,” and the angel Gabriel appeared unto the Virgin Mary and told her the manner of its fulfilment—that the “Holy Spirit should come upon her, and the power of the Highest should overshadow her,” and, “That Holy Thing that should be born of her should be called the *Son of God*.” Now we know that, as a general thing, all children partake of the nature, constitution, and character of both their parents. No child is ever wholly, and entirely, and in all respects like *one parent only*, and we are not warranted in making an exception to this law in the case of the Son of God. From his mother, he derived all the faculties, propensities, and instincts which belong to the nature of the first Adam—as it is written—“He took upon himself the nature of the seed of Abraham,” that sin might be condemned in the nature which had sinned; and also, that he might be able to sympathise with *our* infirmities, and to “succour those who are tempted,” “forasmuch, as he also was compassed with infirmity.” This was the “body prepared” for a habitation of the Spirit in all fulness—as it is written—“A body hast thou prepared for me;” “Lo! I come to do thy will, O God.” Now we understand what was the nature of the *medium* of manifestation, but

what was that which was *manifested*? Was it merely the natural manifestations of a natural man? By no means. It is written, "He shall be called Immanuel," that is, being interpreted, "*God with us.*" This was God manifested in the flesh, for the first time. It could not be affirmed of any other man that ever existed, before or since, that he was God manifested in the flesh, although the Spirit of God has operated through other media, both in word and sign. He is called the "only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." Some might ask, how was the Deity manifested? We answer, in the *character* of the Son and his *mental attributes*.

The Apostle John says, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God," and, "the *Word became flesh* and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth." The *Word* of God is the wisdom of God; the thoughts or intelligence of Deity. This word of wisdom is personified in the Proverbs of Solomon, thus,— "I, wisdom, dwell with prudence and find out knowledge of witty inventions," with many other similar passages. Jesus Christ was the wisdom of God embodied in the flesh—"the express image of his person" or character, because it was ordained that in him should dwell the *fulness of the Godhead bodily*, so that it became essential that he should not only receive the Spirit, without measure, at his baptism, for the purpose of preaching the Gospel and working miracles, but, that he should also have power within himself to become *perfect in all virtue*; that he might be found without transgression and without fault from his infancy and childhood; that he might be the Lamb without spot or blemish. So, from the Deity, his Father, he inherited wisdom, thought, intelligence, elevation, and purity of character. Being aware of his divine origin and mission at twelve years of age, and perhaps before, he was able to discuss matters pertaining to the law with men of years and education—professed doctors of divinity. Thus we see that he displayed, even in the years of childhood, wisdom and knowledge inherited from his heavenly Father. "Being the Son of God he thought it not robbery to be equal with God," as all children are, in a certain sense, equal with their parents. The *natural illustrates the spiritual*.

In studying human character we find that the inward thoughts, judgment, or intelligence is something different and distinct from the desires, affections, and propensities; all these are right and good in their proper sphere, when directed and circumscribed within certain limits prescribed by the law of God. If the judgment is clear and well regulated and controlled by the word of God, it will entirely subjugate the desires and affections, and only allow them a certain limited scope. This, however, is a state of mind never completely attained to by us who are born after the flesh by the will of man. Jesus being the word, thought, or intelligence of his Father, consequently, the will of the flesh was far more subjugated and subdued, and he was not liable to be led away by excited impulses and perverted desires. The desires of his nature were in a *natural state*, such as those with which the first Adam was endowed—at his creation. Some of the first Adam's descendants,

however, have so nourished and cultivated those propensities (which in their simplicity are good enough), that they have become perverted and altogether *unnatural*.

In the consideration of this or any other subject of Bible doctrine, we should seek to harmonize all the passages bearing upon any particular point; and not accept some and reject others, which (to our limited comprehension) seems to convey opposition of meaning; when in reality there is no contradiction, but a beautiful harmony when rightly put together.

E. J. L.

THE APOCALYPSE PARAPHRASED

ON THE BASIS OF THE EXPOSITION CONTAINED IN EUREKA,
VOL. II, (DR. THOMAS.)

BY J. J. ANDREW, OF LONDON.

CHAPTER IV.

AFTER these things, I looked and surveyed the political heaven of the Gentiles, which had by this time become intensely black through the extensive development of the political and ecclesiastical manifestation of sin; and in consequence of the entire expanse being occupied by the sun, moon, and stars, evolved out of the mystery of iniquity, there was no room for the manifestation of Jesus and his faithful brethren. But before looking long, behold a door was opened in the heaven, and thus a breach was made in this midnight darkness whereby the Gentile luminaries were extinguished, and a way made for the rising of the Sun of Righteousness, and the shining of those who are to be endowed with the brightness of the firmament.

While contemplating this scene, I heard the same voice which had communicated to me the epistles to the seven churches, as a trumpet speaking with me and saying, "Ascend hither and I will exhibit to thee things which must come to pass after these." And immediately I and all others who were entitled to the gift of immortality were transformed into spirit-beings, and thereby became partakers of the Divine Nature.

And, behold, a throne—even the throne of David—was established in the political heaven, in accordance with the promise made to David; the realisation of which was all his salvation and all his desire. Upon the throne there was one sitting—the man whose name is the Branch. He was in appearance like a jasper and a sardine stone; the latter signifying that he was originally mortal flesh, formed from the dust of the ground, in which state, as the Lamb of God, he was slain for the sins of men; while the former emblem signifies that he had been transformed into Spirit Nature, and had thus become the manifestation of Deity in spirit flesh.

The harvest-time having now arrived, the earth was reaped, and was

visited with a very severe storm-period of thunders and lightning, by which the kingdoms of the world were subdued to the power of Jesus and his saints. The fertilizing rain of heaven then gently descended upon the parched up ground, with blessings on the nations, and the Sun of Righteousness arose with healing on his wings, and shining forth upon the tender grass; the effect of this was that a rainbow of an emerald colour was produced round about the throne, and thus was it proved that the covenant of which the natural bow is a symbol had now come into full force.

Round about the throne were twenty-four other thrones, symbolising the kingly honours of all those who obtain the reward promised to the church at Laodicea:—"To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I was overcome, and am set down with my Father in his throne." And upon the thrones I saw four and twenty elders sitting—the representatives of the whole company of the redeemed—as the anti-type of the twenty-four orders into which David divided the sons of Aaron. They had just begun to exercise their priestly functions, and hence they were clothed in white raiment, the garment of salvation; and they had on their heads golden crowns, indicating that they were victor kings also.

Before, however, these events had taken place, and when the throne in the political heaven was being inaugurated, a fiery flame of lightning and thunder issued forth therefrom, consisting of the Messiah at the head of the armies of Israel—Judah acting as his bow, and Ephraim as his arrow—surrounded by his joint-heirs the sons of Zion; all of whom waged the war of the great day of God Almighty against the Gentile nations in order to subdue them to the authority of Israel's king. In this was fulfilled the prophecy of Daniel, of a time of trouble greater than any previous one, the events of which filled up the storm-period that followed the smiting of the Nebuchadnezzar image with the little stone. The Messiah and his brethren being manifestations of the spirit, although represented by seven lamps of fire and seven spirits, were all animated by one spirit—the number seven being the symbol of perfection and unity.

In front of the throne, on the north side of the Mediterranean sea, there was a group of sea-nations which had been opaque with human blood, but had now become translucent with righteousness and truth, in appearance like unto a crystal; this state of tranquillity continued for a thousand years.

In the midst of the throne and in the circle of the throne there were four living ones representative of the glorified Israel of God banded together as an encampment. This camp was divided into four parts corresponding to the four points of the compass, after the manner of the Israelites in the wilderness; each part, composed of three tribes, being symbolised by one of the living ones. And the first living one had for its standard the Lion, to represent the camp of Judah; the second had the Calf for the camp of Ephraim; the third the Man, for the camp of Reuben; the fourth the Flying Eagle, for the camp of Dan. Each of the four living ones were full of eyes before and behind, symbolising that they were possessed of intelligence; and they were also aided by six wings each, to enable them as cherubim with flaming sword, to execute with the quickness of lightning, the vengeance decreed against the nations of the earth. And they had no inter-

mission day and night, saying, "Holy, Holy, Holy Lord, the omnipotent Deity, who was and who is and who is coming."

And when the living ones gave glory, and honour, and thanks to the one sitting upon the throne, who liveth for the aions of the aions, the twenty and four elders fell before the one sitting upon the throne and did homage to Him, casting their coronals before the throne and saying, "Worthy art thou, O Lord, to receive the glory, and the honour, and the power; because Thou createst all things, and on account of Thy will They exist, and were created."

THE POLITICAL HEAVENS AND THE SIGNS THEREOF.

THE political air is sultry. Omens of coming storm are observable on every hand. The clouds are gathering darkly, and send forth mutterings of thunder, and the earth reverberates with the struggle of forces at work beneath. War is brewing in several quarters. The prospect fills the world's brutish creatures with alarm. Israel's watchmen rejoice at it. It fills them with a glow of triumphant ecstasy. The world cannot understand this. The creatures of the flesh lift their hands and eyes with pious horror at the relish with which the scene of coming catastrophe and bloodshed is contemplated by Christadelphians. They regard it as a species of madness. Christadelphians appear to them in the light of bloodthirsty war dogs, constantly on the scent for scenes of violence. The world, as of old, calls good evil, and evil good; darkness light, and light darkness. No doubt, our modern Christians would have objected to the flood, and the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, and shuddered at the barbarism of Moses and Joshua in putting women and children to the sword, and the shocking cold-blooded ferocity of Samuel in hewing Agag to pieces. And what would they have said to Jesus, when he rudely overthrew the tables of the money changers in the temple, and expelled them with "a whip of small cords?" They are not Christian at all in the true sense. They are poor effeminate creatures of the flesh, who mistake the feeble impulses of the unenlightened, moral sentiments for the divine law. "Cursed be he that doeth the work of the Lord deceitfully, and cursed be he that keepeth back his sword from blood."—(Jer. xlviii, 10.) The world is ripe for divine judgment. The grape-bunches are ready to be reaped for the winepress of God's anger, and the time is

near at hand for the WORD OF GOD to come forth to the bloody work of treading out the wicked fruit. With this work, all who are fired with the zeal of the divine service, have sympathy; not that they delight in evil, *per se*, but that they have learnt that the stroke of judgment will alone break up the inextricable tangle of evil in which human affairs are, in the present state, involved; that the storm of divine vengeance will alone relieve the atmosphere of the foetid and oppressive elements with which it is charged, and produce health to the nations by the healthy respiration of righteousness and peace; that the relentless arm of righteous retribution—for in righteousness doth he judge and make war—is alone adequate to deal that justice to the peoples which will clear away all encumbrances, and lay the foundation or that state of things in which mankind, first being pure, will be peaceable, filled with goodwill and glory to God.

God has spoken; centuries ago, he issued the fiat which is complicating European affairs. He decreed the political entanglement which should break up Turkey, decimate the Pope, and bring Russia, with a multitude of people at her steps, to the mountains of Israel, to be broken by Jesus, the King of Israel, preparatory to his re-establishment of the kingdom of David, through which to rule all nations in righteousness for a thousand years. Is it a wonder, then, that those who have surrendered themselves to the power of Jehovah's word, should "lift up their heads" with quick, instinctive joy, at the accumulating symptoms of the approaching tumult of nations, when rushing like the rushing of many waters, God shall rebuke them, and they shall flee afar off?"—(Isaiah xvii, 13.) Woe be to the man who, professing divine allegiance, is unmoved by this voice of God; who, giving himself out as a citizen of the polity which is from heaven, is engrossed with the concerns of this Gentile order of things, and indifferent to the outspread writing on the wall—"MENE MENE TEKEL UPHARSIN." The brutish man knoweth not; he lifts his filmy, unintelligent eye on the heavens, and, like the beast of the field, he sees nothing. Let the wise bestir themselves. The Bridegroom is at the door.

Brother J. J. ANDREW, of London, writing on the 10th ult., says: "Since I last wrote you, the signs of the times have exhibited a more lively aspect. The several war-notes we have heard from St. Petersburg

are very significant—such as the publication of three or four despatches on the Candian insurrection, written last autumn—the toast drunk to the health of the insurrectionists in Crete by a Russian Archduke, at a recent banquet; the joyful remarks made by another General at the Sebastopol dinner, as to the hopeful signs in the East, and the prospect of a good time coming, when Sebastopol will be rebuilt; and, lastly, the order to call in all men in Poland out on furlough. France is getting rather nervous at these repeated growlings of the Russian Bear, but England seems quite unconcerned. The people here are too much occupied with Reform to trouble themselves about foreign affairs. Did you read the debate in the House of Lords on Friday night, in which the Duke of Argyle attacked Lord Stanley for his extreme neutrality about the Cretans? Lord Derby gave utterance to an ominous but truthful statement concerning the consequences which may arise from the present state of Turkey. I enclose a copy of it, from the *Star* of yesterday: “He believed it to be the earnest desire of the Porte to deal equitably with all its subjects, but the antagonism of races made this very difficult; and no separation of the Greek race, or of Crete, from Turkish rule could take place without a war, more frightfully sanguinary and atrocious than the world had ever witnessed.” Writing again on the 16th, he observes: “Events connected with the East have followed very rapidly upon each other during the present month, and I should not be surprised to see war break out before long. Not only Russia, but Turkey, Italy, and Austria, are all increasing, more or less, the efficiency of their army or navy, as you will see by the extracts I send you.”

The facts of the moment may be gleaned from the following summary:

DARK CLOUDS OVER EUROPE.—Under this caption the *Examiner* says: “We are just now arrived at one of those critical periods in the history of Europe, when *there are unmistakable signs of that general disturbance which has been long foretold*, and which may really come upon us, if the wisdom of statesmen and governments be unequal to the occasion. It is notorious that for some years past the political ties, whether of sympathy or interest, which bound the governments of Europe in something like federal system, have been relaxed; and as a consequence, that events of the greatest importance and significance have been left very much to be decided by chance and the current of events. As the result of this *laissez-faire laissez-passer* system, what do we see? That *no man would buy the peace of Europe at six months’ purchase*. The opinion is becoming universal that *the general tranquillity cannot be preserved beyond that time*. In all probability the thunder will burst in the East; but who can contemplate the mixture of races, nationalities, and creeds, which overspread the whole of that part of Europe with the hope that if once heard there, its roll will not be echoed afar off? It is perfectly hopeless to attempt to unravel the policy of any of the great Powers in respect to the Eastern question, *except, perhaps, that of Russia, which seems to contemplate the possession of Constantinople with a persistency and firmness of hope that in itself does so much for its own realization*. The

common saying in Paris is not now *après moi le deluge*, but, *après l'exposition vous verrez*. NEVER SINCE 1815 WAS THE GENERAL PEACE OF EUROPE IN SO CRITICAL A POSITION."

The *Globe* of the 8th inst. has the following remarks under the heading "Foreign Intelligence:—" "The sooner our country settles its internal dissensions, whether about Reform or Fenianism, the better. *A great war is impending on the Continent*. Despite the Paris Exhibition, and the unanimous desire of the Great Powers to maintain peace, the Eastern question is an irrepressible difficulty; and we repeat the opinion which we lately expressed that it now seems hopeless to expect that war can be adjourned to another year. It is notorious that urgent negotiations have recently been going on between France and Russia; and, if the information from Vienna is to be relied on, it appears that France is about to co-operate with Russia in a high-handed intervention. It is stated that France is ready to join with Russia in demanding of the Porte a complete cession to Greece, not only of the island of Candia, but also of the Turkish provinces of Thessaly and Epirus. *Such an act would be equivalent to the destruction of the Turkish Empire*; for unquestionably, in such circumstances, Servia would claim freedom for herself, and also the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. It is also stated, and we doubt not with truth, that the British Government will take no part in any such high-handed intervention, and moreover protests against it, alike on general grounds, and also as opposed to the Treaty of Paris of 1856. If the Turk would lie quiet, and let himself be dismembered at the pleasure of France and Russia, no doubt there might still be peace: *but we may rely upon it that THE TURK WILL DIE HARD, AND WITH HIS SWORD IN HIS HAND.*"

WAR RUMOURS.—Under this heading, a paragraph appeared in Reuter's telegrams, about the 10th of March, calling attention to a speech delivered by the Russian Grand Duke Nicholas, at a meeting of Greek Volunteers, in favour of the Cretan insurrectionists, and combining it with a violent article on the Eastern question, in the official *Moscow Gazette*, cited it as a confirmation of intelligence communicated to the *Augsburgh Gazette*, to the effect that the Russian military authorities in Poland and the Baltic provinces had received orders *to hold themselves in readiness for a campaign in the Spring, about the middle of April*; and adds, "SO THAT WE MAY SEE THE RUSSIANS ONCE MORE ON THE MARCH TOWARD THE PRUTH." It also states that there is "*but little hope that France and England would now draw the sword in defence of Turkey.*"

In a recent letter from Paris, the correspondent of the *Birmingham Journal*, describing a meeting of "all the astronomers, geologists, mineralogists, and geometrists at present in Paris," gives an account of a visit (reported at the meeting) by M. Turgan to the great Krupp Steel Works in Prussia. He says, "The journey had been made for the purpose of beholding the great steam hammer of 50,000 kilos, which has cost 2,800,000 francs setting up. This colossal machine is to be employed in the manufacture of cannon for the Russian and Prussian Governments: certain of these guns fire balls of 200lbs. weight, which

cost 5,000f. apiece. Each round costs 400f. The guns, destined for the forts of Cronstadt, have been paid 100,000f. each, and vomit forth their steel balls, weighing 150 kilos, or 300lbs. Each round will cost about 1,000f. M. Turgan further beheld in this monster foundry, the like of which he declares exists not in the world, and which employs 9,000 workmen at the present moment, a monster gun, destined for the King of Prussia, which is to weigh 50,000 kilos; each ball will weigh 500 kilos, and every ball fired occasion an outlay of 1,500f. M. Turgan is a man of science and experience, and his report made us shudder at the probable consequences of the insatiable ambition which seems to have seized upon every sovereign of Europe to outdo his brother in *providing against the eventualities of the war which ALL SEEM TO REGARD AS INEVITABLE IN THE SPRING*, and which in Russia has been openly pronounced as desirable in order to settle the long-disputed question as to "who is the strongest?" without which solution no solid peace can be regarded as possible. "France has told us that she possessed the greatest power of all. We have believed until Prussia and the United States have both alarmed her into silence. Let Russia join therefore with both these powers, so shall each one find its proper level, and Europe be no more scared by the threats of a Government which has not stability or power enough to keep its own people in subjection." *This was the opinion expressed not long ago at the dinner given by the Russian Embassy in Paris to the Russian residents*, in honour of the marriage of the Czarewitch, and, combined with the guns prepared for Cronstadt, *looks very threatening for that "universal peace" which was promised us by the Emperor as the consequence of the Universal Exhibition of 1867.*

The *Caledonian Mercury* of March 7th has the following editorial remarks:—"The clouds are gathering heavily around the Turkish Empire * * * On all sides, the very existence of the "sick man" is menaced. The insurrection in Crete is only a sign of the internal disturbance which is threatening to *break up the empire from within*, while the attitude of Greece and Russia proves that there are Governments without, quite ready to take advantage of the internal dislocation with which the Porte is menaced. From the new kingdom of Italy come notes of warning—though what particular quarrel the subjects of Victor Emmanuel can have with the Sultan it is very hard to imagine. When so many Powers promise to be in at the death, and to assist in the division of the spoil, it is scarcely likely that Austria will allow herself to be left out; while, on the other hand, Prussia, having already done much to despoil and weaken the last-named power, will hardly be willing that she should be again increased in strength without a corresponding aggrandisement for herself. *All the elements of a great war thus appear to be in preparation*, unless, through some circumstance difficult to imagine, the intervention of the Western Powers should bring about the same result without bloodshed. One thing appears to be certain—that *sooner or later THE TURKISH EMPIRE MUST BE WIPED FROM THE MAP OF EUROPE.*" The same paper on the 8th publishes the following:—"Russian policy in the East is once more exciting great uneasiness.

It is understood that the Government of St. Petersburg has addressed to its representatives in the various Courts of Europe despatches relating to the Cretan insurrection and the condition of Turkey, and it is believed that these indicate MISCHIEF to the Ottoman Empire. Mr. Layard has thereupon attempted to obtain information on this point, and asks for the production of the despatches. A new phase of the Eastern question is introduced by the publication of a circular by the Turkish Government, in which it is declared that no more concessions can be made to the dissatisfied, and that the Porte is quite strong enough to crush all rebellion. The responsibility of what may happen is thrown upon those European Powers which, under the mask of peaceful intentions, REALLY AIM AT ATTACKS ON THE INTEGRITY OF TURKEY. A letter from Belgrade, published in the *Independence*, states that the Servians are anxious for war rather than for peace with Turkey. "The agitation is so deep among the Christian population that we cannot restrain it much longer. Our preparations for war continue without pause, and with a rapidity which betrays the conviction of the Government that the crisis cannot be avoided. We know that Turkey wants both men and money, and that a simultaneous movement of the Greeks and Servians would place it in a very awkward position. The Prince and his Government will run the greatest risk if they shut their eyes to these dispositions of the people." The same correspondent says, that "throughout the Greek provinces of Turkey, similar notions and dispositions prevail, and that the Russian agents are working in the East as if the final crisis were on the point of breaking out." The *Mémorial Diplomatique* states that there is no longer any doubt that the journey of Garibaldi to Venice is connected with the Cretan insurrection. The leaders of that movement, finding their own strength insufficient, have invoked the aid of the Italian Liberator, who has yielded to their request, and is now occupied in organising forces to ensure the Cretan emancipation. The ports on the Western shores of the Adriatic are crowded with old soldiers of the General, who are taken across to Greece, and thence transferred to Crete by the Panhellenion. To this fact the attention of the Italian Government has been drawn by the Turkish Minister at Florence, with what effect the *Mémorial* does not state. It adds, however, that there is only too much probability that the

support given by Greece to the Cretan insurrection will cause the diplomatic conflict, which is at present going on to DEGENERATE INTO AN ARMED STRUGGLE." On the 11th the following appears: "Letters from various quarters, published by the *Indépendance*, throw some little light upon the diplomatic negotiations on the Eastern question. At Paris, the Russian Ambassador—Baron Budberg—is stated to be in constant communication with the Marquis de Moustier, and there has been an incessant interchange of despatches for some days past between the Russian Embassy and St. Petersburg. In the latter place, great satisfaction is expressed at the friendly attitude which France is assuming toward the Russian Court, and a general opinion is entertained that in the approaching settlement of the Eastern question, Prussia will also lend her support to the pretensions of the NORTHERN POWER. The position of this country is not, perhaps, one of the most dignified. Great Britain is said to be waiting until the other Powers have agreed upon a solution of the Ottoman difficulties. If they decide upon such a one as she can accept, she will lend her influence to carry it out; if not, she will continue her policy of non-intervention. * * * It is less on the side of Greece than on that of Servia that the present danger of Turkey lies. The special informant of the *Morning Herald* states that the Government of Prince Michael has declined the proposals of the Porte, and demands the evacuation of the fortresses without conditions. In anticipation of the rejection of its demands by the Porte, the Servian Government has commenced the concentration of its forces on the Bosnian frontier, and is commencing preparations for besieging the citadel of Belgrade forthwith."

It is impossible, the *Times*' correspondent thinks, for the British Government any longer to overlook the fact that the hour is at hand when the interests of all Europe will call into existence a GREEK STATE sufficiently powerful to take up an independent position in the Eastern part of the Mediterranean.—(See Zech. ix. 13-14. *Editor Ambassador*.) The Italian Government has had three vessels of war for some time in the Candian waters. The *Italia* now announces that this number of vessels is to be considerably augmented, and adds— "Italy is preparing for the grave events which may take place in the SPRING, and which everybody anticipates." "The Italian fleet," writes the Florence correspondent of the *Débat*, "collected at Cagliari, under

the orders of Admiral Ribotti. will leave for the Levant in a few days. *Between this and the month of April, events are expected to take place in the East; and Italy appears destined to play a considerable part in them—a part of conciliation rather than of war—a part which it is difficult to define, but which it is easy to foresee.*” The despatches addressed by the Russian Foreign Minister to Baron Brunnov, composed originally in French, translated into Russian for the Russian press, and thence retranslated into some language of Western Europe, have just made their appearance in our newspapers, after having been summarized by telegraph several days ago. “*Sick man, sick man,*” is all their burden; and the echo of public opinion has by this time been trained, and is quite content to reverberate, “*Sick man, very sick man.*” “*Dying man,*” repeats the docile Duke of Argyll, and points out the discoloration on his face, and the hues of advancing decay and dissolution. “*Some discoloration is there, certainly; but what we want to know is whether it comes more by nature or by the garrotter’s clutch. This issue cannot long be shirked.*”—*Pall Mall Gazette*, March 14th.

Prince Michael, of Servia, (at present an integral part of European Turkey) demands the independence of that province, and as will be seen from the foregoing, is prepared to back his demands by military forces. Russian influence inspires this attitude. Greece is aiding a similar demand on the part of Crete, Epirus, and Thessaly. Turkey’s difficulties are greatly increased by the attitude taken by one of its servants in another part of its dominions, viz. Egypt: On this point, we quote the following from the *Caledonian Mercury*, which is confirmed by intelligence, published in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, on the 9th ult.

“The Viceroy of Egypt has chosen the present moment for pushing his claims to a loftier title than the extremely modest one which he now bears, and for increased powers corresponding to the increased importance of his rank. He claims, with the support of the balance of public opinion in the West of Europe, the right to change his title, and with it the power of directing his kingdom as he will, of raising troops, and of taxing or of remitting taxation—in effect, of acting as an entirely independent sovereign, save for a nominal allegiance to the Sultan. There are many reasons why these demands should be supported by the friends of peace in this country and in

France, since the more those two States can accustom themselves to regard Egypt as capable of governing and defending herself, the farther off will be the melancholy prospect of that country becoming, as at the end of the last century, the battle-field of two rival Powers. It would thus appear that the elements of dissolution already exist within the limits of the Turkish Empire itself.”

So much for the “Eastern question.” The war spirit extends elsewhere. On March 16th, the French Foreign Minister made the following declaration in the Senate:—“In presence of the partial realisation of the unity of Germany, what is our duty? We must be firm and precise; there must be no hesitation and no compromise. *If it be thought that France has lost a single centimetre of her height, WE MUST DRAW THE SWORD. I prefer the solemn storms of war to a morbid disquietude, in which our strength and prosperity would gradually be extinguished.*” This throws light on the Emperor’s scheme for increasing the army to over a million of men. In Italy, an immense agitation prevails, consequent on a dissolution of Parliament on a question characteristic of the ending of the papal-beast (1260 day) period, viz. whether the ecclesiastical property of the country shall not be converted to national uses. Garibaldi is making an electoral tour of the country. Speaking of Rome in one of his speeches, he says: “Those lordly priests, who for so many ages have enjoyed that city, have defiled and trailed it in the mire, and made of it a sink and a sewer, shall be made to know that at length the time has arrived for ending their work of soiling or staining us, and for abandoning to us our rightful capital. Italy has plenty of valorous men to take it by arms, but I do not believe that force will be required, for Rome is legally ours; consequently, we will go to Rome as though we were entering a room in our own houses. I hope it will not be necessary to take it by arms, though it would be perfectly easy to do so, for we are accustomed to enterprises far more arduous.” A little later he referred to the Tonello mission, denouncing those who “bargain with the priests, with the accomplices of priests, and with the protection of priests, denouncing the priests and those who covenanted with them”; this last allusion being manifestly to the promoters of the unpopular Free Church Bill. He had not calculated the possible effect of such denunciations on a populace intoxicated by the

enthusiasm of the hour even more than by the enjoyment of a long-accustomed liberty. On the following evening, people assembled in front of the palace of the Patriarch, raising a cry of "Death to the priests!" threw stones at the windows, and compelled the occupants of the houses to hang out flags and display lights. The police were unable to restore order until aided by the National Guard. This indicates the temper of the populace in reference to the Papacy, whose days are nearly run. The *Daily News* correspondent, writing from Rome in the beginning of the month, reports that the great annual Carnival was in progress, but "dragged." He says, "the more educated portion of the Roman people have ample reason for abstaining from the so-called "festivities" of the period. During the last few days, the police have taken to domiciliary visits and to wholesale arrests. On one day, the 25th February, more than fifty persons were arrested without any charge being made against them, in the single district of Monti. As many more received timely warning of the coming of the police, and saved themselves by flight. By way of checking the gloom which not unnaturally results from a state of things such as this, the authorities have taken the precaution of *strengthening the military posts in all*

parts of the city. In every open place, throughout the afternoon, detachments of troops are drawn up *ready to fire on the populace at a moment's notice*, and by way of prologue and epilogue to the amusements of every day, *the army is marched up and down the streets with colours flying and drums beating.*"

Spain is in the throes of a bloody revolution; Ireland is paralysed by the somewhat formidable rowdiness of the Fenians; in America, peace trembles in the balance. Everywhere, agitation, uncertainty, pre-*sage of evil*; "men's hearts failing them for fear, looking for those things that are coming on the earth." God speed the crisis which will turn the kingdoms of this world into "the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ:" a period of unprecedented war, calamity, and confusion will ensue; but after the storm, the sun of righteousness will shine out upon the scene, and there will be "Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace and goodwill among men."

EDITOR,

March 19th, 1867.

DEATH AND LIFE.

"By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned."—(Rom. v, 12.) This is a divinely revealed truth that the perversity of man has endeavoured to explain away into an entirely opposite sense to what the words in their plain reading convey. Popular teaching is, that man is an immortal being, and cannot die. That although to all appearance he dies, in reality he only begins to live. That there is that within him which, though unseen, is, by the death of the body, set free, and enters on a fuller and freer state of existence. Now, what proof can be adduced for this theory? The proof would require to be clear and full to support a theory that is opposed to all that we can discover by reason or observation. The stern undeniable fact—a fact of daily experience—is, that man dies, and

immediately begins to decompose, and becomes so loathsome that we are fain to get rid of our most loved ones and cover them in the grave from our sight; and what have we to set aside this fact—this evidence of our senses? What proof that it is all mere illusion, a mere appearance, while the real person is not dead, but away to heaven or hell? Death is to a man a dismal prospect, which he knows no means of averting. He has, therefore, formed and cherished the idea in his mind that there must be something in him which will escape the wreck of corruption which death brings him to, and soar away to elysian fields of bliss beyond the bounds of time and space. It was upon this inherent longing for immortality that the ancient heathen philosophers based the idea of the immortality of the soul; but that idea, like its basis, is only a dream. No one

ever saw that "immortal" thing; no physiologist can say where in man's body it is located, nor say where in that particular part of his organization is the seat of the immortal soul! If it is a substance, and nothing but a substance can exist, then it must have space for action, to lie, stand, or move. All known entities, whether solids, fluids, or gases, are material substances, and have component parts and affinities, why then assert the existence of a substance that has never been seen or felt, and that cannot be defined? A doctrine so unphilosophical would require the strongest and most direct demonstration that the divine writings can give of its truth. Does the Bible give such demonstration, or any proof at all? The teachers of popular religion say it does. We say it teaches the opposite. Extremes cannot meet; if therefore we find the opposite proved, the other must go to the wall.

Modern so-called Christianity is based upon the existence of an immortal soul. Hence its teachers contend for it as for a matter of life and death; because, if there is no such thing, the whole superstructure must fall. The shorter catechism gives their hope in the following terms, which will be found to express the hope of all Protestant communities:—"The souls of believers are, at their death, made perfect in holiness, and do immediately pass into glory, and their bodies being still united to Christ, do rest in their graves until the resurrection." Where in the Bible do we find a similar statement? None of the men of faith that lived and died before Paul's day had passed into glory, for the apostle says of them, "These all died in faith, *not* having received the promises; God having foreseen some better thing for us, that they without us might *not be made perfect*."—(Heb. xi, 13, 39, 40.) Here the Catechism and the Bible are in direct opposition. Paul says these faithful worthies (men, too, of whom the world was not worthy—v 38) received *not* what God had promised them, and were *not made perfect in holiness*, nor will be until all the believers of the promises are raised from death, and then as heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ, they shall all be *glorified together with Him*.—Rom. viii, 17. This places the "perfection," or reward, in the still future, and gives no indication of anything in the interval. Now, man is either mortal or immortal; partly mortal or partly immortal. That he is not immortal, the evidences of our senses

proves, and likewise that all we ever saw of man is mortal and must die. God only can tell whether any part of him is deathless and escapes the wreck of corruption. Now we find that when Adam sinned the sentence pronounced upon him was "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."—(Gen. iii, 19.) And lest he should eat of the tree of life and live for ever, he was put out of the garden. We don't find here that any exception was made for that part of man which is alleged to be "spiritual" and cannot "eat bread." The sentence was pronounced upon the man as he stood. He was entirely formed out of the ground, and so he is doomed to return entirely into it again. As Solomon says, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return to the God who gave it."—(Eccles. xii, 7.) Yes; but some will say "the spirit is the man, and that is what escapes the wreck of corruption." If that were so, it would require to be proved that this spirit was Adam, and that he existed before his formation out of the ground, or at least separate from it, and that thereby Moses' account was deficient; that instead of a formation of Adam out of the ground, he should have said that "there was an amalgamation of Adam the spirit with a body made out of the ground;" but as neither Moses nor Solomon *did* say so, and as God did not make any such exceptional reference in the sentence passed upon Adam, we must reject the assertion of separate spiritual existence.

But further, Solomon says that in the matter of death there is no difference between man and the beasts; "Even one thing befalleth them, as the one dieth so dieth the other; yea they have all one breath (*spirit*—the word used in ch. xii, 7); so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast, for all is vanity. ALL GO TO ONE PLACE, ALL ARE OF THE DUST, AND ALL TURN TO DUST AGAIN."—(Eccles. iii, 19, 20.) There were people in Solomon's time, just as there are such now, who thought there was a difference between the spirit of a man and that of a beast; but he thought the wisdom which God had given him could say there was no difference, and challenged proof for the opposite notion:—"Who knoweth that the spirit of man goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast goeth downward to the earth?" That, reader, is an unanswered question. "All go to one

place" says Solomon; who knoweth that they have different kinds of spirits? God formed man and gave him spirit; God formed the beasts and gave them spirit; for "he is the God of the spirits of all flesh."—(Num xvi, 22.) And what is that spirit which God gave them? It is his own spirit, for we read that "if He set His heart upon man, if He gather to Himself His spirit and His breath, all flesh shall perish together, and MAN SHALL TURN AGAIN UNTO DUST. IF NOW THOU HAST understanding hear this."—(Job xxxiv, 14, 16.) It is not the man, the thinking, acting man, that is thus gathered to God, but his own spirit in which the man "lived and moved and had his being."—(Acts xvii, 28.) And the man, what of him? *Man shall turn again to dust*, and his thinking powers perish with him; for Solomon says, "The dead know not anything"—(Eccles. ix, 5.) And in Psalm cxlvi, 3, 4, we read "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man in whom there is no help; his breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence."—(Psalm cxv, 17, and vi, 5; Isaiah xxxviii, 18, 19.) This spirit then is not the man, but something which the man receives and retains while living, and gives up at death. It is written of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and many others that "they gave up the spirit, died, and were gathered to their people." For one to give up a thing implies that the giver remains.

But another may say, "that may be true of the spirit, but the soul is the man, and it does not die." Well, we find in Ez. xviii, 4, that God says "All souls are mine * * * and the soul that sinneth it shall die." What "shall die" cannot be deathless? "The wages of sin is death."—(Rom. vi, 23.) If any man can lay claim to exemption from sin, he may reasonably hope to escape death; but if not, he must "go the way of all the earth." "For there is none who can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him, that he should still live for ever, and not see corruption."—(Psalm xlix, 7, 9.) There is then no escape from dying to the natural man; the redemption that the Deity promises is redemption out of the death state—the grave. In this same psalm, v. 15, the writer says, "But God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave; for He shall receive ME." He had no idea of his soul being deathless, or it would not

have required redemption from the power of the grave. In such a case it would not have been exposed to the grave at all. The testimony of the Scriptures is thus shewn to teach the absolute mortality of both man and beast—that the one has no pre-eminence over the other in that respect; if the man exists after death, so does the beast, "For all go to one place, all are of the dust, and all go to the dust again."

Immortality, then, not being possessed by man naturally, he must, in order to possess it, receive it some other way. Such is the positive teaching of the Scriptures "Eternal life is the gift of God, through Christ Jesus our Lord."—(Rom. vi, 23.) "Because I live," says Jesus, "ye shall live also."—(John xiv, 19.) He does not say "because ye have an immortal soul ye shall live with me;" He does not say "the life ye now have will continue." No; the cause of eternal life is in Himself, no man has it. He is "the resurrection and the life." "As the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in himself."—(John v, 26.) The life comes from the Father to man through the Son. "God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son. He that hath the Son (by faith) hath life (by faith); he that hath not the Son hath not life."—(1 John v, 11, 12.) It is by "faith" we say that any one now has this life, because it is said to be in "His Son." It is reserved in His keeping until the time for its actual reception by those who may be found worthy of it. Paul said to the Colossian Christians "Your life is hid in Christ with God."—(iii, 3.) Until Christ appear again none will receive it; for the next verse says "When Christ our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory;" and Paul says concerning his own hope of life, (for he wrote to Titus that eternal life was a matter of hope—1, 2) "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day, and not me only, but unto all them also that love His appearing"—2 Tim. iv, 7, 8.) He did not expect to "immediately pass into glory," he expected to have to wait until "that day" when all the lovers of Christ's appearing would share it with him; the "day" when he would attain to "that resurrection out from among dead ones" which he so much desired—(Phil. iii, 11.) That "day" for which such as he "groan within them-

selves *waiting* for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of their body."—(Rom. viii, 23.) For, says Jesus, "Thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just."—(Luke xiv, 14.) From the testimonies adduced the reader will see that it must be so. Life is the basis of, and therefore essential to existence; and, as man dies, so he must be raised up again to life before he can receive a never-ending reward. Without a resurrection, no eternal life, no glory, no reward can be had; hence we read that "life and incorruptibility were brought to light by Christ through the Gospel."—(2 Tim. i, 10.) Life *with corruptibility* we now have, and it therefore comes to an end; those who shall receive life *with incorruptibility* will have that which will never come to an end. Such a life can only be obtained by an intelligent faith in "the things concerning the

kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ,"—(Acts viii, 12,)—and immersion into that "name" for the remission of sins,—(Acts ii, 38,)—after which "by a patient continuance in well-doing" those who "seek for glory, and honour, and immortality" will have eternal life rendered to them "in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, who shall render unto every man according to his deeds; but unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, He will bestow indignation, and wrath, and everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord."—(Rom ii, 6-11, 16; 2 Thess. i, 9.) Reader, which of these portions will be yours? Give all diligence, that you may be found of Him in peace on that day.

Aberdeen.

W. GILL.

THE COMING AND KINGDOM OF CHRIST IN RELATION TO THE GOSPEL.

REFERENCES DISTRIBUTED IN PRINTED FORM AT THE CLOSE
OF LECTURES IN LONDON.

FIRST LECTURE.

THE SECOND APPEARING OF JESUS THE CHRIST.

Proofs from Scripture:—

Matt. xvi. 27.	Heb. ix. 28.
" xxiii. 39.	1 Cor. i. 7.
" xxiv. 30, 42, 44.	Philip. iii. 20, 21.
" xxv. 6.	Col. iii. 3, 4.
Luke xii. 37, 38.	1 Timothy vi. 13, 14.
" xix. 12, 13.	Titus ii. 12, 13.
Johr. xiv. 2, 3.	1 Thess. i. 9, 10.
Acts i. 11.	1 " iii. 12, 13.
Zech. xiv. 4.	1 " v. 2.
Acts iii. 19 to 21.	1 " v. 23.
1 Peter i. 6, 7.	2 " iii. 5.
1 " i. 13.	Rev. i. 7.
1 " v. 4.	" iii. 11.
1 John ii. 28.	" xvi. 15.
1 " iii. 2.	" xxii. 7.
James v. 7, 8.	

*The Second Advent is the only hope of
believers:—*

Col. i. 5.	Titus ii. 13.
" i. 21 to 23.	Romans viii. 24, 25.
Ephes. iv. 4.	Heb. iii. 6.
1 Timothy i. 1.	

THE OBJECTS OF JESUS CHRIST'S ADVENT.

1.—*He comes to raise from the dead those of
His own household, and then judge them:—*

Dan. xii. 1, 2.	Romans ii. 16.
1 Thess. iv. 16, 17.	" xiv. 10, 12.
1 Cor. xv. 22, 23.	2 Cor. v. 10.
1 John iii. 2.	2 Timothy iv. 1.
John v. 22.	Matt. xxv. 31 to 34, 41.
Acts x. 42.	

2.—*He comes to punish the Gentile nations
for their sins:—*

Dan. xii. 1.	Joel iii. 1, 2.
Isaiah ii. 11, 12, 19.	Isaiah lxvi. 15, 16.
" xvii. 12, 13.	" xxxiv. 2, 3.
" xxiv. 21, 22.	Luke xxi. 25 to 27.
Zech. xiv. 1 to 4.	" xxi. 34, 35.

In this work He will be assisted by the
resurrected righteous:—PSALM cxlix. 5 to 9;
1 Cor. vi. 2; Zech. xiv. 5.

3.—*He comes to restore the Jews to their own
land, and make them the greatest nation on
the face of the earth:—*

Deut. xxx. 1 to 3.	Joel iii. 1, 2.
Isaiah xi. 11 to 13.	Zech. xii. 9, 10.
" xliii. 5, 6.	Micah vii. 15 to 17.

Jerem. xxxi. 10. Ezek. xx. 37 to 38.
Ezek. xxxvii. 21 to 27.

4.—*He comes to establish His kingdom
on the earth.*—

Psalms lxxii. 1, 2. Isaiah lx. 12.
" " 7 to 11, 17. Jerem. xxx. 11.
Isaiah ix. 6, 7. Micah iv. 6 to 8.
Luke i. 32, 33.

*This kingdom will be given to all who have
been found worthy of eternal life.*

Dan. ii. 44. Rev. xx. 4.
" vii. 18. " v. 10.
Romans viii. 17. " ii. 26, 27.
2 Timothy ii. 12.

*This kingdom constitutes the Gospel which
Jesus and His Apostles preached, a belief of
which is necessary for salvation.*—

Matt. iv. 17. Acts viii. 12.
" vi. 33. " xxviii. 30, 31.
Acts i. 3. " xix. 1, 8.
Mark xvi. 15, 16. Ephes. i. 12, 13.

SECOND LECTURE.

THE GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM.

The word "Gospel" means good, or glad tidings. Compare Luke iv. 18, with Isa. lxi. 1.—compare Mark i. 14, with Luke viii. 1.

The Gospel of the Bible is glad tidings of the Kingdom of God:—Mat. iv. 23; Mark i. 14.

A belief of this glad tidings is necessary for salvation:—Mark xvi. 15 and 16.

The Kingdom of God, the Kingdom of Heaven, and the Kingdom of Jesus Christ are but different names for one and the same Kingdom. Compare Mat. xiii. 11, with Mark iv. 11;—compare Mat. xix. 14, with Mark x. 14;—compare 2 Pet. i. 11, with Eph. v. 5.

Full particulars of this Kingdom are to be found in the writings of Moses and the Prophets:—Acts xxviii. 23;—Gal. iii. 8;—Heb. iv. 2;—Rom. i. 1, 2.

The Gospel preached to Abraham:—Gen. xii. 1, 2, 3, 7;—xiii. 14, 15;—xv. 18.

The same Gospel preached to Isaac and Jacob:—Gen. xxvi. 2 to 5;—xxviii. 4, 12, 13;—xxxv. 11, 12;—Heb. xi. 8, 9, 13.

The seed of Abraham is the CHRIST:—Gal. iii. 16;—Gen. xxii. 17.

The Spiritual Israel, and not the fleshly Israel, are to share the inheritance with Abraham and the CHRIST:—Rom. ix. 6 to 8;—iv. 13 to 16, 22 to 24;—viii. 16, 17;—Gal. iii. 29.

The seed of Abraham was predicted to be a member of the tribe of Judah:—Gen. xlix. 8 to 10; and to be born of the house of David:—1 Chron. xvii. 11 to 14.

The same seed is to occupy the throne of David, and David is to be a witness of the event:—2 Sam. vii. 12 to 16.

This promise constitutes the Covenant made with David:—Ps. lxxxix. 1 to 4, 28, 29, 34 to 37;—Ps. cxxxii. 11 to 14.

The realization of this Covenant was all the salvation and all the desire of David:—2 Sam. xxiii. 5.

The Covenant with David was proclaimed by Peter to the Jews:—Acts ii. 29 to 36.

This Covenant, denominated the Sure Mercies of David, was also preached by Paul to the Jews:—Acts xiii. 23, 30 to 38;—Isa. lv. 3.

The same Covenant was afterwards preached by Paul to the Gentiles:—Acts iii. 42, to 49.

The Davidic Covenant is the theme of some of the most glowing predictions of the Hebrew prophets:—Isaiah ix. 6, 7;—xvi. 5;—xxiv. 23;—xxxii. 1;—lxv. 17, 18;—xxxiii. 5, 6;—xxx. 9;—xxxiii. 14 to 17, 20, 21;—Ezek. xxxiv. 23 to 25;—xxxvii. 24 to 27;—Hosea iii. 5;—Zech. vi. 12, 13;—xiv. 9, 16, 17.

The seed of David is Jesus of Nazareth:—Luke i. 32, 33; who preached the Abrahamic and Davidic Covenants of promise, under the name of the Kingdom of God, illustrated by parables: in which he was assisted by the twelve Apostles and seventy disciples.—See the four Gospels.

He afterwards suffered death, as predicted, to redeem man from death, which is the wages of sin:—Ps. xvi. 10;—Isaiah liii. 5;—1 Cor. xv. 17, 18.

After his resurrection, the Apostles preached the same Gospel as they had preached before his sacrificial death, but with the addition of certain doctrines concerning that event—the former being comprised under "the things of the Kingdom," and the latter "the things of the name;" both together they constitute "the truth as it is in Jesus," and it is equally necessary to believe the one as to believe the other:—Acts viii. 12;—xix. 8; xxviii. 23, 30, 31;—xiv. 21, 22;—2 Thess. i. 4, 5;—2 Tim. iv. 1;—1 Cor. xv. 50.—*Isa. ii. 5.*

The Editor is obliged to an unknown friend for the weekly receipt of *The Herald of Life and the Coming Kingdom*. Friends who are kind enough to transmit an occasional newspaper, are requested to mark the places which they think deserving of attention.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

WILL THE KINGDOM ONLY LAST A
THOUSAND YEARS?

Question.—Thinking of the kingdom of Christ only lasting a thousand years, I have often wondered why such a glorious time should be so short after such a long preparation. There have been nearly two thousand years of this time of strife, called "the times of the Gentiles." Is there no fair way of making the kingdom, on the year-day theory, longer than the times of the Gentiles? Of course, I do not think the thousand years is the only great result of so much preparation. At the same time, there seems a very great preparation for it. J. RICHARDS, Montgomery.

Answer.—If a thousand years' reign of righteousness and peace were the only result proposed as the upshot of such a long and bitter process as the world has gone through for the last six thousand years, the question of our correspondent might well occur to every reflecting mind. But, in point of fact, the kingdom is not the object or end of the scheme of salvation. It is but a part of the machinery of the scheme. True, in relation to the saints, now and in all past time, it is "all their salvation and all their desire"; but so far as the world is concerned, it is but the closing act of the great drama which ends in the extirpation of evil from the face of the earth. The saints of previous ages are privileged to participate in it conjointly with the Son of Man: this is their special honour and glory, and for any man of this dispensation to fail in obtaining to it, is to lose his opportunity for ever. Yet, the great object of the divine operations is to abolish sin and death throughout the whole earth, having brought its population into subjection to divine wisdom and obedience. If a thousand years of divine government are sufficiently long for this, would it be any gain to prolong the unexpired state of that period? Will it be a less "glorious time" when every creature on earth in human form will be immortal and perfect? If the state to succeed the thousand years is more glorious than the millennium itself, surely, to use a Hibernianism, the sooner the thousand years are done the better. It is no drawback that the millennium is short, if it is destined to be succeeded by a time so glorious that even the majesty of the Son will be eclipsed in the unrestrained effulgence of the Father's manifested glory. But then the question of our correspondent is, may the apocalyptic "thousand years" of Christ's reign not be a symbolical period representing (on the year-day principle) 365,000 years? We submit, in the first place, that the reason of the thing is against it. The existence of flesh and blood on the

earth for that period of time in the absence of disease and war, would involve an increase of population far beyond the earth's capacity; and with the means of knowledge that will exist during the reign of Christ, the work of providing an obedient population for the permanent occupation of the earth, would be done a thousand times over. The fitness of things points to a thousand years as an appropriate period for the great work of Christ and the saints. In the second place, the context neither suggests or admits of the application of the symbolical principle of interpretation. Symbolical times generally occur in connection with a symbolical representation of events. When the events are literally stated, the time is generally on a literal scale. Now, in this case, the event measured by the "thousand years" is a literal event; or rather, it is literally stated, "*They lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years.*" Hence, fitness requires that the time specified should be literally stated also.

DEFICIENT KNOWLEDGE AND THE "ONE
BAPTISM."

J. P.—If you are satisfied that your knowledge at the time of your immersion was too limited to constitute that act a valid union with Christ, be immersed again. If none of the brethren will countenance you in the act, do it privately, without their countenance. It is a matter between you and God, in which no one can interfere: Immersion is not a "church" affair; it is an institution of divine appointment, and stands upon its own merits. It has not been associated with any ecclesiastical organization; it acquires no value and loses no virtue from the hands of an administrator; no "church" can make it valid in the absence of a correct faith; neither can they vitiate it by repudiation, should all be in accordance with the divine requirements. The part taken by an ecclesia in the matter is purely ministerial and expedient. The "church" at present is not a judicial or executive body. The idea that it is such (gathered from the days of apostolic ministrations) has produced the Mother of Harlots with her inquisition. All that men and women believing the truth can now do is to associate on the basis of goodwill, mutually consenting to certain regulations for the promotion of the general objects of their community in the faith. To introduce the element of rule or authority into such an organization is to mar its operation and frustrate its object. Authority is intolerable in the absence of wisdom, and specially odious in things divine, where God has not appointed it. There is no living authority

on earth "by divine right." He has appointed a man to rule the world in righteousness. Till he come, all authority must be in abeyance. No one in Christ may rule, except by the spontaneous influence which wisdom may give him over others. We may recur to this subject on another occasion in another form.

THE NAME OF THE "FATHER, SON, AND HOLY SPIRIT."

Question.—We are baptized into Christ, as Peter directs, for remission of sins past and the hope of the kingdom: Why was Dr. Thomas, by his own direction, immersed into the three names of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit? I take it that he did not then understand, but should like to know.—M.H.N.

Answer.—Jesus commanded baptism into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—"Matt. xxviii, 19: and his Apostles, in executing the command, baptized in (or "into," more properly) the name of the Lord Jesus.—Acts viii, 16; Rom. vi, 3; Gal. iii, 27. It follows that Jesus is "the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit." This is the truth. Of Jesus, Peter says, "There is none other NAME given under heaven whereby men may be saved"—Acts iv, 12. Now what is the peculiarity of Jesus as the name of salvation? The answer to this reveals the identity between Christ and the triple name under consideration; *he is the manifestation of the Father, in a Son by the Holy Spirit.* To be baptised into him is to be baptised into all three, and *vice versa.* Hence, Dr. Thomas evinced no misunderstanding of the matter in requesting his immersion in the form of words prescribed by Christ himself.

THE NATURE OF CHRIST.

Question.—If Christ was born of the spirit, by Mary, was he not spirit and not flesh, on the principle that that which is born of the spirit is spirit? W. H.

Answer.—The question arises from an inaccuracy of words. Jesus was not "born of the Spirit, by Mary," but begotten of Mary, by the Spirit. Here is a great distinction. "He was sent forth made of a woman"—Gal. iv, 4. He was fashioned from the human substance of Mary, by the power of the Spirit, and was, hence, a flesh product after the Spirit's type, and therefore "holy, harmless, and undefiled." On this subject, see the excellent letter which we publish in this number, from Dr. Thomas's daughter. The birth of the spirit, which results in spirit nature, pure and simple, is a process in which the flesh has no formative participation.

"AM NOT I A BROTHER?"—I have known and believed in many of the principles of the

truth since I was at school, having been taught by my brother, who died six years ago, in September, 1863. I was baptized by Geo. Dowie, of Edinburgh, and have until lately, considered myself as rooted and grounded in the faith; but having read your articles lately published on the creed of Messrs. Dowie & Co., I have been somewhat doubtful whether I am worthy of the appellation of "brother." Before and after baptism, I have never had a doubt as to the things of the kingdom and name; the mortal nature of man, immortality being a gift bestowed only on the righteous at the resurrection; and the non-personality of the Devil; but it is only lately that I have thrown aside the fallacy of the Trinity, and I do not believe, or rather, do not understand that the saints will rise in a mortal state, afterwards to receive immortality. G. B. F.

Answer.—If G. B. F.'s faith was right, George Dowie's immersional officiation won't make his baptism wrong. The validity of immersion lies with the subject of it, and not with the administrator, who is merely mechanically accessory. Was his faith right? He says he never doubted the things of the kingdom and name, but did he know what the things of the name were? His admissions show that his understanding was imperfect. He believed in the Trinity, and even yet disbelieves in the judgment. Both these questions affect the "things of the name." As the name of God, manifested for salvation, Christ is a man, begotten and anointed by the Spirit proceeding from the eternal Father. No one can understand this who believes in the Trinity. As the name manifestation, he is also appointed to be judge of the quick and dead. This fact is ignored where the resurrection is looked upon as an entrance into life without judgment, which is practically the case with those who believe in the immortality of those who emerge from the grave at the advent. It is for G. B. F. to consider whether these defects on his faith are not vital, as they appear to us to be.

QUERY ABOUT THE DEVIL.

Is it necessary to understand what the Devil is before immersion?—C. H. R.

Answer.—Is it necessary to understand the object of Christ's mission in order to a valid baptism? This is a question to which not even a Dowieite would answer "No." If so, it is necessary to understand who the Devil is: for the Devil is the very thing upon which Christ's mission operates. *Proof:* "FOR THIS PURPOSE WAS THE SON OF GOD MANIFESTED, that he might destroy works of the Devil."—Jno. iii, 8. "Forasmuch also as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he (Jesus) also himself likewise took part of the same, that through death he might

destroy him that hath the power of death, THAT IS, THE DEVIL."—Heb. ii, 14. If the very subject of Christ's manifestation was to destroy both the Devil and his works, how can it be a matter of indifference whether a person understand what this mean? As to what the Devil is, that is a separate question, which will be discussed from time to time in another part of the *Ambassador*. An able contribution to this discussion will appear in next month's number. That sin is the Devil, in its various form of manifestation, is unquestionable; and hence, those who believe in a personal supernatural agent of evil believe a lie, and are not in the truth.

THE COMING OF CHRIST IN RELATION TO THE "TEMPORAL" AFFAIRS OF THE LIVING SAINTS.

Question.—DEAR BROTHER ROBERTS—There is a subject I have thought about lately, which will concern many of the brethren: that is, in the case of the coming of the Lord, and the calling away of his chosen ones, what will be the position of property left? Many may have something to leave to dear friends and relations, who will be left behind. The question is, will those relations be able to get it? Suppose it to be insurance money, or burial fees, or anything else, which requires a certificate of death?—J. RHODES, Huddersfield.

Answer.—As regards personal estate, a trust deed of settlement drawn up in a form, which we have arranged to supply to anyone desiring them, will secure the possession of property to relatives, in case the withdrawal of living saints should be of that sudden and unforewarned character that some anticipate. The probability is that such an instrument will not be required, as the members of Christ's household will, doubtless, be privileged to hear the midnight cry, "Behold the bridegroom cometh!" in time to make deliberate preparations for their withdrawal from the scene. However, should any be uneasy about the arrangements of their affairs, in consequence of the supposition that they may be called without a moment's notice, they may, by the means of the legal document referred to, settle such arrangements as they may contemplate, in view of the possibility of an early occurrence of the great event to which we look with desire and expectation, not unmixed with "fear and trembling." All that will be necessary will be for a copy to be made, in writing, with the blanks filled in, according to the names of persons and articles concerned. As to death benefit, we are informed, on enquiry, that no arrangement can be made to secure any benefit contingent on death. Nothing short of absolute proof of death will do this, and as this will not be forthcoming in the case of those removed to judgment, all interest held

under insurance or other death investment must lapse.

M.H.—The "Holy City" of the Apocalypse and Jerusalem of the prophets are not precisely the same thing, though they are allied. The literal things of the prophets are in several cases made to play a symbolical part in the Apocalypse. Thus, the literal Babylon of the former is made to represent in the latter the papal system of rebellion against God, which has developed itself on Roman territory, having Rome for its centre. The literal Euphrates of Assyria is used to represent the power occupying Euphratean territory in the latter days. The waters and life-giving trees of Ezekiel are, in the Apocalypse, made to stand for the beneficent rule of the saints. The literal prophets themselves are made to stand for witnessing classes. So, literal Jerusalem is chosen to represent the community which has a future geographical relation to her. The "Bride, the Lamb's wife," after her glorious nuptials with the King of Israel, is symbolised as "New Jerusalem," descending from heaven, shining like to a stone most precious. This is when the saints are manifested in the power and glory of their perfected totality; but when the down-trodden and death-bound condition of the Bride is represented, the Holy City is exhibited as a waste and a ruin, trampled and desecrated by the Gentiles. When the symbolical character of the Apocalypse is recognised, the difficulty of Jerusalem, apparently meaning two separate things, will disappear. As to the "Assyrian" and the Russian being the same, this conclusion arises from the fact that the latter-day achievements of the Assyrian, as described in the prophets, are identical with those which we know from Ezekiel and Daniel, are assigned to the Russian. Thus, the Assyrian is the power to be broken in the land of Israel, preparatory to the appearance of the rod out of the stem of Jesse; Isaiah x, 24-34 read in connection with the 11th chapter, which is a continuation: chapter xiv, 25; xxx, 30-31; xxxi, 8; Micah, v, 5-6. It is unnecessary to prove that Russia will occupy this identical position at the identical time here spoken of. This fact is too palpable and well known to require demonstration here. The only point to be considered is the circumstance of the same power receiving two designations. This is, doubtless, owing to the fact that both descriptions are, in their own place, correct. Politically, the power will be Russian; geographically and morally, in its relation to events in Palestine at the moment, it will be Assyrian, approaching the Holy Land through Assyria, and bearing the same hostile relation to God's land and people as that observed by the Assyrian of old.

[We have other queries on hand which will receive attention in due course.—EDITOR.]

INTELLIGENCE.

ABERDEEN.—Brother Gill, writing on the 25th of February last, says, "We have an application for baptism from a young man, William Milne, joiner, who has been brought to a knowledge of the truth through your lectures, oral and written. His baptism is arranged to be on Sunday, March 3rd." Writing again on the 18th ult., he says: "In addition to the young man I wrote you of in my last letter, I have the pleasure to record the addition of JESSIE LEASK, granddaughter of brother and sister Leask (domestic servant), who was immersed into the name of the Lord on the 13th inst., and added to the church yesterday." Brother Jardine, of Dublin, writes on the 18th ult, as one "having been once among the brethren in Aberdeen for a considerable time," to say that brother Davidson's remarks are apt to create a wrong impression. He defends the ecclesia. He says: "The remarks you made on them while relating your journey, were good enough in the passing, and they would be none the worse for it. A stirring up at any time is not a bad thing, and I should have taken no notice of them had brother Davidson not spoiled the influence of these remarks by a reference of an invidious character. He has done it very unconsciously, and with an excellent intention, and with no desire to hurt any one's feelings, and no one, I hope, should be offended by what he has said; but his making mention of brother Gill, without reference to any one else in Aberdeen tacitly conveys a false impression to the minds of others, concerning brother Gill's equally excellent and faithful coadjutors. The staunchest among them is brother Mowatt, and though his peculiarities are of a kind many do not like, he has the merit of founding that church, and of bringing many to its fold, and if it had not been for him, I don't believe there would have been an ecclesia in Aberdeen at all. He is not one that will attract any by his public addresses, but his private worth in attracting many is great. He is very much like what brother Davidson describes himself to be, "Let one or two meet me in private conversation, they will soon see what dwells within." This is just the character of brother Mowatt, and I am inclined to think it is the character of most of them. If there had been more ecclesias like Aberdeen we should have had no Dowieites as in Edinburgh, no confusion as in Glasgow. We should have had more faithful adherents to the truth. I do not praise them; I do not say they are without many faults. I simply defend them that none of them may get discouraged, and that others may not think of throwing stones at them."

EDINBURGH.—Writing on the 25th of February, brother Ellis says, "I am happy

to announce to you the immersion of DAVID BROWN, a young man, who is the first fruit of our evening lectures, combined with the reading of your lectures and other tracts. We are thus encouraged to go on, and have commenced a second series, going over the same ground, taking up the prominent passages on which the traditions of christendom are mistakenly based. The attendance continues steady, though not very full." Brother Paterson, of the same place, writing on the 18th ult., communicates the intelligence, which we doubt not will be hailed with satisfaction by the brethren everywhere, that the differences causing separation among the brethren in Edinburgh have been so far amicably settled as to admit of their reunion. This, of course, has no reference to the Dowieites, to whom alliance is impossible on the part of those desiring to be faithful to the truth.

GLASGOW.—Brother Clark, writing on the 18th ult., says, "The little company of Christadelphians meeting alternately in Govan and Glasgow, have secured one of the class rooms belonging to the Glasgow Institution, at 280, George Street, Glasgow. We shall welcome true Christadelphians visiting Glasgow; but we cannot fellowship with any who believe things contrary to the truth, such as the immortality of the soul, the pre-existence of Christ, a personal Devil, resurrection without judgment, burning up of the world, rebuilding of literal Babylon, kingdom-at-hand gospel as taught in this quarter. I am glad to inform you that brother and sister Dick have seen it to be their duty to give up their connection with the Stockwell Street Meeting. They now meet with us, and their company has cheered us not a little."

HALIFAX.—A course of lectures, by Brother F. R. Shuttleworth, has been in progress at this place for many months past. As our readers were made aware a month or two ago the local press has noticed these efforts. Having been supplied with most of these

NOTICES OF THE PRESS,

we now publish them as both interesting and useful. They all appeared under the general heading "CHRISTADELPHIAN SYNAGOGUE." Dec. 1st.—The third lecture of the course was given in this place on Sunday afternoon last, the subject being "Eternal life." The lecturer was very angry with popular theology upon this question, maintaining that, contrary to universal belief, immortality was not a present possession, but a subsequently wrought attribute of the resurrection's body, and exclusively the privilege of the finally accepted, qualifying them as Messiah's

government for the promised everlasting possession of the kingdom to be established under the whole heaven.—Dec. 15. Another lecture, the fifth of the course, was delivered at this place in the afternoon of Sunday last, the subject being "The Gospel," which the lecturer defined as "Glad tidings concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ." He contended that the earth, as the destined domain of this kingdom, was the predicted locality of reward, and that inheritance thereupon as the kings and priests of a restored theocracy was the one hope of the gospel. He drew attention to the name of Christ, affirming that immersion therewith by water was the only means by which heirship could be secured and the qualifying righteousness and immortality obtained.—Dec. 22. The sixth lecture of the course came off at this place on Sunday last, the subject being "The Messiah." The lecturer dwelt upon the glorious things imported by this Hebrew name of the Saviour. He referred to the inscription over his cross as the scriptural definition of its meaning, in connection with which he averred it to be the infallible key to the destiny of the Jews and the ten tribes of Israel, in that it involved their restoration as the restored throne and kingdom of David under the more righteous administration of David's Lord. He enlarged upon much of the Scripture so admirably set to music by Handel, lamenting how little it was understood; that the sublime features peculiar to Messianic prophecy was the portrayal of things—the consequent and not the antecedent of His return to the earth, to be realised in the unprecedented glory, peace, prosperity, and righteousness which will characterize his reign.—Dec. 29. The seventh of the course of afternoon lectures now in progress at the above place was given on Sunday last, the subject being the terms of salvation. The lecturer commenced by saying that the salvation revealed in the Scriptures was by no means the commonly expected translation of the soul at death to some unknown region "beyond the bounds of time and space," but that otherwise, it was a bodily realisation upon the earth, and by a resurrection from among the dead of the covenants of promise made of God with the fathers of Israel, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. He explained that the terms of salvation were in accordance with the circumstances of the covenant, viz., that Christ was the personal seed of Abraham, to whom the promise was made, therefore as the heir elect, it followed that, as the apostle said, "As many of you as have been baptised into Christ have put on Christ, and if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." He said that salvation was not the dreamy and intangible thing current amongst the people, nor were its terms of that elastic character so universally claimed for it throughout Christendom, but that, on

the contrary, it consisted of the "redemption of the body" to an incorruptible inheritance on terra firma, to be attained only by the most scrupulous compliance with the declared conditions upon which it will be conferred.—Jan. 5. Another lecture was added to the course last Sunday, entitled "The Conversion of the World." The lecture presented a variety of features, amongst which may be noticed the following: That the Scriptures nowhere contemplate the accomplishment of this between the two advents of Christ, nor do they recognise an instrument therefore in the Church, to which is assigned at the most the taking out of a people for the Lord's name from among the nations of the earth. The conclusions at which the lecturer arrived were that it would be realised only as a result of the judicial manifestation of Christ, and the establishment of the kingdom of God upon the earth, when the executive agency would be found in the resurrected saints, the executors of the "judgments written" and the "pastors after God's own heart."—Jan. 12. On Sunday afternoon last, a reading was given at this place, from the writings of Dr. Thomas, entitled "The destiny of the British Empire, and the solution of the Eastern Question, as revealed in the Scriptures."—Jan. 19. A lecture was given on "The Millennium," at this place last Sunday afternoon. In adverting to the time this period would arrive, the lecturer said it would ensue upon the expiring of the present 6,000 years of the world's history, but that meanwhile the return of Christ for the rescue of those who love His appearing was anxiously looked for by all Christadelphians, or brethren of Christ, as the necessary precedent to its accomplishment. He expatiated upon the many and transcendentally glorious features of the coming 1,000 years, when ignorance should be displaced by knowledge, crime by righteousness, oppression and injustice by equity, war and famine by peace and plenty, disease and death by health and longevity, when sorrow and wretchedness should be exchanged for joy and gladness, when the prayer of the poor should be heard and the cry of the helpless answered, and when the present misuse of usurpation, with all its attendant evils, should be for ever superseded by the justice and equitable administration of "that Man whom God has appointed to judge the world in righteousness."—Feb. 2. The twelfth lecture of the course was delivered on Sunday afternoon, the subject being "The lying vanities of Christendom." Commencing with apostolic definitions of the faith and practice of the Primitive church as detailed in the narrative portion of the New Testament, the lecturer passed on to the many predictions of apostasy contained in the epistolary parts and their historical fulfilment in the present and during the past 1800 years. He instanced the following as being amongst the features peculiar to this

declension, and which he denounced as so many "lying vanities," viz.: the doctrines of the immortality of the soul, sky-kingdom rewards, and hell fire punishments at death, an immortal fire-proof devil, immaculate conception, purgatory, infant salvation, salvation without baptism, earth annihilation, trinitarianism, unitarianism, and the practices of consecration, confirmation, cure of souls, funeralizing of souls to glory; all cathedrals, churches and chapels, presumptuously called "God's houses," and dedicated to dead men's ghosts; all popes, fathers, deans, lord bishops, right revs., very revs., and rev. B.A.'s, M.A.'s, and D.D.'s, audaciously calling themselves "God's ministers," together with all the pomp and pride of ritualism and salaried hirelings of every denomination, who only "teach lies in the name of the Lord."—[Anything else? Ed. H.G.]—Feb. 9. A lecture was given at this place last Sunday afternoon, on "The second appearing of Jesus the Christ," by Mr. J. J. Andrew, of London. During the delivery of the discourse, which was listened to by a crowded and attentive audience, Mr. Andrew made about 100 quotations from the Bible in proof of the following propositions, viz., that Christ's return to the earth had been predicted; that this second advent was the only hope of believers; that the objects of His coming again were to raise from the dead those of His own household, and then judge them, to punish the Gentile nations for their sins; in this work He would be assisted by the resurrected righteous; to restore the Jews to their own land, and make them the greatest nation on the face of the earth; to establish His kingdom on earth; that this kingdom would be given to all who should be found worthy of eternal life, and that this same kingdom constituted the gospel which Jesus and His apostles preached, a belief of which was necessary for salvation. The lecturer concluded by adverting to the proximity of this event as indicated by the approaching fall of the Roman Pontificate, &c., &c.—Feb. 16. On Sunday last, a lecture was given at the above place on "The Apostles' Creed," in the exposition of which the lecturer instanced and elaborated the following particulars as its Scriptural constituents, viz.: 1st, one body; the association of believers in the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ. 2nd, one spirit; the Deity in creative, executive, and operative manifestation. 3rd, one hope; the hope of Israel. 4th, one Lord; the anointed Jesus. 5th, one faith; the things concerning the kingdom of God. 6th, one baptism; the bath of regeneration. 7th, one God and Father; the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

NEW ZEALAND.—In a letter from New Zealand, dated December 17th, Mr. JOHN GRAHAM announces the further progress of the truth, stating that seven others had been

"added" since the date of his previous letter. We hope the progress is real and on the right foundation. Some doubts have been expressed on the point, and it is difficult to decide how a matter actually stands at such a long distance off. The fact seems to be that there is considerable agitation and inducement of conviction on the leading first principles, but that on the question of judgment and similar topics, the mistaken views are held which result from the first and more superficial reading of the word. We hope a change may take place for the better, that will remove all obstacles, and gladden all hearts having a special interest in the progress of the truth in New Zealand.

TURRIFF.—Brother Robertson is busy, as will be seen by the following announcement:—Lectures on the Gospel preached by Angels, Prophets, Christ, and Apostles, the One Faith, One Hope, One Lord, One Baptism (*Greek*, immersion), in opposition to the "Traditions of Men," which make void the purposes of the Deity, and render Worship vain.—Matt. xv, 6-9. A COURSE OF LECTURES will (D.V.) be delivered in the Town Hall, Turriff, on the following subjects, by Mr. JAMES ROBERTSON: On Sunday, Jan. 13.—"The Covenants and the Promises."—Rom. ix, 4. On Sunday, Jan. 20.—"Baptism: its Subjects, Action, and Design."—Mark xvi, 15, 16. On Sunday, Jan. 27.—"The Thief's Request and Christ's Answer no proof of the Immortality of the Soul."—Luke xxiii, 42, 43. On Sunday, Feb. 3.—"The Sufferings of Christ: their relation to the Truth, to Man, and the Glories that shall follow."—Luke xxiv, 25, 26, 27. On Sunday, Feb. 10.—"Christ the Son of David and Son of Deity."—Romans i, 3, 4. On Sunday, Feb. 17.—"The Coming of the Lord as a thief, and the duty of watching."—Rev. xvi, 15. On Sunday, Feb. 24.—"The manifestation (Greek—*Apocalypse*) of the Sons of Deity, and the concomitant events."—Rom. viii, 18, 19, &c. The above is "a Form of Teaching," which, when believed and obeyed, emancipates, liberates, or sets free, from the lordship of Sin, and places under a better Master, "The lordship of Messiah." All are invited to attend, Bible in hand. The Lectures to commence at 6 o'clock. "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say."—Luke vi, 46.

HEALTH OF DR. THOMAS.—In a letter dated Feb. 22nd, Mrs. Lassius, Dr. Thomas's daughter, writing for her father, says,—"We are all in a usual state of health and vigour. That, however, is nothing to boast of. Father frequently complains of his head. A feeling of tightness or pressure, and sometimes of heaviness comes over him, disabling him from writing. I think this is not to be wondered at, seeing how constantly he has applied himself to his labours, day and night, without intermission, for so many years. He says he

feels sometimes as though the ideas would not flow so freely as usual, and he has to lay aside the pen for awhile, that the machinery may have a little rest, and him to manufacture more nervous energy. We earnestly hope and pray that vigour may not fail before the Lord comes, if it is according to his good will and pleasure to give strength for the work. Father rejoices at the complete exposure you have made of Dowieism, and we are glad to see, from the last number of the *Ambassador*, that the eyes of some have been opened to their lame position, that they can no longer be deceived by the covering of wool in the form of good words and fair speeches, to deceive the hearts of the simple."

FURTHER NOTICES OF THE HALIFAX LECTURES—February 23rd. On Sunday afternoon last, the public were afforded another opportunity at the above place, of listening to the exposition of Moses and the Prophets, in relation to coming events, the subjects treated of being "The Restoration of the Jews to Palestine." The lecturer asserted the literality of this restoration, quoting from the Scriptures to shew that their possession of the Holy Land is to be landed and territorial, and not merely a conversion to the faith in all lands. He said that this divinely decreed return to their

fatherland would be accelerated by the progress of the Eastern question, and ultimately accomplished in its solution as a political necessity. He further said that the approaching achievement of this by the scattered tribes of Israel and Judah, and their subsequent greatness, would infinitely surpass in magnitude and glory anything preceding it in the history of this people, "terrible from their beginning hitherto." He explained that this would be insured them by the return of Christ as their King, and the resurrection of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob to their long-promised inheritance. The lecturer concluded by reading an extract from the *Dublin Courier* on a "Projected Restoration of the Jews to their own Land." March 2nd.—A lecture was given last Sunday afternoon at the above place, entitled "Christadelphos, or the True Jew." The lecturer described two classes of Jews—the "Jew outwardly," comprehending the flesh-circumcised descendants of Abraham; and the "Jew inwardly," comprehending the heart-circumcised children of the same father, whether of Jew or Gentile. He explained that the latter, as the true Jews, would come into possession of the covenanted inheritance as rulers, whilst the former would realize it only as subjects.

We owe an apology for the delay which has taken place in the publication of *Anastasis* and the *Declaration*. The probabilities justified last month's announcement of their early appearance. *Anastasis* has not yet arrived. A single copy has reached us through the post, and we can assure the subscribers that a rare spiritual treat is in store for them. The subject of resurrection and judgment is treated in a way that thrills the intellect with enlightenment and solemnises the mind with a deep sense of the responsibility connected with a profession of the truth. The work will edify and invigorate the brotherhood, and in some measure prepare them for the solemn scene in which it is probable they will be called upon to take a part at a very early period.

The box containing the English supply of *Anastasis* (which is now expected every day)

also brings the new edition of *Elpis Israel*. Subscribers who have not remitted, will therefore recognise the exigency of the case, and ensure possession of the work by sending at once.

THE SUPPLY OF EUREKA, VOL. II, is now exhausted, (copy reserved for J. Rhodes, by request.) Vol. iii is rapidly advancing. We are advised it will be ready for the press in the course of a few weeks. We shall commence to book orders.

"How to search the Scriptures," compiled by bro. Brown, from the works of Dr. Thomas, is being republished by brother Donaldson, of Detroit, Mich., U.S., at 20 cents per copy, or six copies for a dollar. This information is more particularly for American subscribers.

Brother Coombe, of Toronto, can supply *Anastasis*.

The *Declaration* ready in a day or two.

THE AMBASSADOR

Of the Coming Age.

"A wicked Messenger falleth into mischief, but a faithful Ambassador is health."—PROV. xiii, 17.

No. 35.

MAY, 1867.

Vol. IV.

THE JUDGMENT SEAT OF CHRIST,
OR THE SECOND ADVENT IN RELATION TO THE HOUSEHOLD
OF FAITH.—No. 5.

The Fifteenth Chapter of 1st Corinthians.

THIS chapter is, undoubtedly, the great stronghold of the idea that the accepted come forth from the dust in a glorified state, and enter the kingdom without judgment. On the face of it, it appears to warrant this conclusion, but we shall see that this is but an appearance, and that in elliptical forms of speech, it covers the whole of the details of resurrection and judgment, traced out in those other parts of Paul's writings, which we have been considering. It does this, without in any degree compromising or excluding those details, which indeed is an impossibility, in view of the consistency and inspiration of Paul as a writer. To see this, it is necessary to follow Paul's argument, step by step, from the beginning of the chapter.

From some cause, which need not now be speculated upon, some of the Corinthians had degenerated to the extremity of denying the resurrection of the dead. Paul, addressing himself to this fatal departure from the faith, lays the basis of an irresistible argument, in the reminder that the gospel which he had preached to them, and which they had accepted, and which, in fact, was the ground of their existence as a community, had for its corner stone the proposition that Jesus Christ rose from the dead after dying for sin, and being buried. He reminds them that this proposition he commended to their notice on the strength of the testimony of Peter, to whom Christ first appeared, and of the rest of the twelve who afterwards saw him; after that, of above five hundred brethren, to whom Christ appeared on some occasion,

not mentioned by the evangelists, and of whom the majority were alive at the time of Paul's writing; after that, of James; then of all the apostles; and, last of all, the testimony of himself, to whom Christ revealed himself in person, after the natural time for apostolic delegation had passed, viz., after Christ's ascension to the priestly office. He then tells them that the testimony presented to them wrought conviction in their minds, and led them to profess a belief in the fact of Christ's resurrection, and to constitute themselves an ecclesia of God, "waiting for his (resurrected) son from heaven." Then comes the application of the fact; if they had collectively accepted the resurrection of Christ, how could any of them, with possible consistency, as members of the Corinthian ecclesia, deny the resurrection? To this he seems to anticipate a reply to the effect that the rejectors of the resurrection did not deny that Christ had risen. As Christ did not go to corruption, but retained his bodily identity during the short prevalence of death over him, they might experience little difficulty in believing that he had been re-energized, and made to come forth to renewed and immortal life. Their objection related to those whose substance had dissolved in the grave, and become absorbed in other forms of nature, animal or vegetable. Paul instantly rejoins that if there was no resurrection of the dead who disappeared in corruption, there had been no resurrection of Christ, for the obvious reason that it was entirely with reference to the dead—past and future—that he had died and risen. As he says to the Romans, "To this end, Christ both died and rose, and revived, that he might be the Lord both of THE DEAD and the living."—(Rom. xiv, 9.) If there was to be no resurrection of the dead, *a posteriori*, there had been no resurrection of Christ, for the two went hand in hand in the scheme of salvation, and if that scheme was divine, the two could not be separated, as some of the Corinthians, in their Grecianized speculations, were disposed to do. Doubtless, they had begun to entertain modern notions of a future state. This is highly probable from their proximity to Greek philosophy, of which the principal feature was the immateriality and immortality of the soul. They had probably begun to suppose that Christ's mission had reference to the saving of their immortal souls from a state of *post-mortem* damnation, denying the resurrection of the body on philosophical grounds, as they would, doubtless, affirm the immortality of the soul. Paul tells them that such a view logically excluded the resurrection of Christ, and reduced their faith to a nullity, while it convicted him of perjury in declaring that God had raised Christ from the dead, which he repeats he had not done, if it were true that there was to be no resurrection of the generations of righteous dead, who had disappeared in the grave. Deducing from their premisses (for the sake of argument) that Christ had not risen, he declares that their faith was vain, and their sins unremitted. This shews they had a faith of some sort, and were not atheists in the sense which would ordinarily be suggested by a denial of the resurrection. As already suggested, they had probably begun to mix with the gospel the "philosophy and vain deceit" of the Grecians, who were notably in

that age the vendors of the "wisdom of this world." They were bending in the direction of modern orthodoxy; but with more consistency than orthodoxy, were inclined to go the whole length to which Platonic doctrines lead, in the repudiation of "the resurrection of the body." Faith in a future state, apart from the resurrection of Christ, and the dead by Christ, Paul declares to be a delusion; those who had "fallen asleep" had "PERISHED," if there was no resurrection, though from the Grecian and the orthodox point of view, this did not follow, since the immortal soul would still survive to be the subject of an infernal or celestial destiny. In view of the fact of human mortality, and that death engulfed the being, it followed, as a matter of course, that those who were dead were "perished," if there was to be no renewal of existence by resurrection. Paul throws in another reflection, which incidentally tells most powerfully against the modern views of a future state: "If in this life only we have hope, we are, of all men, most miserable." He urges this in support of the resurrection, shewing that he had no idea of a future state apart from the resurrection. If orthodoxy be true, the resurrection is not necessary to a future state. The future state to which orthodoxy looks is a disembodied state—a going of naked souls to heaven—which does not require the resurrection of the body to confer the bliss of which orthodox believers are in expectation. If Paul had been orthodox, would he not have moralized like the orthodox believers of the present day? Would his eye not have fixed itself, like the eye of orthodox teachers and believers, on the deliverance of death? Would his faith not have laid hold of the soaring to endless bliss, on angels' wings, which orthodoxy pictures to itself as the great sequel of a righteous deathbed? But Paul was not orthodox, but intensely heterodox, from every point of view. He was taken up with "the resurrection of the dead." His question is "What advantageth it me if the dead rise not?"—(verse 32.) He had no idea of any advantage resulting from the good fight of faith until "that day" (2 Tim. iv, 8,) when Christ at his appearing should judge the quick and the dead, and manifest his kingdom.—(2 Tim. iv, 1.) So much for orthodoxy.

"If in this life only we have hope," says Paul, "we are of all men most miserable." This is a thrust at the modern sceptic. Was Paul such a fool as to sacrifice every human advantage for nothing? Did he give up the honours of Jewish learning, the power of Jewish leadership, the comforts of wealth and position, for a lie? Did he sacrifice everything dear to a man's heart for the sake of taking part in an unpopular propaganda, which he knew to be founded in a delusion? No, says the caviller, compelled to acquit Paul of stark madness; he had mistaken, he suggests, as a way out of a difficult position; earnest men sometimes believe that which is not true. But this is no question of belief. Paul did not believe in Christ's resurrection, because some one told him. Argument did not convince him. He was beyond the power of logic on the subject, because he had the great and undisputed facts of Israelitish history behind him, to justify him, as he supposed,

in resisting the pretences of any Messiah, who claimed a divine origin, and repudiated the kingdom, as Jesus did, for the time being. How was he convinced? *He says he saw Christ after his resurrection.* This accounts for his change of mind. Does he utter a falsehood? Those who refuse to believe Paul virtually set him down for a knave or a fool. Was Paul a liar? His life disproves the suggestion. A liar is a sneak and a coward, who only tells a lie to secure an advantage, and who beats a hurried and undignified retreat from any adverse consequences that may spring from his lie. Paul's statement that Christ had risen cost him everything dear to a human being, and ultimately brought him to the block; and, all the time, through a stormy period of forty years, he continued his unchanging and unshakable testimony that Christ had risen, for he had seen him.

Was Paul a fool? How absurd and audacious the suggestion. His letters shew him to have been one of the most cool-headed and logical writers that ever put pen to parchment. He was enthusiastic, doubtless, but his enthusiasm was no more than appreciation equal to the greatness and importance of the things he had before his mind. The dullest man is enthusiastic where what he likes is imperilled. Who is not excited and equal to desperate deeds when the ship is about to sink, and life depends on a jump? A man's enthusiasm is the measure of his appreciation. The creatures of the purse and the belly expend their enthusiasm on "the things which are seen and temporal," because they know nothing better. They don't know that there are higher things than come within the range of their vision, to act upon which require a higher mental effort, and a finer organization of being than they know. Their laughter is evidence of their degradation. Paul, and those who have put themselves under Paul's master, have something to evoke enthusiasm, and the absence of enthusiasm would be an evidence of reprobation. The suggestion that Paul was the subject of a craze, is merely a clumsy wriggle to get out of the logical net that gathers round the unwilling feet. If he was so demented as to surrender his whole subsequent life to the power of an illusion, he was too weak-minded to write "the Epistles of Paul," or to sustain himself in the responsible and laborious position which he filled for forty years. Paul, who harangued the Jewish mob from the castle stairs, in exposition of his sudden change from Judaism to Christianity, who addressed the Roman court with a clearness and earnest good sense, that nearly persuaded Agrippa; who had astuteness enough to escape the lash by availing himself of his Roman privileges, and to sow dissension among his persecutors by a party cry, must be allowed a hearing in his account of what happened on the way to Damascus. His narrative is coherent and rational, his subsequent life in logical harmony with it. The man who seriously contends that Paul had a disorder of the brain, is bound to produce at least a single case in which a man of equal mental parts and education, took a strong notion in his head, and lived for forty years under the power of it, with the same consistency of purpose and intelligence of demeanour and rationality of mental operations. This cannot be done from the whole range of history or

biography. The suggestion carries more utter improbability upon its face than Paul's simple and intelligent narrative that Christ had risen and revealed himself to him while on an errand directed against his followers.

"But now is Christ risen from the dead," says Paul. This fact is an explanation of his career, and a settlement of the general question, which he discusses in this chapter. The meaning of the fact he incidentally explains, "Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead." He states the order in which this result is to be developed. Christ first, being, by reason of his sinlessness, the only one who could take the initiative in the matter; afterwards, those who are Christ's at his coming; then at the end of the kingdom, ["cometh" is in italics, and must be omitted in order to see the order of resurrection] when the time comes to deliver over the kingdom to the Father. Recurring to his argument, he asks if this is not the case, (if there is no resurrection,) why are believers baptized in reference to death? "They are baptized into death."—(Rom. vi, 4.) What could be the meaning of this performance if there were no resurrection? It could have no reference to death itself, as such, for death reigned without it? No explanation of it could be given apart from the resurrection; in view of this, it was intelligible, since it was meet that men should symbolically participate in the process by which Christ secured the resurrection of those who were dead in Adam, as a preliminary and condition of securing the substance, in the recovery of their "vile bodies" from the bondage of corruption.

Concluding his argument, Paul warns the Corinthians—"Be not deceived; *evil communications corrupt good manners*; shewing that their departure from the faith was attributable to external causes: viz., of mixing up with the philosophical people by whom they were surrounded. "Awake to righteousness," he proceeds, "and sin not, for some have not the knowledge of God." He does not say, as modern eulogizers of Paul say, that doctrine is of no consequence; he connects righteousness and sin with an apprehension of the truth, and gives us to understand that a very good man morally is, in the sight of God, in a state of sin if he denies the truth.

This closes the first half of his argument. He has proved the fact of resurrection by a variety of arguments which will stand the test of the severest modern logic. He next advances to another question which he introduces by supposing an objection: "But some man will say, How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come? There are two questions here, and they must be considered separately. Paul supposes them to emanate from one of the Corinthian objectors; they are, doubtless, therefore, of a philosophical caste. The Grecians were "philosophers," and delighted in "oppositions of science" to the things proclaimed by Paul. As instance, the "savans" on Mar's Hill, "philosophers of the Epicureans and the Stoics—What doth this babbler say? * * * When they heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked."—(Acts xvii, 18, 32.) It was part of "the wisdom of this world," which is "foolishness with God," to argue

from the narrow cycle of human experience to what would be in future—to gauge the immeasurable and the infinite by the petty measure of human knowledge and capacity. On this principle, they denied the possibility of resurrection. They had never known a dead man come to life, or a perished form re-emerge from the dust. Therefore, they concluded it was impossible. This appears to be the argument involved in the first question, “How are the dead raised up?” Paul answers it in a way that rather suggests than furnishes a reply. He refers to the familiar fact that a seed cast into the ground, though destroyed, reproduces itself in the fruit of the blade that springs from its remains. Generically, there is absolute identity between the seed and the product. Individually, the grain reaped in harvest time is a new creation, but as to nature and structure, it is the same seed that was deposited in the ground. The reflection evidently present to Paul’s mind in bringing forward the fact, was, that since in the common matter of experience referred to, identity of a defunct vegetable organism was preserved and reproduced by a law, whose existence could only be recognised (because seen in its results) and not understood, what obstacle of real philosophy could preclude the possibility of a dead man being reproduced. The power exemplified in the one process was at least equal to the other, as a question of possibility. Paul could not mean to insist on the germination of seed as an example of resurrection, because there is no real parallel. The power of reproduction is an attribute of the seed, which only requires deposit in the soil for development, whereas, a dead body takes with it to the ground no power that will generate or lead to resuscitation; that impulse must come from without, not from within, as in the case of seed. Paul’s illustration on the simple ground indicated, would answer the question, “*How* are the dead raised up?” and narrow the controversy down to the simple enquiry whether the Almighty had intimated his intention to put forth the power necessary to raise the dead. Indirectly, it was an answer to the second question. In the English version, this stands thus: “With what body do they come?” This rendering is open to question, so far as the word “with” is concerned. Here is the reason: there are seventeen separate Greek words, which in certain grammatical associations, have the force of “with,” *not one of which occurs in this passage.* There is no word for “with,” in the original of the passage. How comes the word to be in the English version unitalicised, then, it will be asked. The answer is simply this: It is presumed by the translators to be the idea intended by the grammatical complexion of the phrase translated “with what body.” That phrase is *poio somati*: this is in the dative case, and “with” is an admissible rendering, but not *the characteristic sense* of the dative. The primary force of the dative form of any noun in the Greek language is “to.” This, in fact, is given as “sign of the dative” in the first lessons in Greek grammar. To this lesson, the following note is, in Ahn’s System appended: “Besides ‘to,’ the prepositions ‘at,’ ‘in,’ ‘on,’ ‘by,’ ‘with,’ and ‘for,’ are expressed in Greek by the dative case.” It will be observed that “with,” chosen by the translators, is only one of the secondary significances of the dative. Now, in a question

so vital as this, it will be much safer to adopt the primary and characteristic sense of the dative in dealing with Paul's words, especially as we shall find this in harmony with the truth elsewhere enunciated on the subject of resurrection and judgment. "To what body do they come?" The illustration of seed-growth seems partly intended to answer this question: "Thou sowest *not that body that shall be.*" The seed put into the ground, as already said, is not the very seed that forms in the ear; the seed that comes up, however, is the same in kind as the one deposited in the ground. In the words of Paul, "God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him." The organic law with which he has endowed the seed yields the product before designed. The law of this arrangement is "*To every seed his own body.*" This cannot be altered in nature. By no method of treatment can onion seed be made to yield carrots; no more can a body used as an instrument of unrighteousness come forth to incorruption. Paul applies the principle to resurrection, for he uses it for no other purpose. It bears intimately on the question—To what body do they come? The dead coming out of the ground may be regarded in the light of the green shoots that are sent up by the seed sown. An unskilled eye cannot tell a field of corn from a field of wheat or barley in the first stage of growth. It depends entirely on the nature of the seed as to whether these tiny leaflets will grow into grain to be garnered, or useless grass blades to be rejected. The body or fruit to which they are coming depends upon the antecedent force contained in the seed from which they grow. How beautifully Paul's doctrine of the judgment is here illustrated. The dead come forth in body to judgment; but it is the seed sown in present conduct that determines the ultimate condition to which the body attains—whether it ripen into the golden spirit state, or sink in the appalling ignominy and shame of superinduced corruption.

EDITOR.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

THE APOCALYPSE PARAPHRASED

ON THE BASIS OF THE EXPOSITION CONTAINED IN EUREKA,
VOL. II, (DR. THOMAS). BY J. J. ANDREW.

CHAPTER V.

AND I saw at the right hand of Him seated upon the throne—the manifested Deity—a scroll that had been written within, and on the outside—indicating that its contents referred to those within the temple and those without; the one class being the saints, and the other class their enemies, who make war upon and persecute them. The scroll was sealed with seven seals, a sufficient proof that it was completely closed up, and that its contents had never yet been revealed

to the people of God; the number of the seals signified that there must be seven unloosings before the scenes recorded between each seal could be fully accomplished. This scroll was probably the same as that referred to by Daniel in the last chapter of his prophecy, as being closed up and sealed till the time of the end, a circumstance denoting that the series of events it contained would not come to a crisis until that period styled the "time of the end" had arrived. If Daniel had been with me on this occasion, I could have instructed him about several things which were unintelligible at the time he witnessed the scroll; such for instance as the preaching of the mystery of the gospel, and its fellowship, whereby the Jews and Gentiles had been offered the blessings of eternal life on equal terms. But as to the events which must precede the time when the saints are to possess the kingdom, I was quite as ignorant as he was, for they were written in the sealed scroll.

And I saw a powerful messenger, heralding with a loud voice, "Who is worthy to unrol the scroll, and to loose the seal?" But no one was worthy in the heaven nor upon the earth, nor under the earth, to unrol the scroll, nor to see it. And I shed many tears, because no one was found worthy to unrol and to read the scroll, nor to see it, for I was very anxious to know what were the contents of this mysterious parchment. Had Daniel been present, he too, would have shed many tears at the sight of the sealed scroll, for even when the vision of the four beasts was interpreted, his cogitations greatly troubled him, because there were some things in it which he could not fully understand; thus, we should have been companions in tribulation. Likewise, all the true servants of the Deity would have been similarly affected, because they would have been equally desirous of becoming acquainted with the wonderful things contained in the scroll. But if any, who are servants in name only and not in reality, had been present, they would have had no such sorrowful feelings, because they possess no desire to understand its symbolical mysteries, and even ridicule those who attempt to interpret them.

While thus weeping, one of the elders saith unto me, "Weep not; behold the Lion who is of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, hath prevailed to unrol the scroll, and to loose its seven seals." When I heard this, I was glad with exceeding joy, and, accordingly, discontinued weeping; for I considered that a scroll, which only one in all the universe was deemed worthy to unseal, must be an inestimable treasure. And when the time came for it to be unrolled, this estimate of its value was fully confirmed, for I found that it revealed the means by which all who follow in the footsteps of the faithful Abraham are to become possessed of that kingdom promised to the rich in faith, to enter which, they are willing to endure much tribulation. The first six seals delineated the mode of abolishing the reign of Paganism, which operation was necessary to the revelation of the Lawless One, and the consequent manifestation of the Catholic Mystery of Iniquity in the dominion of Daniel's fourth beast—a series of events extending from A.D. 107 to A.D. 324. The seventh seal portrayed the subsequent

struggle between the saints and the Imperial Laodicean Apostacy, known as "The Holy Catholic Church," extending from the year 324 until the judgment to be given to the saints shall have been completely executed upon their enemies.

And I looked, and behold in the midst of the throne, and of the four Living Ones, and in the midst of the Elders, a Lamb standing as having been slain, with seven horns and seven eyes, the which are the seven spirits of the Deity—the emblem of unity and perfection—sent forth into all the earth. And he went and received the scroll, which was placed at the right hand of him seated upon the throne, to denote that none but the Deity in manifestation was able to open it. When he had received the scroll, the four Living Ones—emblematic of the fourfold encampment of the spiritual Israel—and the twenty-four elders—representatives of the whole body of the Deity's royal priesthood—prostrated themselves before the lamb; even before him who, as a lamb, without blemish and without spot, had died, the just for the unjust, that he might redeem his disciples from the power of the grave, and transform the body of their humiliation like unto his own glorious body. The four living ones and the twenty-four Elders had everyone harp, and golden bowls, full of perfumes, the which are the prayers of the saints; and they sang a new song, saying "Thou art worthy to receive the scroll, and to undo the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and with thy blood the price hast purchased for God from every tribe, race, people, tongue, and mad'st us kings and priests unto God, and we upon the earth shall reign." And I beheld and heard a voice of many angels, circled about the throne, and of the Living Ones, and of the Elders; and the number of them was ten thousand, and thousands of thousands, saying with a loud voice, "The Lamb that hath been put to death, the power, riches, wisdom, strength, and honour, glory, blessing, too is worthy to receive." Having declared him worthy of these great honours, they enrol themselves under his leadership, and follow him whithersoever he goeth, in the war of the great day of Almighty power, for the purpose of effecting the conquest of the Gentile nations, preparatory to transforming the kingdoms of this world into our Lord's and his Christ's. These events occupy the hour of judgment—a period of thirty years—which commenced when the door in the Gentile heaven (described in the preceding chapter) was opened, and during which, the process of loosing the seventh seal is to be consummated—inaugurating that glorious age, when all the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of God, as the waters cover the sea.

When this much-desired consummation has arrived, the result is acquiesced in by all; and, accordingly, I heard every created thing that is in the heaven, and things which are on the earth, and underneath the earth, and upon the sea, even all the things in them, saying, "To Him that sitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb, the blessing *be*; the honour, glory, and the power, the aions of the aions for ever." And the four Living Ones said "So let it be." And the twenty-four Elders prostrated themselves, and did homage to him that liveth for the aions of the aions, or for the ages of the ages.

THE POLITICAL HEAVENS AND THE SIGNS THEREOF.

THE development of events on the Continent during the month, has been steadily in the direction indicated in our last summary. Affairs do not tend to a solution, but get more and more complicated. Everything forbodes war, and war on no ordinary scale. The nations are armed to an extent heretofore unparalleled. At no period on record have so many men been under arms at the same time; and never has there been more universal or energetic efforts to get military arrangements on a perfect war-footing. The fact is arresting the attention of politicians and newspaper editors. The *Globe* of March 27th, has the following remarks:

"It is certain that a great European war is looming in the distance. The universal disquietude which prevails is of itself a sign of impending troubles: it is simply a presentiment of actual dangers ahead. Every Government, too, is arming, and on a scale never dreamt of before. Nations, in fact, are being converted into standing armies. And, as to the details of military preparation, the subjoined return just made by the Belgian Minister for war is worthy of notice:—France is having 480,000 muskets made on the Chassepot system, not only in France, but in Belgium and England, and the greater part of them are to be ready by the 1st March, 1868. In Prussia, the arsenals are busily occupied in the manufacture of arms, and 1,100 steel cannon, loading at the breech, have been ordered. Austria is transforming 600,000 muskets into Wanzl's system—half of them to be ready by the end of the year. Baden, Bavaria, Wurtemberg, and Hesse-Darmstadt are adopting the Prussian musket, and are casting a considerable quantity of cannon on the Prussian model. England has already transformed 150,000 Enfield muskets on Snider's plan, and will have 350,000 ready by the end of the year; she will also by that time have 426 rifled cannon. Russia is transforming 600,000 muskets on Carle's system, and half of them will be ready by the beginning of 1868; she is also making 900 cannon. In Denmark the Chambers have voted funds for changing muskets into breech-loaders. Holland is transforming her's on Snider's system. Switzerland has got 40,000 muskets on Ampler-Millbank's system, has ordered 90,000 on Winchester's, and has made, or is having made, 200 breech-loading cannon.

Italy, Spain, Portugal, and Greece are transforming their muskets, and Spain and Greece have ordered cannon of M. Krupp, the celebrated cannon-founder of Prussia. Lastly, Belgium has got rifled cannon on the Prussian plan, and is about to adopt the Prussian musket."

Under the heading of "MILITARY PREPARATIONS IN GERMANY," the *Times* of March 25th, publishes the following from a correspondent at the fortified town of Mayence, on the Rhine:—

"What is taking place here is worthy of observation, and not without importance. There is an activity in the fortress, which can only be compared to that of bees in a beehive. Detachments are continually arriving to reinforce the garrison, which is now as numerous as when it was garrisoned by federal troops. You may judge of the accumulation of arms here from the fact that the Baden military commission has received 6,000 needle guns out of the fortress without causing any appreciable void in the arsenal. Contrary to the practice in other countries, the Prussian army, or, at all events, the garrison of Mayence, is busy all the day. More than 18,000 cartouches are manufactured daily, and you can judge of the accumulation of material from the fact that this work is systematically going on. The munitions which were left at Rastadt are being now brought to this place by way of Ludwigshafen. The Baden government have received 700 quintals of cartouches for the needle guns. The artillery of the fortress is being also organised, especially with a view of increasing the strength of the batteries."

On the same subject, we read the following in the *Telegraph* of March 28:—

"According to the *Courrier du Bas-Rhin*, the works of the manufactory of arms at Mutzig in that department are now receiving a fresh impulse, and seem likely to assume a great development. A notice inserted in the journals, in fact, addresses itself to all workmen in the business of filing, fitting, and turning metals, and informs them, that by making application at the Mutzig establishment, they will find as much employment as they please, after April 1st. 'The whole Prussian fleet,' says the *Geestemunde Gazette*, 'is to be got ready by the 1st of April, so as to be ready to put to sea at any moment after that date. The order has been sent to all the stations. Work is, in consequence, carried on so actively at this

place, that even Sunday is not a day of repose.' The *Italia* of Naples says that secret orders have been issued by the Minister of Marine, to get ready several armour-plated vessels, which will be armed with the new guns that have been manufactured in the English foundries."

On the general situation of affairs, a remarkable speech has been delivered by Sir Archibald Alison, whose eminent position and clear head will procure great consideration for his words. We quote from the *Glasgow Herald* of April 11th, kindly sent us by a friend. The speech was intended to be given at the opening of the new drill hall, erected by the 1st Lanarkshire Volunteers, but, owing to indisposition, Sir Archibald was prevented from being present, the MS. was handed to the press, and the speech appeared in full next day, occupying nearly two columns. Sir Archibald's object throughout his address was to demonstrate the necessity for the existence of the volunteer force of this country. He did this by tracing European history since the days of the first Napoleon, shewing that while military reduction and non-intervention had been the policy of this country, European governments had steadily developed their resources in a contrary direction, the result of which is, in Sir Archibald's opinion, to place the independence of this country in peril. He instanced the various recent wars in proof of the evil of England having withdrawn from the arena of European politics, and, glancing at the present situation of affairs, said:—

"Meanwhile, universal anxiety prevails. Every State is arming, and adopting the profuse system of calling out the whole population capable of bearing arms. Europe, in Mr. Disraeli's words, has become a "great camp," and this very day the French funds have sunk 2½ per cent., from the rumours of an approaching rupture. Now, this is the state of affairs when the volunteer question comes forward; and, in common with the whole empire, we have to reflect on the present alarming state of public affairs, and the way in which we can escape their disastrous effects. Everything depends on taking the right way of doing this. Every day you hear the continual "I hope in God we may

keep out of it. Let the Continental Powers fight out their own battles without our interference." All right, gentlemen, if you are sure that it will keep out of us. But will it do that? Rely upon it, it will not. *A dreadful war is about to commence on the Continent, which will, to all appearance, terminate in THE UNDISPUTED SUPREMACY OF ONE POWER.* What such Power will be, whether Russia, Germany, or France, lies buried in the womb of time; but of one thing we may be well assured, that whichever gains on the Continent will ere long turn its victorious arms against us. The simple enthusiasts, who think that commercial interests will govern the earth and arrest the arms of conquest, will then find how miserably they have mistaken; and power won by the sword will never cease to make use of the sword for its extension. Look at Rome in ancient, and France under the First Napoleon in modern times. The Power victorious on the Continent will, beyond all question, turn its arms against this country—the only remaining check on its ambition. Besides their natural and unavoidable inclination, all the great powers of Europe have wrongs to avenge, inflicted on them by Britain in former times, and which they will willingly seize the first opportunity of requiting. We have paid two visits to France within four centuries, and have occupied Paris, and her sons would gladly return the compliment at London. We have made a long visit to Russia at Sebastopol, and she will always feel awkward till she has returned it to us at Portsmouth. Our victorious arms have been seen at Washington; and the Americans are only waiting for "England's difficulty" to let their standard be seen in London. Contemplating, then, as likely, I may say almost certain, such a coalition against us at no very distant period, what we have to consider is, what means have we to resist it? And here an observation of the utmost importance occurs, to which, gentlemen, I earnestly request your particular attention. It is, that the application of iron to the plating of vessels, and casing all ships of war in armour, which is impervious, save to 200 or 300 pounders, have not only made a change in the art of naval war, but have, at one blow, deprived us, so far as available ships go, of our naval superiority. Three Trafalgars won by the French or Russians, the Germans or Americans, could not do this as effectually as the use of iron vessels had done. Our great wooden fleet, so long the pride of Britain, the terror of the world, lies stored up in Portsmouth Harbour, of no earthly use in maintaining any maritime contest. Those noble three-deckers, such as the Duke of Wellington, would be sent to the bottom by a single gun carrying a 300-pound ball. We have, at one blow, virtually lost the fleet which had been

growing up for two hundred years. For the construction of a new fleet of ironclads, we must wait for time and money, just as all the other Powers must do. We have lost our start in the race; we must all set off anew, and abreast. This is the real secret of the vast sums voted annually for the navy, and the general complaint that we have so little to show for them. We have been laying the foundation of a fleet which can be as yet but in its infancy. Other nations are just as far on as we are. It is doubtful whether our royal navy as yet equals that of America. United to that of Russia, the latter is decidedly superior to anything we could bring forward. If a forest of hostile iron-clads appear off Spithead or Plymouth, vain will be the 40 or 50 noble sail of the line lying in our harbours. Everything will depend not on the fifty old wooden line of battle ships, but on the eight or ten five ironclads. This great change has entirely altered our relative position in any future civil war; and, unless steps are taken, and that speedily, to counterbalance its effects, it may safely be predicted that evil days are coming upon us, and the days of our national independence are numbered."

Sir Archibald Alison has political sagacity enough to perceive the tendency of affairs; and the believer of the prophets is gratified at the coincidence between his view of the matter and the things declared beforehand in the "sure word." Sir Archibald foresees the "*undisputed supremacy of one power.*" He leaves futurity to disclose which it is to be; but the student of the prophets knows beforehand that it is Russia. For this supremacy he has been looking for many years past, and seems likely to have his expectations realized before many more months are over. He thinks England in danger, but the prophetic student knows that England is safe until broken by "the King of kings, and Lord of lords," which she is destined to be. This breaking is not a catastrophe, but the best of blessings. Subjugation to any European power would be the worst of earthly calamities; submission to the lion of the tribe of Judah—(King of Righteousness and Prince of Peace)—will lead to glory and prosperity such as boastful Britain has never dreamt of.

The immediate cause of "the imminent rupture" to which Sir Archibald refers, is a

misunderstanding between France and Prussia as to the duchy of Luxemburg, on the eastern frontier of the former. France wants to buy the said duchy from the King of Holland; but Prussia objects, on the ground that Luxemburg is German territory, and in the occupation of Prussian troops, under the treaty of 1815. The quarrel is so serious that war is regarded as inevitable on the Stock Exchanges of Europe, where commercial credit has rapidly sunk. The parties to the quarrel are making their arrangements. Both Prussia and France are endeavouring to secure the alliance of Austria, on whose action the result of the conflict must greatly depend. It is announced this morning (April 19), that Russia has intimated her intention of aiding Prussia. The existence of an alliance between these powers has long been known, and this is one of the hopeful symptoms of the crisis, pointing to the appearance of Russia in central Europe where she must aggrandise herself to the dimensions of Ezekiel's Gogue. The *Globe*, of April 1, says:—"Again and again we have said that a great European war is fast approaching. *Longsighted Russia appears to be the only power that has commenced its preparations for the emergency.*" The *Pall Mall Gazette*, of March 30, publishes the following:—

The *Chronicle* (the new organ of the Liberal Catholics, who were formerly represented by the *Home and Foreign Review*) declares that *Russia is herself again*. Every point of her western territory bears witness that *she has recurred to her expansive policy, and is pursuing it by precisely the same ways and means as before the Crimean war*. It would be folly not to recognise the connection between a retrogression in the internal development of Russia, and the open resuscitation of the Russian propaganda beyond the frontiers of the empire, on the Danube, in Greece, and in Crete. The Government, in face of the domestic reforms which had not been, and could not be, carried out, and which had led it to adopt a reactionary policy, perceived that its omnipotence might be secured by setting in motion the impulse of the Russian nation toward the West and the South."

Attention has also been aroused by the cession of Russian America to the United States Government, simultaneously with the introduction of a bill into the American Senate to *legalise the sale of ships and war materials to any nation at war with another*. The *Globe* looks upon this as an ominous sign. It thinks America is going to pay back England's *Alabama* depredations. At the time the intelligence was published, it suggested that the thing was of Russian inspiration. On April 1st, it says, "a few days ago we expressed our belief that this measure was 'inspired' by the Russian Minister at Washington. We said that Russia was looking forward to an European war, when her fleets would be shut up in the Baltic and Black sea: and that she desired to have the means of attacking and destroying the commercial navy of England or any other Power who should venture to oppose her aggrandisement in Turkey, by getting a supply of swift war-steamers from the United States. This cession of Russian-America to the United States is a further step in the same arrangements. As the only price by which she can purchase the co-operation of the American Government, Russia cedes this territory. Possibly the Yankees even bargain with Russia for a morsel of the 'sick man's' property—say, the Island of Cyprus—in order to obtain for their navy a station in European waters."

As to the "Eastern Question," we quote the following from the *Globe*, of March 26:—

"The semi-official journal *La Turquie* is authorized to declare that neither the French nor any other Government have ever proposed to the Porte the cession of Candia to Greece. 'Turkey,' adds the same paper,

'will never cede an inch of her territory which has been formerly guaranteed by the Paris Treaty of 1856.' A Berlin correspondent writes, that England, hesitating to join Austria, Russia, and France in advising Turkey to cede Crete, has had the effect of causing the three mediating powers to delay the formal execution of their purpose. In addition to this motive for reconsidering the step they were about to take, the late publication of the offensive and defensive treaties between Northern and Southern Germany will, it is hoped in Berlin, tend to prevent an understanding between the three Empires which, were it to be further developed, would, in the very nature of things, not be directed against Turkey alone. *In the meantime, Russian troops are moving south, an event which, in the 'Moscow Gazette,' is frankly accounted for by an alleged 'necessity of supporting the demands of the Czar with regard to the condition of the Christian Rayahs.'*"

It will thus be seen that the elements of the "time of trouble such as never was," predicted by Daniel, are extensively and rapidly coming into play. "Happy is he that hath the God of Jacob for his refuge," whose mind instead of being damped and downcast by the terrible portents abroad in the earth, is stimulated with a divine exhilaration, earnestly looking for the great crisis when He whom God hath appointed to rule the world in righteousness, and who withdrew for a season, eighteen hundred years ago, will come forth and speak to the nations in judgment, prior to the blessedness which under his righteous reign, will cover all the earth! May he quickly come.—Amen.

April 19th, 1867.

EDITOR.

THE DEVIL OF ORTHODOXY COMPARED WITH THE DEVIL OF THE BIBLE.

BY J. BUTLER, BIRMINGHAM.

This is a subject, which, to all those who will not take the trouble to enquire into it, may seem a rather intricate one, and respecting which a person who merely reads the words of the Bible, without diving into their meaning and connection, may entertain the general opinion that the Devil

is a real personal being. It is the more important inasmuch as those who believe in this personal existence cannot have grasped in their full signification, the fundamental truths upon which we build our faith. The popular opinion respecting the Devil is that he is an immortal being,

an angel hurled from the presence of God, in consequence of some act of rebellion in which he was engaged against the Deity whilst in that exalted position; that in revenge for the punishment inflicted upon him, he is doing all he can to snatch immortal souls from the hands of the God who made them, and drag them down to his own ignominious position. He is represented as a person in some respects very little *less* omnipotent than God, if we may use the phrase, whilst in respect to his influence over human beings, he is far more powerful. Though condemned to the place called Hell, as his special abode, the Devil, from some unaccountable cause, is permitted to roam about like a roaring lion; he is, in fact, omnipresent—on this planet at any rate—quite as much as God himself; and on that account he is enabled in a moment to become aware of the operations of God, and at once to thwart him. What I have just stated is, we believe, the popular opinion. There is another belief held by some who profess to be believers in the things concerning the kingdom and the name of Jesus Christ, that the Devil exists in the very presence of God in heaven, and that the act of expelling him, which, in the popular belief, occurred thousands of years ago, is to take place at some future period, somewhere about the time, we suppose, when Christ comes to set up his kingdom. This belief is, no doubt, entertained in consequence of the language used in the Revelations respecting the great dragon, and in consequence of the words of Christ, as recorded in the 10th chapter of Luke, "I beheld Satan, as lightning, fall from heaven." We think we may venture to state that both these views are so full of inconsistency, that no person who carefully examines the Scriptures and has come to understand the natural condition of man, and the means God has adopted to elevate him from his fallen position to the basis of spirit life, will entertain these horrible doctrines, which place God in the most cruel light, as continuously breaking the law he has himself laid down in his word, that the wages of sin is death. We will first examine the popular view. The first allusion to the being who is considered the personal agent or author of evil is, in Gen. iii, 1, "Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made." Here it is distinctly declared that whatever it was that was the means of testing Adam, it was included among the beasts of the field which the Lord God had made. Perhaps some

quibblers might contend that it doesn't say so, that it merely says the serpent was more subtle than any of the beasts; but any honest controversialist, we think, would at once admit the apparent inclusion of the serpent with the rest of the animals (see Gen. iii, 14.) Well, if we turn to Gen. i, 25, we shall see that after stating that God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and everything that creepeth upon the earth after his kind, it says that God saw that it was *good*; and in the 31st verse of the same chapter, it states that God saw *everything* that he had made, and, behold, it was *very good*. Can any Christian, any person who has any exalted ideas at all of the character of God, of his goodness and mercy, and his love of truth, imagine God would say that everything on earth was very good, when there was lurking on its surface that being whom he had hurled from heaven, waiting to poison the mind of the first being that God should create upon earth at all approaching his own perfection? Can anyone imagine, indeed, that God would so deliberately pronounce everything he had made to be *very good*, when he must have known, and could not hide from himself the fact, that there was a being whom he had created who was altogether *very bad*, who had not one redeeming feature in his character? That this serpent, however, was not a creature that had before incurred the anger of the Almighty, and had been hurled from any previous high position, we find proved (in addition to the indirect evidence given above) in the 14th verse of the 3rd chapter, where the Lord, or his angel, having the three culprits before him, pronounced judgment against the serpent in the following words: "Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life." Here the tempter is still classed amongst the cattle and the beasts of the field. There is nothing, in fact, to induce us to believe otherwise, and it would be absurd in view of this most emphatic classification, and of the judgment pronounced against him, to maintain that the serpent was the immortal Devil of popular delusion. If he had been, and occupied the fallen position he is represented to have done, the judgment that God pronounced would be absurd; and which have we greater reason to believe absurd, the judgment of the allwise God, or the opinion of fallible man? How ridiculous it would seem for God to condemn to the eating of

dust all the days of his life a being possessed inherently of immortality, who could therefore live without partaking of any food at all, and who could live in spite of having the worm that dieth not constantly gnawing at his vitals, and the fire that is never quenched constantly burning within him. Then, again, God declares he will place enmity between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent. Now, if the Devil be a real person, this text implies of course that he has real children; and as the Devil *in spite of his sin* is immortal, his children must be also immortal. The number therefore of immortal fiends must have been continually on the increase from the time of Adam until now. Only think of the God of mercy and love permitting such a multiplication of beings for whom there is no hope of salvation under any circumstances, and whose sole object must be the corrupting of the human mind; and yet this is the logical result of the popular assumption. But the upholders of this delusion profess principally to find support for it in the New Testament, simply, we suppose, because the name Devil more frequently occurs there than in the Old. But if we turn to some of these passages we shall find that they afford to the mind that will think for one moment no support at all; and if we go to them with the idea of a personal Devil and again follow the passages to their logical conclusion, we shall discover that they will still lead to absurdity, and in many cases knock on the head the very doctrine they are brought to uphold. Look, for instance, at the 8th chapter of John with this idea. In the 39th verse, Christ, speaking to the Jews, who claimed to be Abraham's children, says, "If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham, but now ye seek to kill me, a man that hath spoken the truth, which I have heard of God. This did not Abraham. Ye do the deeds of your father. Then said they to him, We are not born of fornication, Abraham is our father.—(44th verse;) Ye are of your father, the Devil, (said Christ) and the lusts of your Father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning." Now, if the Devil be a real person, this charge of Christ implies that those whom he was addressing were the children of the Devil—just as much his children as they claimed to be the descendants of Abraham; for Christ places God and the Devil in a similar position as to parentage, and we know that a real personal relationship existed between Christ and God. But a still more glaring inconsistency can be here pointed

out. As we have said before, the Devil is supposed to have been at one time an angel in Heaven, an archangel, in fact, and therefore one of the purest of created beings. In the 44th verse of this chapter, however, this darling theory of the so-called "orthodox" receives a most fatal stroke. Jesus says to the Jews, not only that they were of their father, the Devil, but he added that the Devil was a murderer (or manslayer, as it is in the original) *from the beginning*; and the apostle John, in his first epistle, 3rd chapter, and 8th verse, in corroboration of Christ's statement, says "He that doeth sin is of the Devil, for the Devil *sinneth from the beginning*." What becomes then of the popular doctrine in the face of these statements of the Holy Spirit? The Devil, it appears, never was a bright spotless archangel, never was a leader of God's hosts in heaven. He was always, from the time when he first began to exist, a murderer, a sinner. These statements substantiate our explanation of the passages in Genesis, showing that he first appeared upon the scene on the temptation of Eve. There are other places where the general view encounters obstacles very difficult to overcome, and, in fact, insurmountable. How can the prevailing idea of personality, for instance, be reconciled with the statement of Christ that Peter was Satan, and that Judas also was a devil. But absurd and revolting, and inconsistent as is the popular delusion respecting the Devil, far more so, in our opinion, is the what we might call Dowieite doctrine, (a term, the signification of which is pretty generally known now-a-days,) that the Devil is a being existing in the very presence of God in heaven, his malignant eyes being permitted to behold, with hatred and jealousy, the face of him whose eyes are too pure to behold iniquity, and, therefore, whom no man hath seen nor can see. This, indeed, looks as if God, instead of hating the wicked, delighted in allowing them to enter into his presence to behold him in the fulness of his glory. We have already remarked that the Dowieite view of Satan is derived principally, if not altogether, from the language used in Revelations, and by Christ on notably one occasion. We will turn to Revelations and observe how absurd it is to accept as literal, language which the author of the book himself declares to be figurative; as we find in the very first verse, "The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him to shew unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass (this shews that Revelation must not be looked

upon as it is by most of the orthodox, as a history of the acts of the Devil some thousands of years before) and he sent and *signified* it, (that is, expressed it by signs or symbols,) by his angel unto his servant John." With this preparatory explanation, and we might say caution, of the author, let us now consider the passages which are said to uphold the Dowieite theory.—(See Rev. xii, 3, 4, 7, 19.) Now we understand that these passages, with all parts of the Apocalypse of which a specific interpretation is not divinely given, are by some interpreted literally, and if so, what ridiculous conclusions we must come to. In the 4th verse, for example, it says, that the dragon drew with his tail the third part of the stars of heaven and cast them to the earth. Now it must be remembered, that the nearest fixed star is so far off that its distance cannot be calculated. It is at least 19,200,000,000,000 miles off. Many of the others are, no doubt, twenty or thirty times that distance from us, and every one of them is as large, and, perhaps, much larger, than the sun, which is 8.0 times the size of the earth and all the rest of the movable stars and planets put together, and they amount to nearly 100. The size of each of the stars, in fact, bears about the same comparison to our earth as a large globe to a grain of sand. Just imagine, therefore, leaving out of consideration the size of the dragon itself, the length and strength of the tail that would encircle all these vast worlds and hurl them altogether upon this little grain of sand! If we interpret almost any of the passages in Revelations literally, we indeed express our belief in things and beings more extravagantly absurd than any ever described in the Arabian Nights, or in any legends ever invented. For instance, the very first verse of this 12th chapter states that John saw a woman clothed with the sun and moon under her feet. Now there is no explanation given with it; are we therefore to understand there will be at some future period; or that there has been at any time such a monster as is here described, employing the sun and moon for such purposes? It is possible, we know, that some would say they believed it most emphatically, and if any there be, we can suggest to them how they might endeavour to uphold their view, and in a very legitimate way, viz. by comparing Scripture with Scripture—the only way in which we can arrive at the truth on any subject. They might point us to the passages (Heb. i, and Psalm cii) where it says the heaven

and the earth are to wax old as a garment, and to be folded up as a vesture; and (the sun of course being included amongst the heavens) they might express their belief that it will be between the folding up as a vesture, and the change they afterwards undergo, that the woman described seizes her opportunity to clothe herself. Thus comparing scripture with scripture, we see how the woman here given can be accepted as literal. Seriously speaking, however, how can anyone be so foolish as to suppose that it is literal—a being standing in heaven with the sun as a garment and the moon as a footstool. To our mind the belief is infinitely more nonsensical than the common one which teaches that in most cases where Jerusalem and Zion are mentioned, they refer to the heavenly Jerusalem, to the Zion above. There is, to say the least of it, some plausibility in the explanations orthodox persons sometimes give of those passages; but what plausibility or reason can there be in assuming that God has created such hideous monsters as are described in the 12th and subsequent chapters of Revelations, in developing his plan for the introduction of his glorious kingdom. There is no explanation or interpretation of the dragon; there is no interpretation of the beast mentioned in the succeeding chapter; therefore, say some, they are literal. They are somewhat similar, having each seven heads and ten horns, but so dissimilar that, literally taken, they must be different animals. There must be two devils in Heaven then. In the 17th chapter, 3rd verse, there is another beast introduced by John, but as there happens to be an interpretation following, the Dowieites acknowledge that the language in reference to it is figurative. Now, as it happens, that this beast has the same number of heads and horns as the dragon, and the other beast mentioned in the 13th chapter, is it not more reasonable to think that the two latter are symbolical descriptions also, than to suppose that in one case the beast represents a certain political phase, but in the other two, nothing more than what we read? They are evidently all symbolical representations of the very same power, and history helps us to understand that the dragon represents merely the political system of things as existing during the prevalence of heathenism, whilst the beast described in the 13th chapter represents the same political system, in its so-called Christian phase. Indeed, taking Revelations line for line, throughout the whole of the book, anyone at all reasonable would

see that to interpret it literally would tend only to throw ridicule upon Christianity and upon the Creator himself. It was meant to be symbolical, as John himself states. Having endeavoured to shew the inconsistency and contradictory character of the popular doctrine and the Dowieite, it now remains to explain what is the sensible, scriptural, and Christadelphian view of the subject of the Devil, and the one which harmonises most with itself and with the Deity. We contend that the word is used in scripture as the personification of sin. A far more correct knowledge of the application of this word and the word Satan would no doubt have existed in the English mind if they had appeared in our version, as every other word almost must necessarily appear, that is, in a translated form, but this they do not. Devil and Satan are untranslated words; and when it is known that the former means False Accuser, and the latter Adversary, the relation between the words and that which they represent is more clearly seen, as well as the peculiar fitness of the words themselves. A person labouring under disease, particularly mental, is often spoken of in the New Testament as being *possessed* with a devil, but the word devil in this case would be more properly rendered *demon*; it is not the same in the original as the other. The phrase "being possessed" no doubt originated from the belief (prevalent in most heathen countries at the present day) that all misfortunes, diseases, &c., that happen to the human race are attributable to the action of evil spirits. It does not necessarily follow that a person using the phrase entertains the idea from which it originated, any more than that an Englishman using the word lunatic must believe in persons being moonstruck, and that Christ gave countenance to the idea by using the language of his countrymen, is no more to be accepted than that he gave countenance to the belief in human pre-existence by adopting the same course.—(See John ix, 2, 3.) A student of Scripture can readily understand why sin should be called the Adversary. Sin is the great enemy both of God and man; but for sin there would be no disease, no death; everything in nature and in life would give enjoyment. We should everyone be in raptures with each other, and this earth would be a perfect paradise, as the garden of Eden before the fall of Adam. But for sin, man would enjoy a more direct communication with the Deity, and would bask in his favour and love. No wonder, therefore,

that that which has proved such a curse to us should be called the Adversary, the Devil. Viewing it in this light, it will be seen that everything that is opposed to good may be called the Devil; it may be applied to persons as well as principles, because it is through persons only that principles can have effect. With this view of the Devil we can examine every point of scripture, and find that it will apply. Every statement, however contradictory and inconsistent (when looked at with the idea of a personal devil) is in harmony with the general teaching of the word. We can understand, for instance, the words of God to the serpent, "I will put^u enmity between thee and the woman, between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel," without believing that God would be so cruel as to permit the everlasting existence of a supernatural tempter. The serpent having introduced sin by the success of his temptation, all other sin may be said to be the result and therefore the seed-product of it; and the way that the serpent bruised the heel of the woman and her seed was by introducing that which brought death, for the wages of sin is death; but Christ, who was of the seed of the woman, performed that which will ultimately cause the destruction of death, and therefore he bruised the head of the serpent. Apply this doctrine, as I said before, to every passage where the Devil is mentioned, and you can gain a logical and a reasonable idea of its meaning. We can understand how Peter was a Satan, seeing that he, at the time the term was applied to him, was, however unconsciously to himself, an adversary to the purposes of God, who had willed that Christ should be crucified. One can also understand why in the Revelations, the political systems which sinful man has instituted should be termed the Devil and Satan. One can see how the Devil was a murderer or manslayer from the beginning; how the Jews, in persecuting Christ, were proving themselves children of the Devil; and why Jesus should say that he beheld Satan as lightning cast from Heaven on hearing the joyful report his disciples gave him of the success with which their preaching the Gospel was attended; for that Gospel was intended to turn the hearts of the disobedient to the wisdom of the just, and in the end would tend effectually to drive Satan (or sin) from the high places of the earth, where he has for so many hundreds of years usurped. The doctrine of the Devil is included in or unseparably connected with the doctrine of

Christ; and therefore, as a knowledge of the doctrine of Christ is essential to salvation, so a misunderstanding of the doctrine of the Devil must necessarily be fatal. It is stated that Christ partook of flesh and blood "That through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the Devil."—(Heb. ii, 14.) Here it is stated that it is the Devil that has the power of death, and, as we find in another place (Rom. vi, 23) that the wages of sin is death, sin must evidently be synonymous with the Devil, and our position is therefore

proved. If therefore the Devil, that Christ came to destroy, was sin in the flesh, what a false position that person is placed in who believes that Christ came for the purpose of thwarting and consigning to eternal torments a supernatural being, at present exercising over human souls almost boundless authority. Such belief would be, in the greatest degree, dishonourable to God, and it therefore behoves us to be sound on this question, that at the coming of Christ we may be found worthy in every way to have a share in his kingdom.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

P.M.—Your queries, criticisms and objections will receive attention in due course.

CHURCH ORDER.

J.M.—Your letter will appear in due course, with the reply which we think it calls for.

THE TEMPORAL AFFAIRS OF THE SAINTS AT THE ADVENT.

Brother Ellis, commenting on the query of J.R. last month, expresses the opinion that it is a taking thought for the things of the morrow which is not justifiable. He thinks those who trust in God may well leave their fatherless children and widows in His hands, at a time when he calls away for His own use their natural protectors. He doubts not He will make adequate arrangements for those thus deprived. This is doubtless the correct view, and ought to be cultivated by those who are waiting and expecting to be taken under the shadow of Almighty power at the appearance of Christ. May we soon receive the summons!

THE NATURE OF CHRIST.

A.E.B.—See answer in our last to W.H. The proposition on page 179—(vol. III, Sep., 1866, line 3, in statement of Christadelphian faith)—is inaccurately stated. It ought to read "born of Mary, by the Holy Spirit." The mistake was not the printer's, but the editor's.

THE KINGDOM PREACHED BY THE GENTILES

W.S.—Paul says there is but "one faith." Can it be supposed that he preached a different faith to the Gentiles from what he did to the Jews? Is there a Jew's gospel and a Gentile's gospel? You admit Paul

preached the kingdom to the Jews: can you suggest any reason for supposing he did not preach it to the Gentiles? It is expressly testified it was preached to the Samaritans who were not Jews, (Acts viii, 12), to the Ephesians, many of whom were Gentiles, (xix, 14; xx, 25.) Finally, the salvation offered to the Jews, Paul declares was transferred to the Gentiles.—(Acts xxviii, 28.) This was the kingdom (verse 23), to which the Gentiles were called, (1 Thess. ii, 12), for which they were changed, (Col i, 13), and for which they laboured to be counted worthy of (2 Thess. i, 5) knowing that it had, to be entered through a process of tribulation, (Acts xiv, 22), by perseverance in righteousness, (2 Pet. i, 10, 11), and that no unrighteous would inherit it, (1 Cor. vi, 9), God having constituted the faith-rich poor of this world heirs of it.—(James ii, 5.)

BRO. SHARP'S ARTICLE ON THE RESURRECTION.

J.D. and D.B.—We have received a letter from brother H. Sharp, of Milwaukie, Mich., U.S., in reference to the doubt raised as to his views on resurrection and judgment. He regrets exceedingly that the article in question should have been supposed to "reflect the outlines of a theory which excludes the resurrection of the unfaithful at the coming of Christ." He never heard of such a theory in connection with the admission that "the accepted come forth in the image of the earthly to be changed into the likeness of the heavenly." If such a theory exists, he utterly repudiates it. His reason for not specially introducing the unrighteous in his treatise on the resurrection, was, that his object was more particu-

larly to elucidate the bearing of the resurrection on the character formed by "the truth as it is in Jesus." His faith is firm that the unfaithful in Christ shall awake and come forth in soul-body with the faithful for judgment. The latter will be changed into spirit-body, while the former will remain unchanged and die. He hopes J.D. and D.B. are true and earnest brethren who have borne some of the burden and heat of the day, and he wishes them to know that he has stood under the same burden since March 14, 1854, when he put on the glorious name by baptism, at New York, in the presence of our faithful and beloved brother, Dr. John Thomas. Since that time, he has opposed a firm front of opposition to immortal soulism, unbaptised faithism, charity-for-all-ism, grave-immortalism, and no-resurrection-for-the-wicked-ism. He hopes to do so till the Lord comes.

IS THE TAKING OF AN OATH LAWFUL?

J. A. A.—Christ distinctly prohibits swearing, (Matt. v, 34—37), and James repeats the injunction in an emphatic form.—(Jas. v, 12.) In both cases there is a reason given. Christ says "For whatsoever is more than these (yea and nay) cometh of evil;" James, "Lest ye fall into condemnation." From this, it is obvious that our duty in the matter has a deeper origin than the command. Christ's words appeal to fact; a man who is prone to adjurations and imprecations is almost to a certainty a liar. Truth comes out in plain words. A man may speak the truth the other way, but he is liable to be beguiled into falsehood. The mere indulgence in a wrong form of speech, borrowed from an evil origin, has a tendency to breed the evil to which it owes its birth. For this reason, Christ commands abstention from them. Simplicity in speech will help the growth of candour. Nothing is more wholesome or dignified than the open "yes" or "no" of truth-speaking; the very practice will bring straightforwardness. Oaths or diplomatic polish are equally fatal to honesty. Truth walks best on her own legs. But how about law courts? Here the case stands very differently. The law, which takes nothing on credit, adjures the witness to speak the truth; the witness is passive and merely responds to the adjuration by token. Here it is not a question of individual practice, but of submission to the judicial ordinances of man. This we are commanded to yield.—(1 Pet. ii, 13.) Of course, it is possible human law may sometimes ask us to do what the

divine law prohibits. In that case, there is but one alternative, viz., the one followed by Peter and the rest of the Apostles. (Acts iv, 19); but in the matter in question, there is no conflict, as the witness does not swear, but merely submits to an adjuration. The Scotch form of oath is more open to objection. In this, the witness raises his right hand and repeats a form of words, beginning "I swear by Almighty God." This is so expressly against Christ's commandment that one doubts if any legal obligation can justify it. Doubtless it is a legal form: but one trembles under any circumstances to do so, exactly what Christ commanded not to be done. It is better to be on the safe side.

THE WICKED IN THE RESURRECTION.

C.W. asks a question which belongs to the category of the curious, but which nevertheless relates to an eventuality that actually will arise. He presumes the dead will awake in a state of nudity, and enquires how the wicked among them are to be provided with clothing. He seems to assume that the requirements of the accepted in this respect will be met with due provision, while the other class will be abandoned to the shame of nakedness, which their entire destitution will prevent them from covering. We would answer that in the first place, there is no ground for supposing any distinction will be observed between the two classes until they appear in the divine presence for judgment. If one is clothed, so will the other, and *vice versa*. That they will be clad is more than probable. Jesus left his burial appointments in Joseph's tomb and yet appeared in raiment. The angels who were seen by the women at the grave, are described as "two men in shining garments."—(Luke xxiv, 4.) The angel that appeared to Cornelius he described as "a man in white clothing." The ability to fabricate raiment for the body is not confined to human hands. The wisdom that gave the cunning to the hands that wove Aaron's gorgeous robes is not beholden to an outfitter's establishment. The miracle of resurrection is great enough to include the provision of raiment. But suppose it were not so, the instinct to clothe which belongs to a sinful state will be strong enough in resuscitated nature to find it in some shape or form, that is, before judgment. After judgment, the righteous will be perfectly provided like the angels; as for the other, they will be in too great a state of distraction to think or care about their habitude. Weeping and gnashing of

teerh will be their portion till their dishonoured lives are swallowed up in the second death. The question is one of no practical moment, and only valuable in passing in assisting us to realise the verity of what is coming.

THE PARABLE OF THE TEN VIRGINS.

T.G.—This parable was spoken to illustrate an aspect of “the kingdom of heaven;” (Matt. xxv, 1.) Hence, the ten virgins are representative of those who come within the pale of the kingdom by receiving the truth. It cannot embrace any foreign element such as those outside, who lie in darkness of the truth, for they are not in any sense constituents of “the kingdom of heaven.” As to the time to which it refers, Jesus decides the point by the word “then” with which the parable is prefixed. The question “when?” takes us to the end of the previous chapter, where Jesus was discoursing of the time when he should return and deal to his servants according to their deserts. At this time, the kingdom of heaven will exhibit the phase set forth. The similarity, however, must be taken with certain restrictions. The parable as a whole is a perfect semblance of the literal events viewed widely; but as regards the juncture of affairs at the coming of Christ, only a part of the parable applies, and that the last part, not that in which the virgins go forth for the first time but in that in which having gone forth, they have fallen asleep, and are aroused by the midnight cry. The parable is borrowed from the Eastern form of the marriage ceremony, which is in force at the present day. Arrangements having been made for the nuptials, a certain number of female friends place their services at the disposal of the bride, and their first duty (having prepared) is, to go forth and take up a position on the route by which the bridegroom is expected to come with his attendants from the house of his father, to take to himself his bride. The time of his approach is a matter of uncertainty. It is almost always at night, and it frequently happens that while waiting, the virgin company go to sleep. From this they are aroused by the announcement of the bridegroom’s approach by one of their own party, or a forerunner of the bridegroom’s cavalcade, as the case may be. Their duty is then to go forward and meet the bridegroom. It is not an unfrequent occurrence that several of the party, more thoughtless than the rest, find themselves at this stage without a supply of oil in their lamps, having only brought suffi-

cient for the present need, and without their lamps lit, they would no more think of joining in the procession than a young lady in European countries would think of performing the duties of bridesmaid with an unfinished toilet. The result is as depicted in the parable. They run out to get some at the nearest source of supply, and the chances are, by the time they return, the bridegroom has come, and the whole company are in the house of the bride, with the doors shut, after which, Eastern etiquette forbids in the most stringent manner the admission of any one. Now these things have an almost exact counterpart in the things pertaining to the nuptials of the Son of Man. The marriage is arranged for; he is coming from his father’s presence with his angels; and a company has been organised to wait for him in the bride’s interest. These are they who have “turned to God from (divers sorts of) idols, to wait for His Son from heaven.”—(1 Thess. i, 10.) Plainly speaking, they are those who have believed the gospel and obeyed it in baptism, and are “looking for the glorious appearing.” These are spiritually styled virgins, (Rev. xiv. 4; 2 Cor. xi, 2) because they are separated to the exclusive ownership, service, and love of Christ. The difference between the parable and the reality is that in the parable, there is a bride separate from the virgins, whereas in the reality, the virgins are the bride. This is evident from the fact that the parable is introduced to illustrate the attitude of the “faithful and wise servants” and the “evil servants” (Matt. xxiv. 45 48), who have their counterparts in the wise virgins and the foolish virgins, and no one will deny that “the bride, the lamb’s wife,” is the multitude of Christ’s “faithful and wise servants.” They that are with him are “called and chosen and faithful.”—(Rev. xvii. 14.) “The bride hath made herself ready, and to her it was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white, and the fine linen is the righteousness of saints.” (Rev. xix, 8). Christ’s bride being a multitudinous bride, composed of “the faithful and wise servants,” it follows that in the reality signified by the parable, there is nothing to answer to the bride of the parable. It may be asked why the bride was not selected as the central figure of the parable? The answer is, that the position of the bride in Eastern nuptials would not answer to the position of Christ’s bride. The oriental bride is served, honoured, and attended, and has none of the waiting to do. It is the very reverse with Christ’s

bride. The position and dangers of the latter are exactly represented by the virgins at an Eastern marriage. and therefore the virgins and not the bride, are chosen to represent Christ's wise and foolish servants. The bridegroom tarries, and all Christ's apostles and servants who went forth from the world to wait his return, and for whose especial warning the parable was uttered. are asleep in the dust. By and bye, the angels who liberated Jesus from the tomb will rouse them from their sleep of centuries, and cause them at the midnight hour of the Gentiles, to hear the cry, "Behold, the bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet him!" When they wake, they will find their lamps in the condition in which they left them, when they sank into the slumber of death. That is, they will come forth in the spiritual state in which they fell asleep. The faithful servants will emerge from the death state with undiminished love, wisdom, and loyalty, to recommence their labours in the higher sphere assigned to them; the foolish, whose adhesion to the cause of Christ was an affair of theory and profession, whose first enthusiasm had burnt out, who did not continue patiently to the end, in a worthy walk, and a persevering exhibition

of the truth, will not find themselves enriched by the resurrection, but will come forth in the shame of their nakedness, which will then be manifest to all. It will be too late to be "zealous of good works," as some may frantically proffer to be when they find themselves face to face with the reality. The judgment-seat will separate the two; the first will go into the marriage supper of the Lamb, and the other will be shut out. The broad features of the parable are thus most exactly reflected in the relations of Christ and his servants. There are, of course, one or two points of detail for which a parallel cannot be found, and the attempt to apply which will only result in needless perplexity. On the other hand, there are subordinate features in the scene to be enacted at the coming of Christ, which have no counterparts in the parable. This is inevitable, for a parable not being an exact miniature, there are of necessity little discrepancies. The great body of the truth must be allowed to gauge and determine parabolic details. This rule, we are aware, is liable to be abused, even to the extent of ignoring palpable significances; but the extremities of folly should never deter the application of rules of wisdom.

HOW LONG, HOLY AND TRUE?

Lord, we wait the time of blessing,
Resting on Thy promise now,
Hear our prayer, the throne addressing,
Lord how long? why tarriest Thou?

Come upon the wings of Spirit
To redeem Thy mourning bride,
And the Kingdom to inherit,
Give her glory at Thy side.

Many days of holy sadness,
Many wrestlings for the prize,
Have prepared her for the gladness
Of that day of sweet surprise.

London, August, 1866.

Lord! how long shall intercession
For the Saints of God prevail?
How long thy blood for their transgression
Plead its work within the veil?

How long shall sin and death devour,
And faith and love in dust remain?
Return and speak the word of power.
'Awake and sing Jehovah's slain.'

Lord, our hope and consolation,
Bring thine Israel quick release,
O, refresh us with salvation,
Be our strength, our joy, our peace.

D. BROWN.

INTELLIGENCE.

BIRMINGHAM.—The lectures continue with encouraging results. The Athenæum Hall is filled every Sunday evening, and intelligent people are earnestly enquiring after the way

of life. At the quarterly meeting held a few weeks ago, it was reported by the Secretary that the total number of brethren and sisters on the books was 93; but, that the total number

available to the meeting was only 79. The additions during the last twelve months had amounted to 39, and for the quarter immediately preceding, 4. The highest attendance of brethren and sisters at the table during the quarter was 68; the lowest, 45; the average amounted to 53. The collections during the quarter (including a special effort on one first day for the poor) amounted to £23 17s. 2d. The total number of absences from illness during the quarter was 42, as against 6 during the previous quarter. On Easter Monday, a tea meeting was held in celebration of the addition of over twenty brethren and sisters in one week, twelve months ago. Brethren C. Smith and J. Gillies, from Scotland, and J. Lind, Liverpool, were present, and also others. There was a large gathering. After tea, addresses were delivered by several of the brethren, encouraging to continue labour in the good work, which hitherto had been attended with such large result in Birmingham. Interested strangers were admitted to the meeting, as the proceedings had an indirect relation to them, and were of a nature calculated to assist them in their endeavours to come at the truth.

HALIFAX.—A provincial daily paper heads its column of curious information with the announcement "There is a 'Christadelphian Synagogue' at Halifax." Doubtless, the editor thought he had fallen on a curiosity when he discovered this; so he did, from an ecclesiastical point of view, but it would be something a great deal more curious and surprising were he to publish the faith set forth in the said Synagogue. Of this, it is presumable he is entirely ignorant. Doubtless, he supposes it is some new-fangled species of Judaism—a split from the Rabbinical creed, upheld by a few hooked-nosed malcontents, who have broken away from the ancestral faith of the Synagogue. It is not altogether a mistake to suppose it has something to do with the Jews. It has much to do with them; it has no actual connection with them; for they are a generation of rebellious unbelievers—fit descendants of those who rejected Jesus; but it looks upon them with the interest created by divine history and prophecy. Its fellowship is with the God of the Jews, the prophets and apostles of the Jews, the land of the Jews, and the future history of the Jews, as divinely foretold. In this it is bound up. Its salvation is entirely "of the Jews." It has no hope till the King of the Jews has broken the power of the Gentiles, and made the name of the Jew a praise and a fame in all the earth, as it is now a byword and a proverb. These things are imported by the word "Christadelphian," but the world knows it not, and never will know it till the rude band of Christadelphianism—militant teaches them the lesson in judgment. Some will learn the lesson by

gentler means and be saved. Such in Halifax have an opportunity of doing so by attending the Christadelphian Synagogue, where these things are exhibited week by week, from the oracles of God. We have published the notices of local papers. We append some more:—

Mar. 9.—The 17th lecture of the course was given at the above place on Sunday afternoon last—the subject being "The Approaching Resurrection of the Dead." The lecturer described this sublime and momentous event as in the near future, coincident with the now expiring "times of the Gentiles," and the immediately succeeding "times of the restitution of all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all His holy prophets since the world began." He said also, that its occurrence would be contemporary with national commotion and universal warfare. He further said that it was the only possible means by which "the dead in Christ" could enter upon their reward; he affirmed the unconscious sleep of all the deceased faithful till that time, who he said would then come forth from their graves, to receive recompense at the tribunal of Christ.

Mar. 23rd.—A lecture was given at the above place last Sunday afternoon, on the following subject, viz., "The Gospel of the Bible, or salvation demonstrably impossible to the fatally deluded multitudes who are beguiled by the ministry." Amongst some twenty other propositions the lecturer submitted—That the Gospel of the Bible was glad tidings of the kingdom of God, and that consequently to believe in the Gospel was to believe in the kingdom, and to believe in the kingdom was to believe in the Gospel; and therefore, said he, quoting from the Scriptures, as "he who believeth not the Gospel shall be damned," so likewise "whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child shall in no wise enter therein." He affirmed that this kingdom constituted the promise made to Adam, the oath to Abraham, the covenant with David, the hope of Paul, Stephen, Philip, and the only glad tidings which could revolutionize the mind, change the motives, and induce purity of life, personal holiness, disinterested philanthropy and benevolence, and unreserved obedience to the will of God. He dealt sternly with the hired ministry, charging them with beguiling the people into a false security by promising them other inheritance than that offered in the Bible.

HUDDESFIELD.—James Mitchell, Mrs. Mitchell, and Thomas Fisher, lately meeting with the Dowieite church here, have withdrawn, and united themselves with Brother Rhodes and those who meet with him.

NEWARK.—On confession of his faith in “the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ,” Mr. William Hage, of Bilsthorpe, Ollerton, Newark, was last spring immersed into the glorious name of Jesus Christ, and now waits with his partner, who is a faithful sister in Christ, for the salvation to be manifested at his appearing and kingdom. The fact was omitted to be recorded at the time.

NOTTINGHAM.—A few weeks ago, the Mechanics' Hall, in one of the side rooms of which the brethren held their meetings, was destroyed by fire. The brethren were thereby put to great inconvenience, but have at last secured a school room in Bilbie Street, in which they were wont to assemble some years ago. The accommodation is by no means adequate to the operations contemplated by the brethren in the service of the truth, and efforts are being made to secure a better place.

NOTICES.

THE FOURTH EDITION OF TWELVE LECTURES.

We are in a position now to state positively that the *Lectures* will be ready for delivery before the 20th of June next, and maybe earlier. The printer has bound himself for the date mentioned. We are also in a position to make the gratifying announcement, that besides being nearly half as large again (in respect of matter), also larger as to size of page, and better got up than they have ever been before, this edition will be issued at a *lower price than the last edition*; it will be published

at ONE SHILLING PER COPY. This is due to the munificence of two friends of the truth, (who desire their names to be suppressed), who have undertaken to contribute whatever sum may be necessary to reduce the *Lectures* to the price mentioned; so that there may be as little obstacle as possible in the way of their circulation. In this fact we rejoice, desiring that the truth may abound more and more.

NOW READY, PRICE ONE PENNY,

A DECLARATION OF THE FIRST PRINCIPLES OF THE ORACLES OF THE DEITY,

Set forth in a series of Propositions, attested and illustrated by a right division of the Word of Truth, in a classification and full quotation of appropriate proof-texts, for the purpose of demonstrating that the faith of Christendom is made up of the Fables predicted by Paul (2 Tim., iv, 3), and is entirely subversive of the Faith once for all delivered to the Saints; the whole being elucidated by copious foot-notes, original and selected.

It is with much pleasure that we at last are able to announce the appearance of this pamphlet. Our readers will understand the reason of the delay that has taken place, when they see it. We rejoice, for the truth's sake, at its publication, and predict a rapid and extended circulation. Our readers have

at present no idea of what it is they are offered for a penny. A large-sized pamphlet of 52 pages, in neat cover, printed on fine paper, and generally got up in first-class style, is not the sort of thing generally offered at the money. The fact is, the price is merely nominal; the book is really a gift to the

purchaser. On this point, we make the following quotation from the preface: "The price at which it is offered is a merely nominal one. The merest tyro in printing will be aware that it is impossible to issue such a work for three times the price charged, so as to leave a publisher's margin. The compiler's object is to bring the truth within reach of the poor. For this reason he issues the *Declaration* at a price which the very poorest can afford to pay, and in a sufficiently large edition—6,000 copies being printed—to meet probable wants for a long time to come. His reward will be the awakening of some honest minds to the startling situation of the religious world in the present day, when, with much profession of allegiance to the Bible, there is an almost total ignorance of its plainest doctrines and commandments." As to the contents of the *Declaration*, they are freely indicated in the sub-title, given above, in italics. They consist of a series of affirmations (numbering 37), setting forth the truth in all

its features; and a full quotation, under their respective headings, of the various scriptural testimonies, which prove the things affirmed. To these there are appended a variety of foot-notes, which deal with the objections and obscurities that arise in the path of investigation. It will thus be seen that for those whose interest has by any means been awakened, this will be "the very thing," setting before them in an accessible form, the grounds on which the Christadelphian hope rests, as opposed to orthodox faith; while on all occasions when brethren are asked a reason of the hope that is within them, the *Declaration* puts into their hand an implement highly adapted to enable them to do their duty effectively. We feel grateful that God has put it into the heart of the publisher to make so large sacrifice in the service of the truth, and doubt not that it will prove effective in strengthening and accelerating the work which is going forward prosperously, in the preparation of a people for the name of the Lord.

NOTES.

A CASE of urgent necessity has arisen in the extreme north of Scotland, where a brother with a large family is reduced to extremities, through illness and want of work. The case is that of A. Hall, tailor, of Crimond, who was brought to the truth through the instrumentality of brother Robertson, and immersed about three years ago. Believing the case to be one of real need, we shall be glad to take charge of any free-will offering, consecrated on this behalf, for Christ's sake.

SINCE the last issue, three copies of *Eureka*, vol. II, have come to hand, on sale, from a brother who had surplus stock to that amount. Those who desire to be possessed of the work have, therefore, three more chances. We advise an early application on the part of such.

We are authorized to state that the pamphlet entitled the *Soul and the Kingdom*, advertised on the cover at 1s., may be had at half price.

TO AMERICAN SUBSCRIBERS.

BROTHER Donaldson, of Detroit, Mich., our American agent, desires subscribers on the other side of the Atlantic to be reminded of their obligations. He says "I do not like to see 'dunning' notices in the *Ambassador*, but a new notice would be well, as quite a number have not paid for 1867. I have made arrangements with some to collect all in their section, and remit to me in the bulk. Those who do not come under any such arrangement, I would ask to remit direct to me at once; otherwise serious loss arises." A hint to the wise is enough.

THE AMBASSADOR

Of the Coming Age.

"A wicked Messenger falleth into mischief, but a faithful Ambassador is health."—PROV. xiii, 17.

No. 36.

JUNE, 1867.

Vol. IV.

THE JUDGMENT SEAT OF CHRIST, OR THE SECOND ADVENT IN RELATION TO THE HOUSEHOLD OF FAITH.—No. 6.

The Fifteenth Chapter of 1st Corinthians.—(Continued.)

So far, Paul answers the double question put into the mouth of the objector. Leaving the illustration of the grain, he proceeds in a strain which shews he is striving to meet the philosophical caviller on his own ground. He states the palpable fact that there is a variety of flesh-natures, and a difference between the radiance of the heavenly bodies and the light emitted by mundane substances. We are left to deduce the argument intended by this allusion, as Paul has not elaborated it. It is evidently designed to meet the philosophical contention that if there is to be a resurrection at all, it must be a reproduction of the flesh and blood that formerly existed, and that, in that case, immortality would be an impossibility, since flesh and blood is too fragile to endure for ever. Those who use this argument contend that the dead raised in any other state than flesh and blood would not be the persons that lived in a former state, and that, therefore, their reproduction would not be a resurrection, but a new creation. Paul's reply seems to be this: there is no limit to the resources of nature. Flesh and blood is not indispensable to the powers exhibited in human life. There is a variety of flesh and glory; and God is not beholden to that frail form of them which we experience in mundane life, in the execution of his purpose to give everlasting life to men and women, through Jesus Christ. This reply is good on philosophical grounds, (and we must observe that it is from a philosophical point of view that Paul is here treating the question, in accommodation to those who experienced philosophical difficulty in receiving the doctrine of the resurrection.) It is the question he put to Agrippa, advanced upon a philosophical basis:

“Why should it be thought with you a thing incredible that God should raise the dead?”—(Acts xxvi, 8.) “Why should the resuscitation of the dead to an immortal state be thought an impossibility on natural grounds, since it is impossible so to measure the powers of nature as to say what is possible and what is not? Why deny my attested declaration that God will raise the dead to immortality, on a ground liable to be fallacious, seeing that even in heaven and earth, there are things which, as natural facts, are beyond measure or comprehension?” Paul contends—and the contention has great logical force—that it is foolish to place the doubt of limited knowledge and imperfect intellect against the fact that he and others had seen a resurrected Christ, and against the fact that God attested their declaration by the performance of miracles. Philosophy—the deductions of the human intellect—may always be mistaken, especially when it dogmatizes on the subject of impossibilities. Hence, the folly of resisting facts on such vague and dreamy premisses. “But, on your own ground,” argues Paul, “you reason unwisely; for, there is great range and diversity in creation; and in asking you to believe that there is a step higher in the chain than man—that there is a state above the human to which man will ascend by resurrection, I only ask you to believe that to which the gradual ascent of nature points as a probability.”

Paul then leaves the philosophical track, and resumes the dogmatic style which is his wont, as an inspired writer. He proceeds to declare with authority what he knows, by divine illumination, to be the truth of the matter. His words are—

“So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption: it is sown in dishonour; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body.”

These words constitute the great stumbling block with those who deny the judgment of the saints. Restricting them to the mere act of emergence from the ground, they naturally regard them in the light of an express affirmation that the body is incorruptible, spiritual, and immortal from the first moment of its restoration; and that therefore judgment is anticipated and superseded by this silent proclamation of acceptance, and that nothing lies between those thus rising incorruptible, and perfected salvation, but a joyous re-union with the Lord. The mistake consists in construing Paul's words too narrowly, and reading them as if he were dealing with the dramatic incident of the resurrection, instead of the state of existence to which the act of resurrection leads. Paul is not discussing the scientific aspect of the subject. He is not defining the process by which a dead man ascends from the depths of corruption to the nature of the angels; the literal details are foreign to the subject before his mind. He is dealing with the broad question propounded by the objector; first, how (as a question of possibility) are the dead raised, and, second, for (or to) what body do they come? The first point he disposes of by an appeal to a phenomenon which exemplifies the power of resurrection organically exerted; and the second he meets by challenging attention to the fact that there is great diversity of power and glory in the universe of God, and that dead people, in a future state, need not *necessarily*, therefore, be the corruptible

flesh and blood they are in mundane life. This being so, "raise" must be taken in its widest sense, including, of necessity, the act by which the dead first resume bodily form and consciousness, but, at the same time, covering the whole process, *whatever it may be*, which leads to incorruption. It could not be that Paul intended to exclude any part of the process. It is doubtful if the question of process was at all present to his mind. This is suggested by the entire absence of allusion either to the judgment or the unfaithful. It was the broad question he looked at, viz., the position of those destined to be accepted, in relation to the two facts that they are to see corruption, and that God intends to promote them, in a renewed existence, to an incorruptible and immortal state. Paul affirms that as there is a difference of nature in different orders of being, and a difference between heavenly and earthly glory, so there is a difference between the present and future constitution of the saints, because the present is the earthly, and the future the heavenly; the present the animal, and the future the spiritual. The characteristics of the present state (of which death is but the conclusion) are corruption, dishonour, weakness, and naturality; from this, the body will emerge at the resurrection in incorruption, glory, power, and spirituality. This is true, without at all involving the conclusion that at the precise moment existence is resurrectionally renewed, the saint will be in possession of these qualities. The resurrection, as a completed transaction, inclusive of the judgment seat of Christ, will, in the case of the righteous, ultimate in incorruption, glory, power, and immortality. In a sense, they will attain to these on emerging from the ground, since they will never return to corruption; but, actually, they will be in the neutral state, to be determined for good or evil by the judgment. Paul, however, does not take this into account. He is not treating of details. He overleaps every item in the programme, and looks broadly at the fact that the destiny of the righteous, by resurrection, is the swallowing up of death in the victory of immortality.

That construction of Paul's words which makes Paul teach that the righteous come from the ground in an actually immortal state, overlooks the question to which his whole discourse is directed: "How are the dead raised, and *for* (or *to*) *what body do they come?*" It is the state to which the dead arise that engages Paul's thoughts, *and not the state in which they come*. It is the broad contrast between the present and the consummated future that is present to his mind all the way through. He leaves out all details; takes no account of the judgment or the rejected class, but deals only with those who shall be saved, and the condition of life to which they will be exalted "in the resurrection." Jesus says "those who have done good shall come forth *to the resurrection of life*."—(John v, 29). This in general terms, answers Paul's objector; the resuscitated dead do not come forth, as the Grecian and Sadducean philosopher supposed, to a flesh and blood state in which there will be marrying and giving in marriage; but, having been approved by the judge, they come to be changed from the image of the earthly to the image of the heavenly; to participate, in fact, in *the resurrection of life*, while those who have done evil, having been condemned by the judge, will share in *the resurrection of condemnation*. Paul leaves the latter class out of account, inasmuch as the aspect of the

subject under his consideration does not present them to notice. He contents himself with declaring that so far as the accepted are concerned, their resurrection, viewed as an accomplished process, is *incorruption, glory, power, and spirituality*. This is in answer to the question, "For what body do they come?" The "coming" includes their release from the prison in which they are bound, and their appearance in the presence of the Judge; the state to which they come is beyond this, and that state is the one described by Paul.

This view of Paul's words (which harmonises this 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians with all the New Testament besides) makes the word "raised" cover a considerable amount of ground. This is objected to by those who take the other view, but they object without a reason. It is true the word translated "raise" is used in the limited sense of a body coming to life and standing up: *e.g.*—

"Raised again the third day."—(Matt. xvi, 21.) "Lazarus, whom he raised from the dead."—(John xii, 1.) "He who raised up the Lord Jesus."—(2 Cor. iv, 14.) "Accounting that God was able to raise him (Isaac) up."—(Heb. xi, 19.)

But it is also true that the word is frequently used in a sense that involves a process. We give illustrations:

"God is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham."—(Matt. iii, 9.)

"He hath raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David."—(Luke i, 69.)

"And when he had removed him, he raised up unto them David to be their king.

* * * Of this man's seed hath God, according to his promise, raised unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus."—(Acts xiii, 22, 23.)

In all these cases, the raising was more than a single act; *it was the result of a series of acts performed with a view to its development*. Now, if this is a permissible and actually-illustrated definition of the word in New Testament use, need there be any objection to its application in a case where the great body of Paul's teaching necessitates its adoption? The raising of the dead in incorruption is a process which involves their "coming forth," and their arraignment at the judgment seat of Christ, where the "crown of life," will only be bestowed on those counted worthy. The word "resurrection" covers the whole process.

Independently of this, there is evidence in the chapter that Paul is dealing with his subject elliptically. He introduces Adam and Christ in proof of his proposition that "there is a natural body, and a spiritual body." He quotes the record of Moses with reference to Adam in proof of the existence of a natural body. "The first man, Adam, was made a living soul" (or natural body.) His proof of the second lies in this: "the last Adam was made a quickening spirit." Now, supposing a person ignorant of the history of Christ, were to receive his impressions of Christ's history from this statement,—supposing he had no other source of information,—would he not come to the conclusion that the "last Adam" was a spiritual body from the first moment of his existence? Would he ever conclude from it that "the last Adam" was first a helpless babe at

Bethlehem, clad in the flesh and blood nature of his mother,—then a boy submissive to his parents,—then a carpenter, helping in the workshop to earn a livelihood for the family,—then anointed with the Holy Spirit and Power, going about doing good, and performing works “which none other man did,” and that finally, he was abandoned of the power of God, and *crucified through weakness*, even the weakness of frail human nature? Would the uninformed and the superficial reader of Paul’s allusion to the last Adam learn from it that not only the first Adam, but the last Adam also, was a natural body for thirty-three-and-a-half years, and that he only became a life-giving spirit by the power of God in his resurrection? By no means. All these facts so familiar to us are elliptically compressed into the words “was made.” A process with so many striking features, is expressed in a way which, if there were no other information, would conceal it. If this is the case with reference to Christ, if we are at liberty to believe against the appearance of things in 1 Cor. xv, that Christ was first a living soul and then a quickening spirit, why need there be a greater difficulty in reference to his people, whose re-awaking in the flesh and appearance at the judgment-seat is kept out of sight in a phrase which its use in other cases admits to the possibility of covering the whole ground?

This method of exposition proceeds, it will be observed, upon a different basis from that which relies upon an emendation of the text. We have preferred it to the latter, as more in harmony with the logical necessities of the chapter. There is another reason; the amended reading is not beyond doubt. It is with great diffidence that we differ on this point from so great a teacher as Dr. Thomas, to whom, under God, we owe our enlightenment in the truth. We will, however, state the reasons, in the hope of eliciting from him, such comment on the points of difficulty as may either remove them or place them in a new light. As our readers will, for the most part, be aware, he submits the following as the correct reading of Paul’s words in 1 Cor. xv, 42, 43: “It (the resurrection body) springs in corruption; it is built in incorruption: it is sprouted in dishonour; it is reared up in glory: it is sprouted in weakness; it is built up in power: it is born a natural body; it is reared up a spiritual body.” Now, if this reading could be established, there is no doubt it would set all controversy on the subject of resurrection and judgment for ever at rest, inasmuch as it would constitute just such an explicit declaration on the point at issue as has always been felt to be wanting; but there are several reasons for mistrusting the rendering advocated. The first relates to *speiretai*, translated in the common version “it is sown,” and, by Dr. Thomas, “it springs, or is born.” The Dr. does not question that the word comes from *speiro*, to sow, in the ordinary sense of scattering seed on the ground; but he contends that its grammatical incidents justify the rendering he has adopted. Calling attention to the fact that in the passive voice, the verb has, in certain cases, the significance of springing, or being born, he points to the circumstance that the word, as used by Paul, is in the passive voice, and claims for it the sense in question. The answer to this would take the following shape: first, *speiro*, in the passive voice, means *to be sown*, as well as to *spring*; second, it very rarely, and that only in recondite and occasional, and, we may add, classical use, means *to spring*, and, in such cases, it only

expresses that idea by metonymy, and not by direct import; third, in the eleven other instances (apart from 1 Cor. xv) in which the passive form of the word occurs in the New Testament, (Matt. xiii, 19; Mark iv, 14 (twice), 16, 18, 20, 31, 32; James iii, 18; Matt. xiii, 19, 20), it is used in the sense of *sown*, or having received seed, and never in the sense of *spring*. Under these circumstances, it would require strong collateral reasons to warrant the adoption of it in 1 Cor. xv. These reasons appear to us to be wanting. Not only so; but the context seems against it. In the first place, "raised" being used antithetically to the word translated "sown," it seems to follow that the process expressed by the one word should be the inversion of the other. This is the case if "sown" is understood of death, as suggested by Paul's illustration of the grain; but if *speiretai* has the significance of *spring*, *sprout*, or *to be born*, there is no proper antithesis. In fact, there is no antithesis at all, for "raised" or "built" points in the same direction as "spring" or "sprout," and not in an opposite direction. Second, if "spring" was the idea Paul intended, it was necessarily a conspicuous feature in his statement. It, therefore, appears strange he should select an equivocal and rare form of speech, when there were other words that of their own inherent force would have done it without miscarriage, such as *gennesthai*, to be born; *phuo*, to spring; *exerchomai*, to come forth. In all other cases where "spring" is the sense intended, it is expressed by these and other similarly direct words. Third, it seems unnatural to use "raise" to describe part of a process which has been initiated by sprouting, or being born; in all other cases it covers the whole process of development expressed by the word *raise* or *rear*. It does so in this case if "sown" be accepted as the synonym of death; since it would denote the whole operation which brings the dead from corruption to incorruption; but if "sown" describes the first stage of resurrection, "raise" is made to define a process which would have been much more correctly and appropriately described by "finish," "complete," or some such word. The use of "raise," advocated in the amended reading, is not illustrated in any other New Testament instance. These facts, together, raise a strong doubt as to its accuracy. In addition to this, the bearing of Paul's argument seems to require that in the disputed passage, he should contrast the body of the present state with the body of the resurrection state. The sequel of the chapter continues the discourse on this basis. "There is," says he, "a natural body, and there is a spiritual body." He does not state this in reference to any particular epoch or event, but as a proposition true in the abstract. This is evident from the argument by which he supports the proposition. "And so it is written, the first man, Adam, was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit." Adam is the proof of his first assertion; the evidence is good if his assertion is abstract; but if his assertion mean that in the resurrection there is a natural body, the case of Adam proves nothing to the point, since Adam was not the subject of resurrection. That it is the contrast of the two states, present and future, which he presents, is further evident from the statement: "Howbeit that not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterwards that which is spiritual." This is in the nature of an historical reference, rather than a

statement about resurrection. Paul still has Adam of the present state in view, in contrast to Christ of the resurrection state, as is evident from his next observation: "The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven. *As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy*; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly." The precise meaning of this is placed beyond doubt by the next statement: "As we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." Paul states a reason for this: "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." Then, as if instantly anticipating a question as to those whom Christ would find alive, (seeing he has only been speaking of the dead up to this point,) he says "Behold I show you a mystery. We shall not all sleep, but we shall be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump." The event which ultimates in incorruption to the dead, brings incorruption to the living by change. The change will be an instantaneous result upon the effusion of spirit upon the bodies of "those who are alive and remain." The precise point of time at which it takes place is not stated. "The last trump" is a period, as may be learned from Rev. xi, 15-18, in which the dead are judged; it is not a scenic incident, but an epoch. In this epoch, the change will take place, but certainly not before the judgment, for judgment precedes approval. Paul does not mention the judgment. It does not come within the scope of his subject to do so. He deals only with the result, leaving all incident and process out of account. We must, therefore, insert the tribunal at which "Jesus Christ judges the quick and the dead at his appearing and kingdom," (2 Tim. iv, 1,) in that part of the resurrection-scene which Paul assigns it in other parts of his writings. As regards the dead, this is to be found in the word "raise;" as regards the living, in the phrase "the last trump." Coincidentally, and elliptically speaking, "the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we (the living) shall be changed." Both events will occur at the advent. This is true, speaking broadly of the subject, without reference to details; but is it, therefore, untrue that both classes will "appear before the judgment seat of Christ, to receive in body according to what they have done, whether good or bad?"—(2 Cor. v, 10.) Does a general statement of truth exclude the involved particulars? Those who oppose the judgment of the saints, from 1 Cor. xv, argue as if it did; as if Paul's glorious, bird's-eye delineation of the resurrection-scene here, in its relation to the accepted, invalidated the more sober details of the judicial transition-process, which he elsewhere declares to be attendant on this epoch; a process in which for a time it remains problematical who are to be confessed before the angels and crowned with life everlasting. As well might they argue that because in Gen. iii, 18, it is declared that all families of the earth shall be blessed in Abraham and his seed, therefore, they will not suffer by judgment which will decimate millions when Christ, the seed of Abraham, comes to bring the promise to pass, first "treading the winepress of the wrath of God," as declared in Rev. xix; that because in Zech. ix, 19, it is said he will speak *peace* to the heathen, therefore, he will not, in the first instance, speak to them in anger (Psalm ii, 5.) and "strike through kings in the day of his wrath,"

(Psalm cx, 5); that because Jesus said to his disciples, "I go my way to him that sent me," therefore, he was not first to die, be buried, and rise again; that because he said again to them, "I will come again and receive you to myself," therefore, he would not on his return, find the disciples in their graves, raise them, and take account of them.

The course of true wisdom is, not to set one part of the word against another part, but to harmonize apparent conflict, by giving effect to all details, and finding a place for these in all general forms of the same truth. This course is not taken by those who, on the strength of the chapter discussed, would deny that the dead come forth to judgment with reference to their candidature for immortality. On the contrary, they put Paul here in conflict with Paul elsewhere. They erect his general and elliptical declarations on the subject of the resurrection, as barriers to his own particular statements in other places and those of Christ and his apostles generally; for assuredly, if the dead spring into instantaneous glory, power, and spirituality, and the living are transformed in their several localities, without reference to the award of the judge, there can be no judging of the quick and dead at his appearing and his kingdom, (2 Tim. iv, 1;) no standing before the judgment seat of Christ, to receive in body according to deeds done, whether good or bad, (2 Cov. v, 10;) no giving account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead, (1 Peter iv, 5;) no bringing to light the hidden things of darkness, (1 Cor. iv, 5;) no scope for "boldness in the day of judgment," (1 John iv, 17,) or place for shame before him at his coming (1 John ii, 28.)

In opposition to this course, we have endeavoured to find in 1 Cor. xv a place for all these features; a place unseen by the unacquainted reader, but detectable by those having Paul's general teaching in view. In doing so, we have differed from the mode of solution suggested by one whose judgment of divine things is weighty. We have done so with regret, yielding only to logical considerations. In these, we may have mistaken our way, and shall be glad if the several points raised can be disposed of by the Dr. In any case, the result is the same; Paul is in harmony with himself. The resurrection includes all that is divinely associated with it. The upshot is incorruption, glory, power, and spirituality of nature, but these are only reached through the tribunal which will "make manifest the counsels of the heart." Prior to this, the future is a sealed book, except in so far as it is reflected in a man's conscience. The judgment will settle all, separating the chaff from the wheat, and determining who are the saints, in deed and in truth, and who the unprofitable servants, who have had but a name to live, and are dead.

EDITOR.

(To be continued)

The editors of the *Marturion*, a monthly paper of eight pages, published at Listowel, in Canada West, in the interests of the truth, have issued an appeal for assistance, as "their funds are exhausted," and they will be unable to continue their labours without the necessary supplies. They offer to send the paper to any of "the Lord's poor," who are willing to accept it as a free

gift. So far as it has gone, (ten numbers having appeared,) the *Marturion* appears to set forth the truth in its scriptural breadth and purity. We understand brother Brown, 19, Cowley Place, Cowley Road, N., Brixton, London, has undertaken to act as British agent, and will no doubt, be glad to receive communications on the subject of the foregoing intimation.

THE APOCALYPSE PARAPHRASED,

ON THE BASIS OF THE EXPOSITION CONTAINED IN EUREKA,
VOL. II. (DR. THOMAS.)

CHAP. VI, VERSES 1 TO 8.

And I saw when the Lamb opened one of the seals, and I heard from one of the four Living Ones, which, when encircling the throne, represent the redeemed after the judgment, but, during the seal periods, typify the One Body or Church Militant, saying, as a voice of thunder, "Come and see!" This voice was the voice of the spirit, as embodied in the early church in its Epheso-Smyranean state, and its utterance, which occurred A.D. 96, was not only the death-knell of Domitian, but the inauguration of a revolution that ultimately hurled the tyrant from his throne.

And I saw, and beheld a horse—symbolical of the Roman Power—the colour of which was white, an emblem of peace; thereby showing that the Empire was in a state of internal peace and prosperity, during the first seal-period. It extended from the death of Domitian, A.D. 96, to the accession of the Emperor Commodus, A.D. 180, during which time, Pagan Rome was ruled by four emperors, who were mild, yet dignified, and whose conduct commanded respect; an era described by Gibbon as "a most happy and prosperous period." And upon the white horse I saw one sitting—the representative of a class of spirit agencies to be coronally wreathed at the completion of their triumph, when they would compose the mystical Christ. And the rider carried a bow, which, to harmonize with the peaceful career of the horse and its rider, was without arrows; had there been arrows, it would have indicated blood-shedding, and, in that case, the horse would have been red or black. This bow was the symbol of a multitude of believers, or spirit agencies, bowing or bending their tongues to shout forth into the world the utterances of the spirit, as embodied in the Word of God. Their object was to subdue their enemies with the truth, and transform them into Eyes of the Living Ones, with a view to expelling from the Roman heavens the idolatrous superstition of Paganism. And so successful was the Bowman in conquering enemies that the Pagan temples became almost desolate, and, consequently, the priests were roused to incite official Rome to put a stop to this spreading contagion. And there was given to the Archer—who went forth conquering, that he might conquer, and when the limit of his conquering had been reached—a coronal wreath, after the custom of bestowing a circlet of evergreen upon successful combatants at the public games of Paganism. The coronal wreath was, therefore, an emblem of victory, and it shewed that before receiving it, the rider was a combatant, with a

conflict before him; a conflict which had for its object, first, the conversion of Jews and Gentiles from darkness to light, and, second, the indoctrination of society with the rider's religious principles, so as to effect a grand political revolution, by which the constitution of the body politic would be entirely changed and remodelled after a pattern altogether different.

And when the Lamb opened the second seal, and heard from the second Living One—a symbol of the early church in its Pergamian state—saying “Come and see!” And there went forth another horse—representing Greek and Latin society; and it was of a bright red colour—emblematic of the fiery indignation of the Deity. Hence, the red horse was a symbol of the judicial condition of society during the second seal-period; indicating, not that society would become red all over immediately on its being opened, but that it would become so before its termination. It was a period which witnessed the infliction of severe judgments on both rulers and people for their crimes, unbelief, and apostacy. The seal opened A.D. 183, when the Imperial throne was occupied by Commodus, a man destitute of every sentiment of decency and humanity, who, instead of performing the duties of his position, abandoned the reins of government to the most unworthy favourites, while he himself indulged in the unbounded gratification of his sensual appetite; after a sanguinary reign of thirteen years, he was strangled while labouring under the effects of poison and drunkenness. The judgments brought upon the empire during his reign fell chiefly on the upper circles of society; though the lower classes did not altogether escape, for they suffered severely from famine and pestilence—as many as two thousand persons, for a considerable length of time, dying daily.

And upon this war-horse there was sitting a rider—an individual representing a class of agents endued with the power of the sword, who were used as the blind executioners of the Deity's vengeance. And to this symbolic rider it was given to take the peace from the earth, or Roman Habitable—the peace of the first seal-period, which was internal, not external, for the Romans were at war with other nations. This decree was first carried out by Commodus, who, having once tasted blood, became incapable of pity or remorse. He condemned persons on mere suspicion without any trial; the execution of a senator was attended with the death of all who might lament or avenge his fate; a large number of consular senators were sacrificed to his wanton suspicion; and he diligently sought out all who were connected, however remotely, with the family of the Antonines, without sparing even the ministers of his crimes or his pleasures. The reign of his successor, Pertinax, was marked by tranquil blessings, but it was very short, and was succeeded by a period of great misfortune. To gratify the rage of the brutal prætorians, he was assassinated, and immediately afterwards, they brought the empire into shame and contempt by putting it up for

auction to the highest bidder. It was sold to Oidins Julianus, the governor of the city; but some of the armies at a distance refused to ratify this ignominious sale. This was fatal to the public peace. Each of the three generals were anxious to secure the throne, and, accordingly, they prepared for the arbitrament of the sword. Septimus Severus was possessed of the greatest advantages, which he made the best use of to dethrone Julian and instal himself as lawful emperor. After succeeding in this, he vanquished, in numerous battles, the legions of the east and west, commanded by the two generals who were his competitors for the emperorship; both of whom were put to death in fleeing from the battle. Thus was fulfilled the remaining part of the decree, which states that it was given to the individuals represented by the rider, that they should slay one another—an intimation that they would produce a period of civil commotion and bloodshed. And there was given to this symbolic rider a great dagger, a short weapon worn by the emperors as a symbol of their power over life and death, and by the prefects of the imperial guard as a badge to indicate that they were the constitutional authorities whose business it was to enforce obedience to the laws on pain of death. As used by the rider, it symbolized a multitude of soldiers in arms—the prætorian bands—who were employed by the ruling powers as an instrument with which to carry out their unjust designs. They were instituted by Augustus for the maintenance of his usurped dominion, and their number, though at first 15,000, was afterwards increased by Severus to 50,000. They enjoyed double pay, together with many other privileges; and so indispensable did they become as the tools of despotism, that, in the end, they took advantage of their powerful position, and instead of continuing the servants of the tyrant, they became his master. This dagger was, therefore, an emblem of the murder and assassination committed by those who wielded the power of the sword, and it was “great” because of the excessive and illegal use made of it.

During this seal-period, the treatment received by the ecclesia of Christ varied; for although Commodus destroyed the peace of Pagan Rome, his reign was remarkable for the peace granted to the saints. And Septimus Severus, who, in his younger days, had been a bitter persecutor of the christians at Lyons, afterwards became favourably disposed toward them for a time. But about the tenth year of his reign the ferocity of his temper broke out afresh, and he persecuted, with great severity, all who professed to be christians.

TRINITARIANISM AND THE TRUTH,
CONSIDERED IN RELATION TO THE FIRST THREE VERSES OF
JOHN'S GOSPEL.

THE "PRE-EXISTENCE" OF JESUS CHRIST—HIS BEING THE WORD MADE FLESH.

(Continuation of "The Bible as a Law of Life and Immortality," from page 80.)

But to return to the babe, born of a virgin, let us trace his history up to manhood. It is said "he increased in wisdom, in stature, and in favour with both God and man." He was subject to his parents, and ultimately wrought as a mechanic until he commenced his mission. These are interesting facts—they show the man. And what do they teach? His being a carpenter implies he worked with his hands. This, however, was not strange, even among the higher classes of the Jews. All Jews were taught a trade, and so it was that Paul happened to be a tentmaker, though by profession a lawyer, of rank a Pharisee, and by birth a Roman citizen. But Jesus, though of the house and lineage of David, was not as immediately highly born as Paul was. His parental circumstances were in humble life, and so poor, that his mother, when she came to present Jesus her first-born, to the Lord, and offer a sin-offering at the end of the days of her purification, she could not afford to bring a lamb, the offering of abundance, and she brought two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons. This is one criterion of her poverty. Had she not been an honourable woman and her husband a just man, the offering she made might have been a doubtful gauge of the poverty of her circumstances, but she and her husband having been both persons of character, we must regard the offering she made as the best she could. And so judging she was poor, we are led to infer that her son Jesus Christ wrought at his trade for the support of himself, and to add to the comforts of his mother. Mark the interest he manifested in providing for her comfort while in his agony on the cross. The inference is, he had all along provided for her, and hence his handing her over to another when death seized him, and bereaved her of the support he had afforded her. It had been the poverty of his circumstances then, that had created the necessity for his working with his hands. And as it is

evident from this, he had been denied the advantages of the education which affluence can command, and which the higher classes of his countrymen enjoyed, we have here the reason why the Jews afterwards marvelled at his teaching, saying "How knoweth this man letters, never having learned?" They knew all about his family and their circumstances, and so knew well enough he was not, nor could have been, a learned man after the ordinary fashion. How then came he to know so much, having in the ordinary fashion never learned? An answer to this may easily be given according to Trinitarian ideas; and the question at first sight may appear unnecessary; but there is more in it than there may seem; and much in the answer many would give, that would not be in harmony with the teaching of scripture, and the character of Jesus Christ. The question cannot be answered from what obtained with Jesus after he began his mission. What obtained with Jesus after he commenced his mission, was pre-eminently supernatural; but there are many things connected with his teaching which cannot be set down as the result of supernatural inspiration, otherwise we should level the supernatural power of the spirit to the operations of natural law. There is a power of the Holy Spirit manifested in man *through* the written word by the natural means of reading, understanding and obeying the word, and of thinking *with* the spirit (or according as the written word imparts the thoughts of Deity to the mind), which is *through* the word read and understood, an unction from the Holy One, and, therefore quickening. And there is a power of the Holy Spirit, supernatural, not now manifest, but which was manifested in all the prophets, apostles, and disciples of old. This supernatural power Jesus manifested in all his miracles, and in all, doubtless, he said and did, while perform-

ing the work of his mission, for never a man spoke as he; but, there was as doubtless, combined with it, the fruit of what he had read and studied for himself out of the written word, previous to the Holy Spirit descending upon him like a dove, after his ascent from the water. The power he received at this time was the authority to teach, accompanied with the power to work miracles in confirmation of his authority. And what he taught was, doubtless, much more that which he had before learned from the written Word than anything new, save in that his work was the fulfilment of the old, his teaching, a new interpretation thereof, and the additional prophecies he delivered. What he prophesied, the authority he received, and the miracles he performed, were all such as he could not have acquired, save by extraordinary or preternatural means; but we are not to suppose that because this was the case after his baptism, that the extraordinary means were those by which, while a boy, up to maturity, he increased in wisdom as he grew in age and stature. "The child grew, waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom." Well; how did he get this wisdom? He did not receive it as he afterwards received the fulness of the spirit. He received it as every well-instructed Jew in youth received it; he received it as Timothy received it; he received it as anyone now may receive it, who, in searching the written word to understand it, submits to the teachings of the spirit therein properly understood. But while we reason thus, let it not be forgotten, that as Jesus was the only begotten of the Deity, he was greatly loved and greatly cared for more than any man, and those circumstances were allotted to him as were best fitted to the growing of "the tender plant and the root out of a dry ground." And in the choice of these circumstances, for the upbringing of His only Son, we are here favoured with an illustration of the respect the Deity pays to the humble position of the poor, the appreciation at which he sets the value of honest industry, and his depreciation of the value of wealth, and the education with which it is generally associated, in the advantage which each respectively affords for the acquisition of wisdom. In this choice, we have poverty respected and wealth depreciated, in their relation to the wisdom which is heavenly, and, as it were, to make Jesus' life a practical example of

Jesus' teaching, it sublimely confirms the testimony he gave. "how hardly shall they that trust in riches enter into the kingdom of heaven. It is easier for a camel to go through a wicket, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven." He could not have been born rich, nor been a possessor of riches and justly said these things. For though riches are not necessarily an evil, they are of much advantage to the satisfying of the fleshy mind, and are, therefore, the less to be coveted than the poverty which is associated with industry, whose power keeps back rags, squalor, and dirt on the one hand, and temptations to sensual indulgences and frivolous thoughts on the other. But though those circumstances were chosen by Deity as the most advantageous for his Son, his choice of them did not alter their character, nor make them in any way subservient to the more clearly educated and preternatural power. Rather the reverse. They were circumstances common to man, and more adapted for the education of natural power than preternatural. The sons of poverty have risen to greater eminence in the history of the world than ever have the sons of wealth. And this is due, not so much to any particular difference between the mental power of the one and the mental power of the other, as it is due to the circumstances in which the mental faculties are exercised. And as those circumstances in which Jesus was born and brought up in, were provided for by the law of Moses, not ignored, as might have been, had the chains of perpetual slavery bound the poor and barred the way to their mental culture—as those circumstances, we say, were provided for by the law of Moses, and as Jesus was put under that law, the circumstances were more favourable for his training in the pure and clear understanding of the Word, than if he had been born rich, and trained in the traditional learning of the then fashionable, and so-called liberal education of the Jews. There is greater reason to believe he would have required more a preternatural than a natural power to grow up in the latter circumstances, and remain undefiled, than in the circumstances of poverty. These tell the more emphatically, that though he was the Son of Deity, he was still but a man. By his Father's choice of these circumstances, we see a testimony in favor of his human nature. We see the means used, the

best naturally fitted to the pure culture of the human mind, and the best adapted to fit Jesus for the work he had in maturity to perform—all natural. By this choice, Jesus was cast more upon himself, and, being under the direction of devout parental guardians, (not “learned” ones, but intelligent readers of the Word,) a willing and obedient child, he grew up guileless, and in the favour of God. He grew in wisdom, and became filled with it. But mark this, *he grew in wisdom*. Is growth the concomitant of supernatural power? Is supernatural power a power that comes by growth? Did he not grow in years, and grow in wisdom, and are we to suppose that the one growth was not as natural as the other? Are we to suppose he grew in either case in a way not natural to man? Why the supposition carries absurdity in its face. The same laws which increased his growth in stature, as he grew in years, were those which rule every man’s growth. And as in his physical nature, so in his mental. And surely if there is truth in the word of God at all, that which regulated David’s mental growth must have been that which regulated Jesus’. Such then must have been the manner in which we are to understand how Jesus grew in wisdom, and in favour both with God and man. He had acquired this growth by attention to the Word of God. He had derived it from the study of Moses and the Prophets. He had meditated on the written testimonies of God day and night. In short he had in common phraseology *taught himself*. Reading and writing he had both acquired while but a child, and if in his humble sphere, he did acquire these elementary branches of education, chiefly by his own effort, it would not be more than many of much less note than he in the biography of men, have acquired in like circumstances; nor would it be so much. Reading he had evidently acquired, and as for writing, we have an example on one memorable occasion of his writing on the ground. These are the beginnings of learning, and we shall not impute them in his case to supernatural inspiration. It would indeed be a pitiful exhibition of supernatural inspiration. We have no example of the Holy Spirit ever having made a man read and write, or *do anything* within the ordinary range of the intellect. And inasmuch as it was the case, that he could read and write, we may ask the question for what purpose did he possess the ability? To what use did he put these

arts? If he had been innately acquainted with the whole Word of God, they were unnecessary to him. But the fact is, the Bible was as necessary to him as to any man, and so the arts were necessary. They were the natural means by which he attained his growth in wisdom; and hence we need not suppose anything else than that it was by Jesus’ own diligent application to the reading and study of the word, that he increased in favour with both God and man. He did not idle, he did not play, he did something, but had he been supernaturally inspired at this time, what would he have had to do? To what purpose would he have read that which was written, if that which was then written was already in him, or given him as occasion required? And on what principle could he have *grown* in the favor of God, if what he possessed was innate? There could have been no *growth* in the matter. The favour of God would have been to him the same all along. He *grew* in it therefore, because he daily merited it. This growth was more due to his attention, studies, and meditation on the Word of God, than to the circumstances surrounding him, conducive to his success. The Deity had formed his brain to fit the purpose for which he had been miraculously conceived, but he had himself to exercise that brain as other men, and what he had acquired before he began his mission must have been the fruit of his exercising it—the result of his diligent mental application. Hence, his having from a child so exercised it as to read and study the holy Scriptures daily, it is not to his having been supernaturally inspired we are to attribute his familiarity with the Scriptures after his baptism, as evinced by the readiness with which he turned to the portion of Isaiah he read in the synagogue, in the ease with which he quoted the Scriptures to serve his purposes of refutation and instruction, and in his oft-repeated allusions to Moses and the Prophets. From all that we learn of him, he was intimately acquainted with the whole page of sacred writ; and had he not been so, we should not have had it recorded of him in the memorable conversation he had with the two disciples going to Emmaus, “that he began at Moses and the Prophets, and expounded to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself.” But had this intimate acquaintanceship with the Scriptures been purely an accidental circumstance, had it been quite apart from a reading and study of them, a circumstance not common to the

ordinary course of things, we should not have had this confession from his lips, concerning "the times and the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power," that "no man knoweth them, neither the angels in heaven, nor the son but the Father."—(Acts i, 7; Mark xiii, 32.) for the simple reason, that such an inspiration as would have given him an acquaintance with the whole Word of God, without any mental effort on his part, would have fallen far short of inspiration such as was exhibited by his apostle, had it not made known to him as well what in Patmos was revealed by John, concerning the same times and seasons. But he confessed his ignorance of them, because they were sealed by the Prophets, because no amount of reading and study of the prophecies could throw light on them at that time, because the time had not then arrived for the Deity to unseal the Prophets, because it was reserved for Jesus to unloose the seals after he had entered the Holy of Holies in the heavens; and this he did, as exhibited in the Apocalypse. But while in the flesh he could not, as he himself confesses. Hence, the conclusion is that the supernatural inspiration with which he was endowed, apart from the natural inspiration he derived from his reading and study, was limited to certain things to which the times and seasons referred to did not immediately pertain. And as this evident limitation of his supernatural inspiration shews the nature of it to have been the same as that of the prophets—that he only differed from them in being wholly filled with the spirit, and entirely under its control during his mission, but not involuntarily so, his teaching was confined to what he had read and studied for himself, and to that which he had received supernaturally for the immediate object of his mission. And there is no reason for supposing it otherwise. To suppose the nature of his supernatural inspiration to be anything different from that of the prophets, is to place his confession regarding those times in a very suspicious plight indeed. Had his authority to teach, the power he manifested, and the knowledge he possessed, sprung from innate faculty which the prophets possessed not, his innate faculty would have thrown suspicion on his statement, that he was ignorant of those times. Had he been the Deity in human form, he would then have been omniscient according to his own showing; his being filled with the spirit shews he

was but a great prophet—a man as the prophets were. In all that we have recorded regarding the inspiration of the prophets, we find that the power they received was a power they received above their own natural power of mind. They wrote what they could not have acquired by any human means; they penned that which had never before been revealed, and at times wrote not the history of the past, as any one might do, but the history of the future, which no man uninspired could do; and we see from this that it was only to purposes for which the mind of man was in itself incapacitated from acquiring, that the supernatural influence of the spirit was brought to bear. And as that which was so revealed is written, the writing is for reading, the reading for meditation, and the meditation for the understanding of that which is read. The fruit of this is natural inspiration, in the ratio the understanding is enlightened. It is still the fruit of the spirit's work, though by natural means, and in the ratio of the understanding that which is read, the reader may be more enlightened than the prophet was, whose writings he reads. For though the prophets were supernaturally inspired, they wrote much they did not understand, while, in the written Word, the whole testimony is before the reader, and his advantages thereby are greater than were those of any single prophet. The natural means are, therefore, by far the better means after all, the more profitable for the reader. The gifts of the spirit thus derived are more excellent than the supernatural. And Paul esteemed them more highly. Compare the tenor of the apostle's remarks in 1 Cor. xiii, xiv, Gal. v, 22, 23, with 2 Peter i, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 2 Tim. iii, 14, 15. Now this advantage Jesus had before his baptism. Such gifts of the spirit as he had before he began his mission were the fruit of his voluntary submission to the Word, the fruit of the spirit through the natural means of his diligent application to the study of the Word. And it is no depreciation of Jesus' character to say this, but the reverse. To say that before his baptism he did not acquire his knowledge and wisdom from the same source any man can now do so, what example could he be to us of a student of the Word of God, any more than he could be an example to us of obedience, had he not been made under the law? To say that Jesus was innately acquainted with the Scriptures,

or that it was through an inspiration apart from his reading the Scriptures he came to know and understand them, is simply to say he was not like other men, of the same passions, of the same mental constitution, that he was not amenable to the laws of his country, or it is simply to say that David's testimony is false. But we are not left long to conjecture on the matter. A very short passage in the history of Jesus explains it all. It is said "he was subject to his parents." This settles the point. Could he have been subject to his parents and not a reader of the Word of God? This short passage is the key to the whole secret? His parents were devout, true to their God, their country, and its laws. And so they had trained him in the way he should walk. Doubtless, in his case they had found it an easy task. He doubtless had been an obedient and willing child; but nevertheless we are not to suppose they did not employ the means directed by their country's laws. His being subject to them implies it. They as Jews faithful to the law of Moses, had certain duties to their family to perform. They were a faithful and honourable couple, and being bound to bring him up in the knowledge of Moses and the Prophets, being bound to keep the words of God in their hearts, to teach them diligently to their children, to talk of them when they sat in the house, and when they walked by the way, we may readily believe of Mary and Joseph, that whatever others may have done, they at least faithfully and carefully discharged their duties to the best of their ability. God never would have committed to them such a charge as His only-begotten Son, had their characters not been eminently righteous, and those with whom they took sweet counsel (Luke i, 36) amongst their relations, equally devout worshippers of God. These were all happy co-related circumstances to the training of Jesus Christ. There was not only the fruitful soil, but the adapted atmosphere. He was not only of a happy mental organization, ready to receive good impressions and shoot them forth; but he was the child of a holy mother, her husband a truly righteous man, and the favourite also of near relations, both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments of the Lord blameless. This was the school in which Jesus Christ's boyhood was spent, and need we wonder therefore he *grew* in wisdom? From infancy he had been instructed by both precept and example, early he had imbibed the truth for himself, carefully had

he studied the scriptures, night and day had he meditated on the law of the Lord, and hence it was but natural he should grow like a tree planted by the river side.—Psalm i.

But let us mark the progress he made and the thirst for knowledge he so early exhibited. His parental guardians associated him with them in their worship, and on their going up to Jerusalem took him along with them to the feast of the Passover. This they were in duty bound to do.—(Exod. xxiii, 17; xxxiv, 23; Deut. xvi, 16.) On one occasion when they returned he lingered behind. What had made him linger? Boys will linger where their tastes are gratified. His tastes were above amusement. He did not tarry to play. What then did he tarry for? To gratify his thirst for knowledge. He had desired converse with men, with men apt to teach, with men of a religious culture. He had acquired from his training and study of the scriptures a virtuous, noble, and inquiring spirit, and an ambition for intercourse with others of a like spirit. So too absorbed with the object of his pursuit, never thinking of consequences, he tarried behind. And when his mother and Joseph came seeking him, they found him among the doctors. Among whom? Among men learned in the law and the prophets. And what was he doing? He was both hearing and asking them questions. Well, what may his questions have been, and what the doctors'? We need not stop to minutely perceive them. The nature of *his* studies and the nature of *their* teachings indicate what they may have been. Sufficient to know that all that heard him were astonished at his understanding and answers. Shall we say that this was the fruit of a supernatural inspiration, and not of his studies? We should rob him of the grandeur of his character if we did. The astonishment he excited does not imply that his understanding and answers were above the intelligence of the doctors. Had this been the case, the astonishment would have given place to bewilderment, and their favour for him to ridicule. Such was the case when, after he began his mission, he was above being taught.—(John vi, 60, 61, 65.) But on this occasion he was under tutors and governors, and differed nothing from a servant, though the only son of Deity, the heir and Lord of all.—(Gal. iv, 1, 2, 4.) He at this time had as yet not been sent forth—the fulness of time had not then as yet come for the commencement of his teaching.

What then does this astonishment of his hearers imply? It only implies that they were astonished at the understanding and answers of a boy so young—only twelve years of age (or like seventeen years in our climate). It implies that his questions and understanding had been of equal intelligence with the doctors; but they men of years and experience, he but a youth and of little experience—they were “learned,” he unlearned. And as his questions, doubtless, were such as his studies had suggested as a fitting subject of conversation with men professedly learned in the scriptures, his questioning had been in the search for more knowledge, or as a pupil would question; otherwise, considering the general character of the men, he would have been regarded as impertinent, and would not have had their favorable hearing.

These remarks spring not from mere imagination. They are suggested by what is natural to the human mind in the given circumstances. And as we are told, Jesus was subject to his parents, we must understand also that he was subject to what they were subject to, as related to their temple worship and public teachers. From all we can learn of him, it is clearly evident his mother and her husband Joseph had been his first teachers, and that what they had taught him was scripture knowledge—the knowledge of the truth; second, that he had himself zealously pursued the study of Moses and the prophets; and third, that he had while thus studying for himself taken such advantages as he could of conversing with others whose life, knowledge, position, and experience were calculated to assist him more than his parental guardians could. To say the latter was unnecessary, is to say the first was unnecessary. If in his infancy he was taught by his mother to lisp the name of his Heavenly Father, and hear from her lips the ways and words of God, (and shall we say he was not thus taught?) in his adolescence he would also gather instruction from those in the appointment of the Jewish worship, whose learning was of course greater than that of Mary and Joseph, and of no small importance withal, though it may have been adulterated with tradition; and as we have proof unmistakable of the one, we may cite his being found among the doctors both hearing and asking them questions, as proof of the other. But both were auxiliaries simply, and probably more incitements than assistants. It was his own diligence and

self-application to reading and meditation which served him most. It was this which made him “wiser than all his teachers,” but nevertheless, for a time, he had these auxiliaries as his teachers, and was subject to them. As a Jew, he was bound to be so. He had then not as yet become the teacher sent from God. He was then only as we have already said, the Son sent from God to be under tutors and governors, until the fulness of the time was come for him to be sent forth as the Teacher. He was then only being taught himself; and as the Scribes and Pharisees, or the “doctors,” sat in Moses’ seat, whatsoever they bade him observe and do, that he observed and did, only he did not do after their works.—(Matt. xii, 23.) This was the advice Jesus himself gave to “the multitude,” after he became the Teacher. He would not have taught them to do this had he not himself done the same, while as a pupil he belonged to the same “multitude” of which that portion he so addressed was the representative. Before his baptism he had no official position, and was, therefore, one of the multitude as any ordinary Jew was. And so too as any ordinary man would in the ratio of his observance of the laws of God, *he grew* in wisdom and in favor with both God and man. His obedience as a Son gained him the favor of his Father—God. His diligence as a pupil gained him the favor of his tutor—man. This was natural. But when he became a teacher, *this favor of man* left him. This also was natural. His superseding his teachers inspired them with envy and hate, as everyone who assumes to be wiser than those who first taught them can thoroughly understand. The favor in the one circumstance and the hatred in the other being both issues from the one principle of self-approbation, they are the natural fruits of the fleshly mind.

But how shall we measure the advance he made? By what means shall we reach at any stage of his life the height of his knowledge? Is there anything we can point to as a striking proof of his intimate acquaintance with the scriptures ere he began his mission? The answer he gave his mother on her finding him, to the question she put—“Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us?”—answers these questions. “How is it,” replied he, “that ye sought me? wist ye not that I must be about *my* Father’s business?” This answer indicates the progress he had thus made in the study and understanding of the scriptures. And he puts it forth as if his

mother should have known the truth as well as he himself did. And why? Because "the scriptures testify of him"—(John v, 39), and she should have known it from them. Besides, it was revealed to her and confirmed to her by a miracle, and therefore she should have known it as well as he, but it appears from this she had neither sufficiently understood the angel's announcement, the miracle, nor the scriptures. There is nothing strange, therefore, in Jesus' answer, nothing that would imply he had been supernaturally informed of the matter. He was rather better informed than he could have been by an angel's message; he was informed by weightier evidence than any miracle or supernatural vision. Mary was supernaturally informed, yet she understood not. But Jesus came to know it by written testimony, the most potent of all evidence. Hence, his answer so far from being strange or singular, simply shows how far he had gone in the study of the scriptures and his clear understanding of them. It simply shows that he at the early age of twelve years had, through his reading and studying the scriptures, come to understand himself to be the Son of God promised. Had he not when he became "the Teacher come from God" reproached the Jews for their not believing him, while they professed to believe Moses and the prophets who wrote of him—(John v, 46; Acts xxvi, 22), our understanding his answer thus, might have been different: but what in Jesus' estimation ought to have been sufficient evidence to them that he was the Messiah, is just the evidence by which he while a youth had been convinced himself of the same thing. He did not tell the Jews they required to be supernaturally inspired ere they could believe Moses and the prophets, otherwise he should not have reproached them; he, therefore, told them as it were his own experience, and this was his experience that he, while he was but growing in wisdom, could even then testify of himself from what he had before the age of twelve read from Moses and the prophets; and as he had done this while but a child, why should they not have been able to do so, being men, and men too who professed to believe and understand Moses and the prophets? His early announcement of himself as the Son of God need therefore excite no surprise. "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business" negatively imputes to Mary the same knowledge as he himself had, and so tacitly

repudiates on his part any assumption of superior attainments to what she should have had. It is simply a sharp answer to a sharp question, and implies his mother *should* have known better and exercised greater faith. But this she could not have done had Jesus' knowledge come through a different channel from what her's should have come. But it did not, and hence his answer: "Know ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" Why did she not know? Why went she seeking him *sorrowing*? What had she to fear? Why had she so little faith? Did she not know he was the son of God, that no evil should befall him, that the angels had charge of him, to keep him in all his ways, and bear him up in their hands, lest at any time he should dash his foot against a stone.—(Psalm xci, 10, 11, 12) Why then did she not assuage her sorrow with the thought he was in the safe keeping of the angels, and must be about his Father's business? This she should have known and reflected on. Had she done so, she would not have required to put the question she did, nor receive the answer he gave. But it appears that notwithstanding the revelation made to her by Gabriel concerning him, and the miraculous conception of which she was herself the subject,—it appears (Luke ii, 50) she did not even understand the saying he spake to her. And the reason is she had not sufficiently understood the scriptures as Jesus had. The revelation made to her, and that made to Joseph, were such as should have enabled them both the better to understand Jesus had they understood the scriptures, but they had not, and therein lies all the difference between their knowledge and understanding and his. Had he not understood the scriptures, the things revealed to him by Mary would have been as an idle tale. The revelation made to Mary by the angel, the shepherd's visit, and the wise men's offerings, she had doubtless spoken of to Jesus in probably many a conversation with him concerning the things "most surely believed" by her; and as he by twelve years of age had reached the stage of puberty, he had fully comprehended the matter. But, nevertheless, his understanding of the conception would have been of little avail in persuading him he was the Son of the Deity promised to the fathers, had he not at the same time been intimately acquainted with Moses and the prophets. The evidence of the latter was of the first importance: the testimony of Mary the confirmation of that evidence. Without

the former the latter would have had no effect in bringing conviction to his mind; because, no miracle however great, no teacher however powerful, no working of Deity however striking in its effects on the senses of man whether in favour, judgment or war, will ever bring conviction to the mind of what is truth, without a previous understanding of the scriptures. Had Mary and Joseph sufficiently understood the scriptures, they would have understood his saying, or prevented it by refraining from grief and anxiety in their search for him. Had the Jews understood the scriptures they never would have rejected Jesus' powerful teaching. And did men in these days understand the scriptures they would see in those striking events which have just happened, the links which connect them with the long chain of events which now form the matter of ancient and modern history, and hear within the hush which metes out peace for the present, the seething and hissing of still mightier commotions yet to happen, which will make way for him whose "right it is to reign," and make the "eastern question" his own. For, it is not according to the wisdom of man or

even angels, events happen; it is according to the scriptures. Of the incidents which happened while Jesus was on earth, how often is it said, they so happened that the scriptures might be fulfilled. And it is the same still. It is not the events happen and therefore fulfilled, but it is, they *must* happen so as the scriptures shall be fulfilled. The events connected with Jesus' birth had to happen ere the scriptures concerning him could be fulfilled, and Jesus had first to know the scriptures concerning himself ere he could connect them with the knowledge he had acquired from Mary of his origin. His answer, therefore, was in accordance with his understanding of the scriptures as bearing on his birth. His answer was no riddle from him on that account, and should have been for the same reason no riddle to her. It appears the very conclusion to which he should naturally come—a true logical deduction from the premisses—viz.: his intelligent understanding of the prophets, coupled with what he had learned of Gabriel's announcement from his mother's lips.

W. D. J.

(To be continued.)

THE POLITICAL HEAVENS AND THE SIGNS THEREOF.

THE Luxemburg question, which gave promise of war, has, for the present, received a quietus at the London Conference. Both the parties to it—France and Prussia—were doubtless anxious to postpone a rupture; the first, because the Exhibition has yet several months to run, and the second, because the military resources of the new German Empire are not yet consolidated. They have agreed to terms, which, for the present, admit of a continuance of peace. This is an unusual result for a Conference, and is doubtless attributable to the unusual pressure on both sides in a pacific direction. That the result can be permanent is impossible; the tendency of the general situation is to war. Diplomacy may patch, restrain, postpone, circumlocute, and generally modify the direction of events, but that it can bring peace is impossible. War will

come that will set the whole of Europe in a blaze, and end in the interference of Christ in the world's affairs. This is divinely decreed, and the past shews that God's word is sure to come to pass. We are not permitted to know beforehand the details which lead up to the subjugation of Europe by Russia. We know not by what diplomatic eddies the political clouds may be agitated and wrought into all sorts of fantastic shapes; these are all at the divine disposal. God works the secret springs of political action, and all things run in the chosen channel. In this confidence, we can calmly survey the political arena, and accept every event that happens, knowing that in this matter, peculiarly, "whatever is, is right;" that every new phase—whatsoever may be the direction it appears to take—is a part of the divine process of

events by which the great climax of our expectation is to be reached. Disappointment is out of the question. A brother writes to say that the success of the Conference has caused him this feeling; this need not be. God's programme will be carried out; and every political incident is part of that programme. It is natural to be elated with events when they are significant of the end; and perhaps it is not wonderful if a contrary effect is produced by those that appear to go the wrong way, but experience will moderate both tendencies and bring a man to the attitude of patient observation, ready to welcome every favourable token, and, at the same time, to accept with submissive endorsement, the events that may seem to defer hope. There is no special exercise for the latter kind in the present crisis. It was not upon Franco-Prussian difficulties that the prophetic watchman had fixed his gaze. The Luxemburg question was a passing complication which it was probable might superinduce the belligerent activities looked for in connection with other matters; it was not in itself a sign. It is to Rome, Russia, and Turkey that the prophetic student is looking, and there is no retrocession or obscurity at any of these three points of the field of vision. It is by no means certain that even the Luxemburg difficulty is at an end. In the *Birmingham Journal* of May 11th, we read as follows, in the letter of the Paris correspondent:

"In common with a great many sceptical people here, I believe that a temporary arrangement is the right name for the result of the London Congress. The wolf did not refrain from ultimately declaring war against the lamb, when the original charge of muddling the stream had been satisfactorily disposed of; and yet it is well known that one of the high contending parties in that dispute was in favour of peace at any price. How much smaller, therefore, must be the chances of a finally pleasant issue, where both of the disputants are wolves, and each is intent on making the water as muddy as he can for the other! The truth is, the French and Germans just now hate each other, and that state of things, unless I have read history backward, generally leads to a fight. Nothing is too bad here which is said to Bismark's discredit, and in Berlin the press and stage vie with each other in insulting the French."

The *Little Times*, of May 9th, commenting prospectively on the Conference, says:

"For our part, we never believed, and we have twice stated our disbelief, that this convocation of plenipotentiaries would do much toward establishing a permanent peace in Europe. They may patch up something that will hold water for a while, but there is too much bad blood running, both in German and Gaul, to go much longer without letting. And then there is the necessity for the employment of Louis Napoleon's soldiers, forced upon him with all the relentless requirements of fate; and on the other side, there is the grand unity of the German peoples, so much desired by his antagonist; and which, although yesterday more than half accomplished in the Prussian Chamber, needs that perfecting and cementing that can only be done by the baptism of blood. For these two reasons, then, do we fear that the Conference will prove a failure, and that blood must flow upon the banks of the Rhine, if not over all Europe."

Illustrative of the warlike mood that prevails on the Continent, the reader may note the continued progress in the invention and manufacture of military weapons which are being carried to a terrible pitch of perfection. In a recent issue of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, there occur the following editorial remarks:

"WEAPONS OF WAR.—The firing of the Chassepot rifle has astonished the Emperor of the French by its destructiveness. In two minutes, a battalion of 500 men, at 600 yards from the mark, had fired 8,000 balls, of which 1,992 had struck the line of aim. The ground in front of the mark was so cut up, that not a blade of grass could be seen: and the Emperor, perhaps having in his mind's eye 500 Prussians standing in that dangerous spot, is reported to have exclaimed, "It is frightful! It is a massacre!" The Steinhil cannon is also said to be a success. This mysterious weapon, smokeless and noiseless, is based on the application of centrifugal force. The balls are propelled by the motion of a circular disc, traversing a groove from its centre to its periphery, whence they pass through the barrel of the gun. It is merely a scientific application of the weapon with which David killed the gigantic Philistine. Just as a stone, whirled round and round in a schoolboy's sling, leaves it with enormous velocity, so this rotatory disc propels cannon balls with enormous momentum. * * * Powder is now beaten out of the field by the very earliest and simplest form of centrifugal propulsion. The reporter of these marvels thinks he is not too sanguine in entertaining a hope that war will become more and more rare, owing to the dreadful perfection of the

instruments intended to further it. An amiable idea, which we have seen expressed pretty often before. But when is it to be realised? So long as humanity remains what it is, there must be sometimes war, though the perfection of weapons tend to make it short, sharp and decisive."

The *Globe*, the other day, published the following intelligence, from Prussia:

"Experiments are being made with the new double-barrel cannon of Herr von Dreyse, the inventor of the needle-gun. The cannon is said to be completely successful, and perhaps will be soon called upon to measure its powers with the new weapon of the Emperor Napoleon. In Germany the Brothers Eberhardt, at Ulm, have just turned out an offensive weapon, operating on the same principle as the latter, but having four barrels instead of one, as in the case with the French "infantry cannon." Each barrel is stated to be capable of 60 discharges in a minute. Wurtemberg has adopted the Prussian needle-gun."

The *Pall Mall Gazette* of the 9th ultimo, states that the Rotterdam insurance brokers have resolved not to insure vessels, except with a stipulation referring to war. Notwithstanding all these warlike indications, there begins to be a talk about assembling a Congress, to bring about a general beating of swords into ploughshares. The diplomatists have succeeded so well with the Luxemburg business, that they think they might as well extend their good offices to the distempers of Europe in general. Possibly the project may be received with favour, and the peace-cry caught up. The sovereigns of Europe may assemble, and under the soothing influences of the Paris Exhibition, consent to disarm, and make a pretence of doing it; but it will all be a sham and a delusion. It will be the cry of "peace and safety," which at some stage, in some form or other, must precede the final catastrophe. The faithful will not be deceived.

As to Russia and the Eastern question, we quote the following remarks from the *Morning Advertiser* of May 8th:

"Let us now say a word or two on the state of Russia. In that country, also, we should be glad to discern conditions imposing upon her an equal necessity for exclusive attention to domestic questions. Most undoubtedly Russia is not short of subjects imperatively demanding reform, and upon which her population may be presumed to take a deep interest. Unfortunately, how-

ever, the policy of that empire, now already extending over so vast a territory in Europe, and covering more than a fourth of the Asiatic continent, has always been, and still remains, a policy of further extension into Europe. Those who, among Russian statesmen, seek to give practical effect to that policy, believe it to be materially aided by the present conjuncture of circumstances. The agitation which reigns in Greece—an agitation to which Russia cannot be, and is not, a stranger—is daily undermining the foundations of Ottoman power. That is a fact which it would be idle to dissemble. The apparent impotence of Turkey to quell the Cretan insurrection has signally betrayed her weakness, while, on the other hand, the influence exerted by Russia has been continually increasing under cover of the intense interest which possibilities in Western and Central Europe have excited. It is in the relative positions of Greece and of Turkey, and in the ceaseless ambition of Russia, the danger for the future continues to threaten. At this moment everything is still calm, or at any rate appears to be so, and all causes of trouble to be only superficial. A single day, however, may suffice to unveil to us, with terrible suddenness, the mischief which has been lately accumulating in those regions, and to show us that things are in a much more advanced state than they appear to be. It is to this quarter, we repeat, that we must now more than ever turn a watchful eye, and in this quarter troubles are most likely to arise against which it behoves us to be on our guard."

The Paris correspondent of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, on 9th ult., states that in that city, it is now regarded as certain that a treaty of alliance has been signed between Russia and Prussia, and the attitude of the United States causes uneasiness. A Paris correspondent of the *Independence Belge* states in the most positive manner, that an offensive and defensive alliance has been concluded between Italy and France, in case of war between the latter power and Prussia. The correspondent of the *Pall Mall Gazette* also states, that in addition to Italy, France, in case of war, counts on the aid of Holland, Denmark and Sweden, and that it is hoped that Austria may also be won over. This shows that war, when it breaks out, will bring nearly every nation in the civilised world into the conflict.

As to Rome, we read as follows, in a letter from that city, published in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, of April 27th:

"The most perfect tranquillity pervades the city, though many fear we are on the verge

of an insurrection. Garibaldi has accepted the presidency of the "centre of insurrection" at Florence, which is connected with another "centre" at Rome, working in opposition to the Roman National Committee; there is an impression that this party will attempt a *coup de main*. There seems no ground, however, for apprehending an immediate movement. Garibaldi has informed his friends at Rome, that he will head an inroad of Roman emigrants, after the fetes of the canonization, and of St. Peter; but he recognises the importance of remaining inactive up to that time, so that he may not deprive the Romans of the advantages these great solemnities will bring them. The question of the deliverance of Rome, is thus made subordinate to its enrichment, and has become a matter of local finance."

Intelligence from Crete during the month reports three repulses of the Turkish army, under Omar Pasha. In reference to this, the following letter appeared in the *Morning Star*, of the 16th ult.

SIR,—Omar Pasha has struck his final blow, with what result your readers are now acquainted. A few more such final blows, and the Turk will have to take up his tent, minaret, harem, and the whole paraphernalia of Asiatic barbarism, and leave the shores of Europe. The sooner the better. But while important events are thus taking place in Candia, I am anxious that some Liberal member in the House of Commons should ask the noble Secretary for Foreign Affairs the following question:—Has not the British

Minister in Athens sent a communication to Her Majesty's Government as near as possible to the following effect: "The independence of Candia may be looked upon as an accomplished fact. Its immediate union with Greece is a certainty?" If such a despatch has been sent from the British Legation at Athens to Her Majesty's Government here—and I have reason to know that such a despatch has been sent—I may be permitted to ask why, in the name of goodness, is the moral and diplomatic action of your Government still engaged in supporting a state of things in Candia which the Ministers of this country must know can only tend to encourage a protracted and useless struggle?

I want an answer to this question. Perhaps some Liberal and independent member in the House of Commons will ask Lord Stanley for an explanation.—I am, sir, your obedient servant, JOSEPH CARTWRIGHT.
Corcyra Villa, London, May 14.

The Berlin correspondent of the *Times*' writing on the 8th ult., says:—

"The tone of the Russian press on Eastern affairs continues very threatening. The Czar has again recommended to the Sultan to cede Crete to Greece, and the journals are earnestly inviting the public to assist the future son-in-law of their sovereign by taking up his latest loan."

The *Standard* of the 9th ult., has the following:—

"Agitation increases in Thessaly and Epirus, in spite of the efforts of the Greek government to check it."—ED.

INTELLIGENCE.

ABERDEEN.—Brother Gill, writing on the 13th ult., reports the addition to the Aberdeen ecclesia of ANN GORDON, domestic servant, who has already three sisters according to the flesh in the meeting. One of the brethren, Alexander Mennie, originally from Turriff, is about to emigrate to New Zealand.

BALLUSS, BY MINTLAW, (SCOTLAND).—Brother J. Mitchell, announces the immersion of Mrs. MORRISON, of Feterangus, upon a confession of her faith in the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ. Brother Mitchell assisted her in the act. She afterwards removed to Strichen, where she is four miles from any of the household of faith.

BIRMINGHAM.—The course of twenty-four lectures having ended, the general exposition of the word, read in regular course, has been resumed without any falling off in the attendance. During the

month, there have been three additions by immersion, the obedient believers of the truth being EDWIN CALDICOTT, (30,) ornamental engraver, and his wife, ELIZA CALDICOTT, both formerly undecided, but in attendance among the Baptists, and MARY ANN MAY, (19,) formerly Church of England. Brother and Sister T. WALLIS, having (after dissociating themselves from the ecclesia in Birmingham, and transferring their countenance to the God-dishonouring operations of George Dawson, M.A., a quasi-clerical lecturer of the humorous sort, who is popular in Birmingham and throughout the country, for his power to entertain the fleshly mind; who after the Colenso school, pretends to be a preacher of Christ, while denying Moses and the prophets, and, in a manner peculiar to himself, deceives the understanding through the sheer force of dogmatic sarcasm; appearing to teach wisdom, while, in reality, inculcating principles that lead the ignorant into the certain paths of destruction, or rather

make their escape from those paths a matter of impossibility;) the two persons in question having, in addition to this treacherous act, removed to Edinburgh, and there joined themselves to those who are unfaithful to the truth, viz., the Dowieites, their names have been struck off the roll of the Birmingham ecclesia. During the month, the ecclesia has been visited by brethren Tait and Paterson, and sisters Tait and Smith, of Edinburgh.

DERBY.—There seems every probability of the truth taking root in this town. Mr. Joseph Ward, of Irongate, writing on the 24th ult., to order 100 copies of the *Declaration*, says: "I want them to give away to a number who are enquiring what strange doctrines I have got hold of. I have been a deacon in one of the Independent Churches in Derby for some years past, and have lately sent in my resignation on the ground that I cannot any longer give my assent and consent to what I believe to be the unscriptural doctrines taught in their church. The *Declaration* is just the book I want to circulate among them. Several have begun to search the scriptures to see whether these things are so, and, I am glad to say are becoming convinced that hitherto they have been in error."

EDINBURGH.—The brethren here have been cheered by three accessions from the Dowieite meeting—all sisters. Their names are ISABELLA OLIVER, ISABELLA PEARSON, and MARGARET SUTHERLAND. They have been a long time in making up their minds. They have all along felt the insipidity and spiritual purposelessness of the people with whom they were connected; but they have been deterred from a summary decision by the natural strength of long standing friendship, and from a fear of wrongdoing kept strongly alive by the neighbourliness of the Dowieites, and their denunciations against the crime of schism; and aided, it may be, by some degree of inability to see that Dowieite corruptions of the truth justify and demand protest and separation. They have now, at last, come to the right conclusion, and they are to be congratulated, for their own sake and the sake of the truth. Their secession from Dowieism is perhaps of the more value for its having come tardily; it is evidence that if they could have found a resting-place in it, they would have continued in connection with it, having many collateral inducements to do so. It is on a footing with the case of an educated elderly sister, now in Nova Scotia (Mrs. C. B. Hulme,) who, originally in fellowship with the Dowieites, emigrated to her present place of sojourn, and, after several years' absence, returned, in ignorance of the rupture which the truth had caused among them, and found the remaining Dowieite stock so indifferent and

unintelligent in the truth, that, of her own motion, (having proved them one by one at their own houses) she left them, and cast in her lot with the Christadelphians, of whose existence as a distinct body she came ultimately to be aware.

HALIFAX.—The wife of brother Thomas Aspin, a sister in the faith, fell asleep on the 15th inst., "looking for the mercy of God unto eternal life." During the month previous to the date of information, the ecclesia had been refreshed by visits from brethren Smith, Tait, and Gillies, and sisters Tait and Smith, all of Scotland.

LONDON.—The ecclesia hitherto existing in the northern part of the city, having divided on the question of resurrection and judgment, those who stood for the truth (brethren Bissett, Andrew, and Greenwood) have re-united themselves with those meeting in the southern half of the city, in connection with Brother Brown, with whom their faith is identical. A compromise has been agreed to in reference to the only obstacle of former experience, viz., the question of excluding strangers from the meeting at which bread is broken.

SWANSEA.—Brother Goldie, writing on the 2nd ult., states the ecclesia has suffered a loss by the removal of brother and sister Dell to Llanelly, where they have taken a business. The loss is much felt as brother Dell was beginning to take an active and useful part. The brethren reconcile themselves to the loss by the reflection that it may be the means of introducing the truth in brother Dell's new place of abode. The loss has been partially made up by the addition of two by immersion, upon an intelligent confession of the faith. The new brethren are John Morgan, a young man formerly connected with the Welsh Baptists, and ARCHIBALD W. GOLDIE (in his seventeenth year,) brother Goldie's eldest son. The former is expected to prove useful from being able to speak the Welsh language, which brother Goldie says is a great desideratum in these parts.

TURRIFF.—Brother Robertson and sister Margaret Clark (third daughter of brother Clark, of Balfaton, parish of Conway) were united in marriage on the 2nd ultimo. Brother Robertson is in hopes that the step, instead of hindering, will expedite his operations in the truth. His situation hitherto, as a widower with a family, has been unfavourable to efficiency in many respects.

Brother S. G. Hayes, of Jersey, is desirous of possessing himself of odd numbers of the *Herald of the Kingdom and Age to Come*, of which he is lacking, and would be glad to hear from any person having them to dispose of. Such will please communicate. Brother Hayes will buy or exchange.

NOTES.

[We have on hand a number of queries which we hope to deal with next month and onward, as time and space may permit.]

A GOOD SUGGESTION.—Brother J. J. Andrew, of London, believing it is the collective duty of the brethren to spread the net of the kingdom as widely as possible, suggests the formation of a fund for advertising *Elpis Israel*, *Twelve Lectures*, and other works connected with the truth, in the public press. He says there is a daily increasing number of independent minds who are dissatisfied with the theology of Protestantism, many of whom, he believes, would be won over to the truth, if it were brought under their notice. He instances his own case. He says if he had seen an advertisement of the *Lectures* in any of the religious or secular papers three or four years ago, he should certainly have purchased, being dissatisfied, and probably have come to the truth so much earlier than he did. He offers to head the subscription, if others will join. We strongly approve of the suggestion, on the principle of doing all we can and the best we can, for the work entrusted to the hands of those who believe the truth. We shall follow brother Andrew on the list. It may not appear to some the most productive corner of the wide field of labour, which brother Andrew proposes to work; but it must be remembered that every agency in operation does something to help forward the general result. Numbers in divers parts would doubtless come to a knowledge of the truth, who, under existing circumstances will never see the light or know of its existence. Who will help? We recommend that brother Andrew take the matter in charge, as his position in the metropolis, and his zeal, as the originator of the proposal, eminently qualify him to carry it into execution. He is willing so to do.

The British supply of *Anastasis* is exhausted. We have several orders that we cannot supply. We shall transmit them to brother Donaldson, of Detroit, Michigan, who will arrange to have them attended to.

Brother Tait of Portobello, near Edinburgh, has on hand a considerable stock of the tract *Yahweh Elohim*, by Dr. Thomas, issued about three years ago, and he will be glad to supply them in any quantity, free of charge, to any one willing to pay the postage.

Considerable delay has occurred in supplying orders to hand for copies of the *Declaration*. This is owing to the great demand which has sprung up for the work. The first 1,000 went off within two days of delivery. The second 1000 was not received from the printer till nearly a fortnight afterwards; and these were all ordered before they arrived. Orders exceeding 700 await the arrival of the next parcel from the printer, which we expect in a course of a few days.

The contributions in relief of the case of distress, mentioned last month have been as follow, (observing the anonymous, as is proper in the matter of almsgiving pure and simple):—an ecclesia, 5s.; a sister, 2s.; an ecclesia, 5s.; a sister, 2s.6d.; a brother and two sisters, £1 15s.; a brother, 1s.; an infant ecclesia, (by the hands of brother Turner, Birmingham,) 7s.6d.; a sister, 2s.6d.; an ecclesia, 10s.; an ecclesia, 8s.1d.; a sister, 10s.; a brother, 4s.; a brother, 5s.; a brother, 3s.; a friend, 5s.; a brother, 5s.; a brother, 10s.; an ecclesia, 15s.9d.; a brother, 10s.; a brother, 1s.; a brother, 5s.; a brother, 3s. 4d.; a friend 1s. 6d.; total, £7 18s. 2d. Brother Hall returns thanks for the relief thus afforded.

THE AMBASSADOR

Of the Coming Age.

"A wicked Messenger falleth into mischief, but a faithful Ambassador is health."—PROV. xiii, 17.

No. 37.

JULY, 1867.

Vol. IV.

LETTERS FROM DR. THOMAS.

WEST HOBOKEN, HUDSON Co., N.J., *March 7th*, 1867.

DEAR BROTHER ROBERTS,—Yours, containing the draft for £100 sterling, came duly to hand, as also the one that preceded it. In obedience to the latter, I have caused 250 copies *Elpis Israel* and 250 *Anastasis* to be shipped to you, through Inman & Co., Liverpool, the agents there for the New York, Philadelphia and Liverpool Steam Ship Line. This is an open letter left with the printer to mail when he gets the bill of lading to put into it. He will then close it up, and mail it. The contribution, however, is herein acknowledged with due appreciation and thankfulness. It is a satisfaction to know that the labour and conflicts of years, and the best days of one's natural existence, have not been consumed in fruitless and ineffectual efforts. I shall persevere through evil and good report, being determined as far as in me lies, to contend for the ancient faith, to the ruin of all rival theories. The outcries of those who have not the "Father's name written upon their foreheads," may pass unheeded as the wind. * * * * *

We all join in kind regards and good wishes, in hopes that all our labours may change their base soon, in personal co-operation with the Lamb.

Faithfully and affectionately yours,

JOHN THOMAS.

WEST HOBOKEN, HUDSON Co., N.J., *May 20th*, 1867.

DEAR BROTHER ROBERTS,—Yours of April 16, enclosing the draft for £33 12s. sterling came duly to hand, for which I am much obliged to you, as well as for all other favors and kindnesses.

I am glad to hear that "the position of the truth at the present time is more promising than it has ever been" in Britain within the recollection of any living. The truth has had great difficulties to contend with there, as well as in other parts of the Fourth Beast Habitable, for the passed 1260 years. The enemy without, and the worse enemy within, have inflicted upon it a downtreading which had almost trampled it out of existence among the sons of men. The "wise and prudent" of the outer darkness, and the hypocrites and traitors within the pale, have been almost too much for "the blessed who fear Jehovah, and walk in His ways." But their part is nearly played out. Their influence is on the wane, and will doubtless ere long, be numbered among "the lies and vanities" to be dispelled when the Sun of Righteousness shall arise, with healing in his beams. You have done well in planting your pebble of the brook between the eyes of "the little giant" of Surgeon Square, where he used to "discuss everything and settle nothing;" an unmistakable characteristic of a "Synagogue of Satan," whose "depths as they teach," are found only in the bottomless abyss of human presumption, uncertainty, and ignorance of the Word. But while you can expose the depths of Satan as they teach, for the benefit of "unstable souls" liable to be deceived by them, you may not hope to convert Satan to the truth. This is beyond even the power of the Word; for Satan will be Satan to the end of his rôle, which he is to play out in being bruised under our feet soon.

You have a fine field before you in Britain, which is full of "high things that exalt themselves above the knowledge of God." There are the state and dissenting forms of blasphemy claiming to be Christian, which so long as they reign in the hearts of the people, intoxicate them, and prevent their reception, yea even their attention to, the truth. Attack them, and give them no quarter. Never mind the outcry of the faint-hearted. Cleave Satan in all their forms, from head to crotch, with the sharp two-edged sword of the spirit, which sympathisers will term reviling, but the apostles, an earnest contention for the faith once for all delivered to the saints, against all things thereunto opposed. I feel a rising impatience when I read the drivelling nonsense proceeding out of the mouths of "dignitaries" and "divines"—the names and denominations of the Gentile court. A necessity in Britain is a paper of wide circulation among all classes, conducted by an editorship understanding the truth, and valiant for it, to unmask the hypocrisy and ignorance of the clergy of all ranks, classes and degrees—a paper, not to echo "public opinion," but to demonstrate its fallacies; to show what the truth is, and *what it is not*; for as people rarely think for themselves, the negative must be shown in perspective, that the truth may stand out more conspicuously in the forefront of the picture. But such an enterprise would require great wealth to set and maintain in operation. This is a great element of weakness for the friends of the truth, who, however rich in faith, and heirs of a kingdom, are poor in the wealth of this "present evil world," which probably, after all, is not worth so costly an effort for its illumination: this generation of it at least. We have therefore to fall back upon small things, which are by no means to be despised. I trust you will be able to continue the *Ambassador* till the Lord comes. This, or some paper like it, is a necessity not to be dispensed with by Christadelphians, or Christ's brethren. Its merits entitle it to ample support by

these in Britain and America. It ought to furnish you a living; so that whether the Derby government sink or swim, means may be allowed to you for a support, independently of the vicissitudes consequent upon their legislation in regard to the affairs of the Court of Bankruptcy. Let the paper continue to be good and piquant, and unencumbered by prosy articles upon abstractions—not a vehicle for all sorts of whims and fancies, which seek ventilation in print for the gratification of the vanity of creatures who have the itch—the itch, I mean, not commonly styled “the Scotch Fiddle,” but that other itch, no less inveterate, termed the *cacoethes scribendi*, the itch for scribbling. Such a paper, in spite of all croakers, will command readers; but whether said readers will be liberal and punctual subscribers, will depend upon their conscience and appreciation of the truth and its interests. When I used to publish the *Herald*, my most efficient and pains-taking agent and friend, Mr. Robertson, adopted a rule by which the conscientious and punctual in Britain, only could obtain it. He put no one down as a subscriber upon the list, who did not send the subscription price with the order for a complete volume. He gave notice too, that the volume for the new year would not be sent, unless the order and prepayment were renewed. I lost many subscriptions in this country by readers whom I dealt with upon a principle of honor, but I never lost any in Britain and Canada, where my friend’s rule was in operation. If I were ever to publish a periodical again, which I do not think I shall, I would, I believe, give two months’ notice that the paper would be discontinued to all who did not renew their orders with prepayment, at or before the commencement of the new volume. This would make things snug, pleasant and safe, and exclude all dunning to shame unconscientious subscribers into paying their dues. A few exceptions to this rule might be made on its establishment, on the principle of *exceptis probat regulam*, of those known and tried friends of the truth, whose word is as good as the money in hand. Experience, which teaches fools wisdom, has taught me to publish my works after this method. I have been deceived in one or two instances, in the publication of *Eureka II*, to the amount of a hundred and thirty-seven dollars, where I supposed I was confiding in the promises of the faithful and reliable; but these exceptions excepted, which will not recur in the same direction at least, all things have worked together in financial harmony and peace.

I am glad to hear that good men and true in Britain, approve *Anastasis*. Bro. Donaldson writes me, that all who have written to him are much pleased with it, except one, who thinks it “a flash”—a streak of lightning, I suppose, in the surrounding “thick darkness covering the people.” This opinion, however is not very disparaging, seeing that the mass of publications on religious subjects, teeming from the press, have in them no light at all. He said he “did not wish to find fault with me, but he thought it only a flash;” by which probably he meant that it was not a steady and permanently enduring flame.

Now that I am noticing opinions unfavourable to my work, I may quote an extract from *Public Opinion*, published in London, showing what I might expect if *Eureka* were placed in their hands for review. On April 20, in their notices of books, is the following expression of opinion on “*Coming Wonders expected between 1867 and 1875*. By the Rev. M. Baxter:” “We

agree so far with the author of the above (we were almost going to say serio-comic) work, that we believe that 'at no period of the history of the world, have mankind ever stood on the threshold of more eventful changes and mightier revolutions than at present.' But we arrive at this conclusion by quite a different process from that of Rev. M. Baxter. Nothing in our opinion, is more ridiculous than for any one to arrogate to himself the power of interpreting the prophecies contained in Daniel and the Revelations. It would require as divine and miraculous an inspiration, we think, to interpret and apply those prophecies, as was necessary to utter them. Some persons, however, think there is no presumption, not to say blasphemy, in such attempts; and to those, the Rev. M. Baxter's work, on which he has evidently expended much patient labor, may be welcome. The world at large will certainly not peruse the Rev. M. Baxter's work at all; and if they should, we believe that in most cases it will have no effect upon them, except that of exciting their risible muscles." Baxter is a fanatical episcopal missionary clergyman, who proclaims Louis Napoleon to be the anti-Christ. He has been to hear me twice or thrice in New York and Toronto. He presented himself to me with the same questions in both cities. "Do you not believe," said he, "that Napoleon is the anti-Christ?" "I do not." "Don't you believe that he will make a covenant with the Jews, build a temple in Jerusalem, show himself there in the temple of God, as an object of worship for all the world, in the midst of the week break the covenant made, and then be suddenly destroyed by the brightness of the Lord's coming?" "No," said I, "I do not believe a word of any such nonsense." He gave me some of his tracts and pamphlets, which, of course, I was careful not to circulate, lest they should "beguile unstable souls." His speculations are truly characterised as "serio-comic." He has changed the date of his "Coming Wonders" several times. He has now given himself a margin of eight years, in which, doubtless, there will be great events, of which he has but little expectation. Eut enough of him.

The following, from *The Israelite*, the organ of the Jews, published in Cincinnati, Ohio, will give you some idea of the mind of Israel in America, under the influence of worldly prosperity. "We need no personal Messiah: what benefit could we expect of any Messiah? We do not wish to go back to Palestine, or to submit to any king. What good can we expect of a Son of David? We are the children of the House—we go to no steward, need no guardian, require no mediator, and ask none to plead our cause with our Heavenly Father. We are of Israel." I have not room or time now for comment.

The extract which follows, recently received, will illustrate the nature of some things here amongst another class of Israelites. "Brother Thomas—for I feel after reading *Elpis Israel*, *Chronikon Hebraikon* and *Anastasis*, that you are one of the brethren of the ancient faith—years ago I read *Elpis Israel*, but until recently I had not seen your other writings. For years I preached for the Campbellites—yes, for them; but *now* I have no fellowship for them, nor for any who do not love the one faith and the one, obedience. I notice a "Synopsis of the One Faith," on the back of "Important Correspondence," just now for the first time. While I could not subscribe to any "Synopsis of Faith" as such, yet I do most heartily believe and

approve what is set forth in the "Synopsis." We need no creed aside from the Bible, nor do I understand you as offering the "Synopsis" as one, but you give it as a synopsis only.

Christadelphians "will not insist on any name not found in the Bible." I like "brethren," or any name given. Please answer me the following questions :

1. Do you insist on the name "Christadelphian," and why?
2. Can we fellowship any who may be satisfied with their immersion, who did *not* have the faith at the *time* of immersion? *I cannot.*

You will assist me by speaking to me on these matters."

In reply, I spoke to this brother as follows: "I congratulate you on your emancipation from the trammels of our old heresy, Campbellism, which was originally a protest against *the* "Names and Denominations" and *their* creeds—against ALL Names and Creeds *except its own*. It was the No-Creed Creed, and the Anti-Name-and-Denominational Name and Denomination. Its creed was a misunderstanding of *the use* of the proposition, "Jesus is the Christ;" and a mistake concerning the Christ's mission; together with a misinterpretation of Acts ii, 38, &c., &c.—a creed proclaimed *orally* by its preachers, and by press and pen by its editors. It sanctified ignorance of the "Old Jewish Almanack," as it blasphemously styled the Holy Oracles ministered by Moses and the Prophets, and committed to the custody of Israel; and falsely affirmed that the New Testament was the sufficient rule of faith and practice. Still, as a system of error, in combat with other systems of error, good resulted to some few (styled by Paul *Christou adelphoi*, Anglicé, CHRISTADELPHIANS, or Christ's Brethren), while with the mass which embraced it, it only "puffed up" their self-esteem, and changed the form of the "Strong Delusion" by which the Court without the Holy City, is universally condemned.

A definition of "The One Faith and the One Obedience," is the definers' creed. This he may either speak, write, or print. Such an exhibition to the mind of another is his "Synopsis" of what he believes and holds is set forth as "the truth as it is in Jesus." I can subscribe to any synopsis or creed, which by the Old and New Testaments construed in harmony, is *proved* by anyone to be the teaching of the Father in his Word. I should object decidedly to even a scriptural creed being made a *substitute* for the Word. This would be the wrong use of a creed or synopsis, and very much to be reprobated. The Bible is acknowledged by many who dispute and reject what it teaches; they even say "the Bible is my creed." But the Bible contains no less than *four* divine developments, as Ways of Salvation, only one of which is the Way of Salvation to us, who are contemporary with the Holy City trodden under foot of the Gentiles. *First*, the patriarchal way; *second*, the way prescribed contemporarily with the existence of Mosaic times; *third*, the way of the kingdom proclaimed by the Apostles; and *fourth*, the way on which the nations will walk when the law goes forth from Zion after the future advent. A creed or synopsis written, printed, or spoken, by "FAITHFUL men ABLE to teach others" (as Paul designates the class which was to be the true succession to the apostles in the work of

teaching the Word), becomes a necessity in view of these four Bible ways : the first of which is very strait of gate and narrow, and is the only one that now "leads to life," for the few that find it.

The faithful men and their associates who walk in this "narrow way," are or ought to be, as jealous as God himself; who is "a jealous Deity," as he told Moses: and his character changes not with the lapse of centuries and generations. They are jealous for the truth, that it may not be imposed upon by "the cunning craftiness of men, whereby they lie in wait to deceive." So indefinite a declaration as that, "the Bible is my creed," does not satisfy them. Professors use the phrase "the Bible" in various senses; and declare it to be their creed with certain mental reservations, which oftentimes affect the veracity and authenticity of the book itself. Two cannot walk together unless they be agreed; how much less fifty or a thousand! When therefore anyone seeks their fellowship, they desire to know what said seekers believe the Bible teaches as "the narrow way." If this is not defined to the satisfaction of faithful and competent men, they decline to walk with them; for no two persons can walk together in two different ways at the same time. When divers persons are intelligent in the Father's teaching of the narrow way (for it is written, that they who come to Jesus shall be all taught of the Deity, John vi, 45), they will express themselves, if not in the words, in the substance, of a formula which Paul's "faithful men able to teach others," may approve. The declaration contained in yours, "I do most heartily believe and approve what is set forth in the Synopsis," is satisfying to the mind of a jealous adherent of the truth, which the declaration "the Bible is my creed," would fail to effect. You might be a "carnal Jew," or a blasphemer belonging to any of the "Names of Blasphemy," of which the Gentile Beast is said by the spirit to be "full;" but though I have no personal acquaintance with you, by your declaration I know that—it being the honest expression of your conviction—you have the root of the matter within you, are no such Jew or Blasphemer, but a brother in the faith.

Christadelphians, so-called, hold that their name is scriptural and apostolic; and that "the One Body," of which Christ is the Elder Brother and Head, should not be nameless among all the polities of the world. The Deity gave himself a Name at the bush; and he has condescended to address his children by various names of endearment and relationship. You like "brethren." This would confound you with the Moravians; and would identify you with all sects, whose members all pass current as "brethren." But whose brethren are they? Or, to put it in another form, Whose children are they? "Of their father the Devil, whose works they do—they are brethren in sin." Christadelphians are all brethren, but all "brethren" are not Christadelphians. The name was adopted first in Ogle County, Illinois, during the civil war, to distinguish its subjects from all other names and denominations against which they protest, as the Beast's Names of Blasphemy. The word "*Christian*" has long ceased to be distinctive; and is now representative of the worst of the heathen. In Ps. xxii, the Spirit of Christ styles the true believers, "*my brethren*;" and in Isaiah viii, says, "Behold, I and the children whom God hath given me." These texts Paul applies to Jesus and the many *sons* he brings to glory, in Heb. ii, 11—14.

“My brethren” is therefore equivalent to *Jesus’ Brethren*; and as he was made “Lord and Christ,” it is equivalent to “CHRIST’S BRETHREN,” *Christou adelphoi*, which, condensed into a name of our tongue, is Christadelphians, as pronouncable as *Philadelphians*, and much more descriptive of “the children God has given” to Christ for brethren, than the latter is of the relation of the Pennsylvanians of that city to one another. “Christadelphians” is far more euphonious than the name of “Thomasites,” to supersede which was one of the reasons I had in suggesting it.

In answer to your second query, I would say, that Christadelphians only fellowship those, who at the crisis of their immersion, intelligently believed “the things concerning the kingdom of God, and of the name of Jesus Christ.”—(Acts viii, 12.)

This is a long letter, but considering your surroundings and antecedents, I have written more at length and in detail than otherwise I should have time to do! Your real trouble will now begin; for it is through much tribulation the kingdom is entered. But the time is short, and the judgment near. I pray therefore that you may be able to stand, and to appear approved and without rebuke at the tribunal of Christ.”

We have recently immersed two young men, and are to immerse the wife of a papist next Sunday. One of the former was a Catholic, and a federal soldier in the late war; and both of them are of good promise through faith. Our meeting has migrated west of the Hudson River. We meet in the Odd Fellows’ Hall, Washington Street, Hoboken, instead of 24, Cooper Institute, New York. This change is more convenient for the majority, who live on the New Jersey side of the river.

My wife is sick, but recruiting; my daughter in tolerable health, and expectant of the letter begun. Eureka III, *not* nearly finished. I’ll let you know when it is ready for the printer, by my own hand. They join with me in love to you and sister R.; and in kind regards to all the faithful with you: and in hope of a blessed re-union in the kingdom,

I subscribe myself, affectionately and faithfully yours,

JOHN THOMAS.

THE APOCALYPSE PARAPHRASED,

ON THE BASIS OF THE EXPOSITION CONTAINED IN EUREKA,
VOL. II. (DR. THOMAS.)

CHAP. VI, VERSES 5 TO 8.

AND when the Lamb opened the third seal, I heard from the third living one—who is a symbol of the early church in its Pergamo-Thyatirian declension—saying, Come, and see! And I saw, and behold a black horse, which represented the subjects of Papal Rome in a state of lamentation, mourning and distress. And he who sat upon him held a balance in his hand, symbolical of a class of agents in the

Roman empire, and their subordinates, whose duty it was to execute the laws—the balance being their badge of office; and so oppressively did they perform their duties, that the Roman world was darkened with a deadly shade. The balance is usually the emblem of justice, but in this instance it was a balance of deceit and oppression.

And in the midst of the four living ones—the presence of which indicated that the spirit was not yet withdrawn, for they are only introduced where there is direct ministration of spirit—I heard a voice, saying “A choenix is wheat a denarius, and three choenices of barley a denarius, but the oil and the wine thou mayest not deal unjustly by.” A choenix was a measure containing about a quart and an eighth, or about two pounds in weight; and a denarius was a silver coin worth about fifteen cents, or eightpence, the use of which, from the fact of its being a Roman coin, proves that it was a symbol of Roman affairs. The four living ones were symbolical of the brethren and their fellow-servants in all the Roman habitable; and this voice which came from their midst, was an imperial decree addressed to the prætors of Rome and the governors of the provinces, the agents symbolized by the rider holding a balance. That this decree was of an unjust character is implied by the latter part respecting the oil and the wine. Hence it betokened an intensely oppressive administration of public affairs by the balance-holders during the third-seal period, with a brief intermission only. The former part most probably referred, not to the price of wheat and barley, but to the tax levied on them. If so, the tax on a bushel of wheat would be about four and a half dollars, or eighteen shillings; and on a bushel of barley it would be one dollar and a half, or six shillings. Consequently when this was added to the market price, it made the necessaries of life enormously dear; also caused large tracts of country to be thrown out of cultivation, thus involving both the depopulation and desolation of regions which were themselves fertile; and prepared the way for that severe famine which came upon the empire in the next seal.

The senate fixed the tariff, but the Emperor and his subordinates carried it out as they pleased, justly or unjustly; and the injunction respecting the wine and the oil shows that injustice would be done in the matter of the wheat and barley. It was the custom for the revenue to be farmed out by certain persons who extorted what they liked from the tax-payers, but only sent to the Roman treasury the amount required by law, keeping the surplus themselves. They were styled by Alex. Severus “the robbers of the provinces,” and, as may be imagined, their unjust proceedings caused a great amount of public distress and irritation. “In the course of this history,” says Gibbon, “we shall be too often summoned to explain the land-tax, the capitation, and the heavy contributions of grain, wine, oil and meat, which were exacted from the provinces for the use of the court, the army and the capital.

The Emperor S. Severus died at the termination of the second-seal

period, A.D. 211, and was succeeded by his son, Caracalla, who favoured the christians and persecuted the pagans until he rendered them black with mourning and distress. He oppressed the great body of his subjects by ingenious and aggravated taxes; one of his edicts, rendering the city of Rome co-extensive with the Roman world, contributed greatly to this, for by it the inhabitants of the provinces had the taxes of the city added to those they already paid. In order to dispose of the rival claims of his brother Geta, he caused him to be assassinated, and afterwards put to death about twenty thousand persons of both sexes, alleged to be friends of his brother. And while at Alexandria, he issued commands, without the slightest provocation, for a general massacre of the inhabitants, citizens or strangers, and without any regard to the crime or innocency of the sufferers. By such means as these, did he crush every part of the empire by the weight of his iron sceptre. He was assassinated, A.D. 217., and succeeded first by Maximus, who was stabbed; and then in the following year by Elagabalus, the high-priest of the sun, an Asiatic, who superseded the authority of the senate by assuming the power symbolised by the dagger and the balance. He introduced into Rome the effeminate luxury of Oriental despotism; abandoned himself to the most sensual enjoyments; and lavished away the treasuries of the people in the wildest extravagance. He was massacred A.D. 222, and succeeded by Alex. Severus, a mild, amiable ruler, who carried out that part of the decree indicated by the wine and the oil. He relieved the provinces from the oppressive taxes imposed by Caracalla, and consequently the price of provisions became much reduced. During this seal-period, the early christians suffered no special persecutions, the only calamities they experienced being such as befel them in common with the general public.

And when the Lamb opened the fourth seal, I heard the fourth living one—who is a symbol of the ecclesias of the Deity in their Thyatira-Sardian condition—saying, Come and see! This occurred A.D. 235, when the calm which had existed during the previous thirteen years came to an abrupt termination by the assassination of Alex. Severus, and the massacre of his most faithful friends by the fury of the soldiers. And I saw, and behold a horse that was pale green—a colour which is one of the symptoms presented by the skin on the approach of death; and hence it foreboded the approaching dissolution of the Roman empire. And I saw a rider sitting upon this dying horse, whose name was Death, a symbol of a class of ruling agents sold to the work of death, and in the midst of it, to a violent death themselves, consisting of the Emperors during the fourth-seal period, few of whom died a natural death; thirty-nine claiming this title during the first fifty years died by violence, mostly assassination. And following with him was Hades, which means literally an unseen place, and is therefore very appropriately used for the grave as the invisible resting place of the

dead. It is here used as a fitting companion to death, to symbolise another class of destroying agencies which co-operate in the destruction of the horse-people, so as to bring their body politic to the verge of dissolution. And there was given them authority to kill upon the fourth of the earth, a term which refers to the fact that the Roman empire was divided into four sovereignties, the fourth being constituted of Rome and Italy. This part was under the authority of Gallienus, who was also constitutionally the ruler of the whole empire, but during the ten years preceding his death, which occurred, A.D. 268, his actual power, owing to usurpations which he could not control, extended over the fourth division only. During the second and third seals, the riders had not received authority specially to distress this fourth division, and, consequently, the judgments they inflicted extended more particularly over the other three. But the time had now arrived when judgment was to be brought home to the very heart and soul of the Italian body politic, in order to produce that mortal languor or deadly pallor, which is always the result when the vital organs are mortally affected. This was absolutely necessary before dissolution could occur; therefore, authority was given to death and hades to afflict the fourth division in addition to the other three. Some idea may be gathered of the way in which they carried out this decree by the remark of Gibbon, when he says, in speaking of the latter part of this seal-period, that though the form of the dominion was still the same, "the animating health and vigour were fled." Thus death and hades produced that paleness of death of which the pale-green horse was a symbol.

The first means by which this end was to be accomplished was that of the sword—not a small sword or dagger as used by the rider under the second seal, but a large sword, such as the Thracians used. As the instrument with which death and hades were authorised to kill on the fourth of the Roman earth, it was the symbol of the Emperor Maximin—a man of vast strength and gigantic stature, exceeding eight feet in height, and of Thracian origin, who gradually rose from the humble position of a barbarous peasant to that of chief ruler of the empire. He manifested the most unbounded cruelty, punishing with death all who were acquainted with his original obscurity, whether friends or foes; and also any against whom there was the slightest accusation, notwithstanding their positions of honour and power: such as nobles, governors, generals, &c. He manifested his avarice by confiscating to the use of the imperial treasury, the whole of the independent revenue possessed by each city, which it was the custom to devote, among other purposes, to the purchase of wheat and barley; thus, he followed the example of the predecessors of Alexander Severus, in acting unjustly by the wheat and barley. He further stripped the temples of their gold and silver, and melted down the statues of gods and other heroes into money. At last he, together with his sons and principal ministers, became a victim to assassination, and,

shortly afterwards, his successors, Maximus and Balbinus, suffered the same fate. Thus, in the space of a few months, death and hades had killed with the sword six emperors.

The second agency to be employed was that of wild beasts—a symbol of the wild, savage men, who invaded the empire in vast hordes from all points of the compass; and, like a plague of wild beasts, carried death and destruction into the central fourth part of the earth itself. Respecting this period Gibbon says, that from A.D. 248 to A.D. 268, there elapsed twenty years of shame and misfortune, during which calamitous period, every instant of time was marked, and every province of the Roman earth was afflicted by such barbarian invaders and military tyrants, that the ruined empire seemed to approach the last and fatal moment of its dissolution. The sword and the wild beasts together under the fourth seal, reduced the heathen dominion of Rome to the lowest pitch of disgrace and ruin.

The remaining means by which death and hades were to kill the people were famine and pestilence—destructive agencies which frequently accompany each other. From the year 250 to A.D. 265, a furious plague raged without interruption in every province, every city, and almost every family of the empire. The fourth of the earth suffered severely; for in the city of Rome, during some time, no less than five thousand persons died daily. And many towns that escaped the action of the sword were entirely depopulated. Altogether, it has been computed that war, pestilence, and famine, consumed in a few years about one half of the inhabitants of the Roman habitable.

J. J. A.

TRINITARIANISM AND THE TRUTH,
CONSIDERED IN RELATION TO THE FIRST THREE VERSES OF
JOHN'S GOSPEL.

THE "PRE-EXISTENCE" OF JESUS CHRIST—HIS BEING THE WORD MADE FLESH.

(Continuation of "The Bible as a Law of Life and Immortality," from page 151.)

[The following testimony of David was omitted from last paper, and is that referred to twice in the progress of that paper. It should have come in after the following sentence: "He received it as every well-instructed Jew in youth received it; he received it as Timothy received it; he received it as any man now may receive it who, in searching the written word to understand it, submits to the teaching of the spirit, therein properly

understood. What saith David? 'Wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way? By taking heed according to thy word.' And what more does he say? 'O, how I love thy law, it is my meditation all the day.' And again, but yet more emphatically, 'Thou through thy commandments hast made me wiser than mine enemies: for thy commandments are ever with me. I have more understanding than all my teachers, for thy

testimonies are my meditation. I understand more than the ancients, because I keep thy precepts.' Thou understandest more than the ancients, even more than thy teachers, David! How is this? Because 'thy testimonies are my meditation;' because 'through thy precept's I get understanding, therefore, I hate every false way, because thy words are sweeter to my taste than honey to my mouth;' because 'Thy word is a lamp to my feet and a light to my path.' And the same may be referred to as the cause of Jesus' wisdom and understanding. But though we reason thus, &c.']

To regard Jesus' announcement of himself as the Son of God in the answers he gave his mother, as the direct result of supernatural inspiration, is to put supernatural inspiration to very little purpose, and written evidence to no purpose whatever. If men "hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." If this, from Jesus' own mouth, while exercising his function as the great teacher, appointed by God, is to be regarded with the respect his words demand, it involves a principle as applicable to Jesus himself, as to any man; and if Jesus, while under tutors and governors, was persuaded by other means than these, then of what use would he be as an example for imitation, in either one way or another? If the knowledge he had was innate, for what purpose was he subject to law? His subjection to his parental guardians implies he had been placed as a child upon the same footing as other Jewish children, and taught as they were bound to be taught. The result in his case as differing from the general result in their case, argues nothing against the fact. It only shows that in his case the law concerning the education of Jewish children had been carefully adhered to, while in their case it had been partially or totally neglected. Had they been trained as he, "in the way they should go," he would not have had so many opposed to him when he began to teach. This result in their case is just the proof that they had not been trained as they ought to have been, as Jesus' case is a proof of the contrary. The goodly qualities which Jesus inherited through his conception (and of which we will speak more particularly afterwards,) cannot be alleged as the chief cause of the grand moral exhibition he reared for

himself and the world for this reason, that goodly qualities, excellent talents, and such like in a child, if not properly directed, will as surely make him ultimately the wickedest of men, as in Jesus' case, being properly directed, they made him the noblest of men. Just "as the twig is bent, so is the tree inclined." Being the "only begotten of the Father," the Father took care the law he made his people for their children should not be set aside in Jesus' case. In Jesus' training, the precept "Train up a child in the way he should go," had been carefully observed to the letter, and the promise annexed, "and when he is old he will not depart from it," was, in consequence, in his case, fulfilled. God descended in His care for his son to apply and fulfil his own law, and hence, in its application and effect upon Jesus Christ, we have an historical illustration of the necessity for its enforcement to secure the result it promises. The result of his training manifested itself daily. He loved the law of God; he made it his meditation all the day; he kept the precepts of God, and so he increased in wisdom as to ultimately possess more understanding than all his teachers, and to understand more than the ancients. We need not wonder, therefore, he should have so early announced himself to his mother as the Son of Deity. He told her nothing but what she had, doubtlessly, before this, often told himself; and if she did not understand it so well as he did, this was her own fault. She had not so well pondered the prophecies concerning the Messiah as he had done. But though he thus exhibited a better understanding of the matter than his mother, there is no reason to suppose that at that time he fully or perfectly understood it all. The probability is, that his tarrying behind may have arisen from a youthful ardour too impatient of delay, from an imperfect knowledge of the time necessary to elapse ere he could begin his work, and of the work itself that was afterwards committed to him to do. The fact of his having *after this* INCREASED in wisdom implies his having been then imperfect in knowledge. And besides, his having been *after this*, subject to Mary and Joseph, not only implies his having been subject to them before, but that his tarrying behind *without their consent*, though for purposes of knowledge, was no mark of wisdom on the one hand, though in its results there was a striking evidence

of his talents and acquisitions on the other. This, however, does not depreciate the value of the reply he gave his mother. The reply, nevertheless, evinces his understanding of the scriptures to have been far in advance of Mary and Joseph's understanding of them, and educes the knowledge and motives on which he had acted. And inasmuch as all this is traceable on the principle we have indicated to his self-application, to the reading and study of the Word, it magnifies his character and elevates the scriptures to their proper place in the education of man. It renders clearer the power of the scriptures "to make wise unto salvation" through faith, as based on the proper understanding of them, and exemplifies in full the favor of God in adapting his truth as the expression of his mind or spirit, to the mental capacity of man. If the Written Word cannot persuade man, no other means will be tried in the present state of things. The example of Jesus in his progress up to manhood illustrates the power of the Written Word. He grew in wisdom from its power to make him wise. It was not an earthly wisdom he grew in, it was a heavenly; it came from his Father, but it came *through* the Word to him. He simply applied his mind to the study of it, and in his comprehension and belief of it, submitted to its precepts. And the answer we are discussing, in presenting us with the height of knowledge to which he had attained at the age of twelve, exhibits to us as well the industry with which he must have cultivated his acquaintance with the revealed will of God. It educes the noble spirit of the youth. It shows the hold he had taken of the Word, and the hold it had taken of him. The fearlessness with which he announced himself as the son of Deity evinces the strong conviction of his mind. He had gone so far in his acquaintance with the word of God, that it was impossible for him to be otherwise than thoroughly persuaded of the fact. He believed Moses and the prophets, and so believed God *through* their writings. He was bold, therefore, to utter his belief at this time, as well as act from it, but that he had been wise in acting as he did, is for the moment another question His conviction was settled. Had it been otherwise, his answer would have indicated him either a fanatic, or a blasphemer. He had, however, gone *beyond* faith. *He had come to be conscious of his particular*

relationship to Deity. Faith is primary, is continually subject to doubts and fears, and if not daily increased by the increase of virtue and knowledge, it is sure to die; but, CONSCIOUSNESS is beyond the liability of doubt, and proof against any trial. Consciousness is frequently a fruit of faith. As wisdom and knowledge increase, faith merges into consciousness. Faith steps forward a pace, and grasps that which consciousness cannot reach until faith steps onwards. A son, brought up from infancy in daily contact with his father, or in such circumstances as to daily impress the child's mind that such an one is his father, cannot be said to simply *believe* that that certain one is his father; he is conscious of it, and acts accordingly. Nor can it be said that a man simply believes that he himself exists; he is conscious of it, and frequently evidence on other matters exercises the same overpowering influence on the minds. The evidence of a Deity for example. So was it with Jesus in the evidence surrounding him concerning himself. His daily intercourse from infancy with his mother, and the scriptures, had made him conscious the Deity was his Father, not merely as his Creator, but as his Father from the human point of view, as by the natural law of progeneration. The answer of Jesus, therefore, exhibits nothing extraordinary; it is quite in keeping with natural things. It evinces nothing beyond the power with which indisputable evidence can control the human mind and establish conviction. And inasmuch as the supernatural part of the story lies twelve years farther back, and was confined wholly to Mary, and that she, notwithstanding this, appeared, when she questioned Jesus as to his tarrying, the less informed of the two, there is the less reason to suppose he acquired any of his knowledge, before his baptism, by any supernatural means, and the greater reason for regarding the natural means as the most potent and effectual in the acquisition of the truth. Besides, even after his baptism, there is from this, much reason to suppose that the knowledge and wisdom he exhibited while performing his work of teaching, was the fruit of his early, ordinary efforts. That which he exhibited as extraordinary or preternatural after his baptism, was rather *power* than wisdom. *It* so far, doubtless, was conferred on him when the fulness of time was come, at which he was sent forth, but even this cannot altogether be disconnected from

the results attendant on his early training and study of the scriptures.

The whole story of Jesus' life is evidently an example of "train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it." In its first part, it is the story of a goodly child subjected to the training necessary to educe to their proper sphere the excellent qualities of his nature, as inherited from the circumstances by which he was conceived—circumstances which, however, do not justify the supposition that these qualities were in any wise more than human, than that his flesh was more than human. He was made lower than the angels, both mentally and physically, and accordingly was entrusted to the care and training of ordinary men, but being the son of Deity, those circumstances were chosen for him, as would necessarily bend and incline the goodly qualities of his nature, to the course they should take. He was associated, therefore, with devout parents, whose relatives were also equally devout, and so grew up amidst goodly influences, from all their righteous observances of the laws of God. In its second part, it is the story of a boy's self-application to the study of the Word, and of the astonishing attainments he had made in diligent search after truth. In its third part, it is the story of a man put to the necessity of earning his bread by the sweat of his brow, denied the readily supposed advantage which pecuniary means and leisure will give for education; and yet the while so carrying on the studies he had so early begun, as to expand his mind in the knowledge of the truth beyond the intelligence of any of his contemporaries. In all, it is the story of a man ever setting his affection on the things above, and not upon the things of earth—of a man so increasing his faith into an unquenchable consciousness of the things promised him in the scriptures, as to make the promises his only joy, and the most effective support of his mental vigour. He persevered and endured for the joy set before him. This he had derived from the scriptures. But had he not been conscious of his being the Son of God, he could not, of course, have regarded those promises for himself. Nor need we suppose that *without* the scriptures he could have learned of those promises. Now, as promises excite effort and invigorate the spirit amidst depressing and afflicting trials, it is as reasonable to suppose that Jesus derived much consolation from his reading and

understanding the prophecies concerning himself, while contending with the unmeasured hatred and opposition his teaching excited, as that he derived additional comfort at the hands of angels, amidst the extremities of his trials. If he were such an one, out of whose mental or innate spiritual resources he could not sufficiently sustain himself without the ministration of angels in the extremity of his sufferings, he was just such an one as would find the written word sweet to his taste, and as honey to his mouth, in his ordinary trials. Angels ministered to him when in the desert; and in that dread hour when, as if flesh and blood and all the resources of his nature were unable to meet the task to which he was subjected, an angel came to him in the garden and "strengthened him." Is this in harmony with his being the Deity, then, and not man? Angels strengthening Deity! Is it not an opening in his history through which we may perceive the kind of nature he bore? Is it not a proof that he was the Son of God simply, and of the Deity's care of him? Had he been even a combination of Deity and man together, would not his Deityship have supported his manship without the aid of an angel? It was because he was human, and purely human; he needed, like his brethren, to have the society of those "who are sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation." His brethren are joint heirs with him of the same inheritance, and, like as they take encouragement from the scriptures; so had he, and like as they are favoured with the ministration of angels in the extremity of their trials, so was he. The whole story is a picture, an illustration, an example, for the study of the faithful. It presents not only the obedience of the Son to the Father, but of the Father's love and care for the Son. It presents not only the character of the Man we have to look to as the author and finisher of the faith, but to the manner the Father shews his love for his children, in his suffering no one to be tempted more than he is able to bear. It does not only shew the love of the Son for the Father, but of the Father's dealing with the Son. It presents both the chastenings and the encouragements, both the burden and the joy, that all who imitate Christ may lift up the hands which hang down, and the feeble knees, and make straight paths for their feet. There is the encouragement. He, the Man Christ Jesus, has left behind him an example indelible in the page of history

of how to live in the flesh. But if he had not been of the same flesh and blood with man, if he had not possessed the same passions, if his nature had not been man's, if he had a Deity which his brethren in some degree have not nor can have, to what purpose would this life of his have been an example? On what basis could men have been adopted to possess as sons of God, the same privileges as he? To what purpose would their "looking to him" have been, who, "for the joy set before him" in the gospel, "endured the cross and despised the shame?" Is the same joy not set before them? Is the same cross and the same shame not cast upon them now? And why then should he not have been of the same nature as they? Why, his being a man like themselves is the spirit of the whole matter. To say that he was of a double nature, is to deprive his conduct of all merit. His being of like fleshly instincts with his brethren gives to his actions such a sublimity of moral grandeur as commands attention, is worth looking at and contemplating. And seeing he was a man it is some encouragement to know his character is imitable, however far short the noblest may follow in his footsteps. But if not purely a man, how could he be imitated? Of what value could his moral history be to one not of his nature? That he had more talents given him than any other man ever had, or will have, is unmistakable, and need not be disputed, but this does not alter the nature he bore, detract from the merit of his goodness, nor depreciate the value of his example. His talents having been greater than any man's, *his trials were also greater.* He was tried to the very verge of his power to endure, and so others have but to put to "usury," *as he did,* the talents they possess, whether one talent or a hundred, and no more is expected of them. God will not tempt them beyond their ability. No one is expected to be able to imitate Jesus further than they have talents to do so, *only the talents possessed require to be used, that the Lord, when he comes, will receive his own with "usury."*

Now, the question arises, in what way did Jesus put to "usury" the talents he possessed, and what were the talents he possessed, he put to usury? The talents in time measure the talents of eternity. The ten, the five, the two, which are doubled here, are met with their proportional interest there. The resurrection metes out in full the identity which distinguished the person who died in view

of it. This personal identity must therefore reflect in the result of the resurrection judgment, the talents occupied in time, though not manifested to the world, and exhibit in the future what is latent and unobserved in the present. The character that now exists will be the same character that will then exist, but under entirely different circumstances. The wisdom and power exercised in the fleshly body will be the same wisdom and power exercised in the spiritual body, only with greater increase and to different ends. This we have confirmed to us by the history of Jesus Christ. From what we know of the power Jesus exercises now, and will exercise; and of what is prophesied concerning him as to his ruling the world and confounding his enemies, we see in these things a reflex and an identity with the same power he had while in the flesh, both with what he manifested, and what he did not manifest, with what he encouraged in himself and what he subdued in himself of that power. And so, in his being appointed to rule the world on a future day, we see also, that he must have had the ability and power to rule the world while he was in the flesh, if he had so chosen. This being admitted, we next perceive, that his having had this ability while in the flesh, the temptation to do so, when he began his work must have been a great temptation. To tempt one with the possession of something beyond his reach is no temptation. He must have had the ability to rule, and the power to command the means, otherwise he could not have been tempted to rule. And it is in his having been conscious of the power to make the then kingdoms of the world his own, and yet refusing the glory, we perceive the majesty of his character. He valued more the glory set before him in the gospel; and, in his case, as there was no proof of a resurrection, save as drawn by himself from the testimony of scripture not so fully revealed as now, there was the more reason for his accepting such an honour at *his hand,* than his relying on a promise which put his inheritance so far off. And therein lies the pre-eminence of his wisdom, in thus preferring the glory of the future to the glory at hand, in choosing the objects of faith on the evidence of God's written testimony, in place of the objects of sense, in depending his life upon the word of God, in place of the bread which perisheth. See the temptation, and mark the power with which he was assailed. No personal devil tried him save his own

fleshly instincts. Being of like passions with ourselves, he had all the desires of our common nature, and having the ability like other men, and more than the ability of other men, to satisfy those desires, he could have turned it to break through the trammels his poverty encompassed him with, and ascend the ladder of a probably legitimate enough, (as far as human wisdom teaches,) but sensual ambition, to the highest pinnacle of human fame. This was his temptation, but he did not choose to yield to it. He was so endowed, judging from what he is now, and will be farther endowed with, and that this is a reflex and an identity with the power he was then endowed with, though he did not manifest it—he was so endowed, that had he preferred to turn his abilities to the service of his instincts in place of the service of his Father, to the worship of the mammon of this world, instead of the Deity in heaven, he could have raised and commanded armies to obey him, and nations to submit to his rule, *but he would not*. He could have raised himself from poverty to affluence, from the circumstances of a wanderer and an outcast to those of a throne. He could have then arrayed himself in the purple of the Cæsars had he pleased, *but he chose rather the circumstances he was born and brought up in, to the dazzling splendour of worldly greatness*. Like Moses, who might have sat on the throne of the Pharaohs, had he not chosen rather to suffer affliction with the people of God than enjoy the pleasures of sin (or fleshly sense) for a season, he too could have sat on the throne of the world, for he was far greater than Moses. And as wealth consists as much in what is at command as in what is in actual possession, we see from this the nature of Jesus' wealth. It was a wealth of no ordinary magnitude. Yet, thus rich as he was, for the sake of his brethren in the flesh, he consigned himself to poverty, that they through his example might be rich in the faith he thus so magnanimously began, finished, and illustrated. He was rich, in as far as he could command whatever he desired of the good things of this life, but rather than tempt the Lord, he would not command even bread for himself, though hungry and away from the habitation of man, that he might the more deeply engrave on the pyramid he reared, as his testimony and his example to posterity, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." In the instance referred to, the

simplicity of the details is as a key to his whole life. He was hungry from fasting, had no bread in his possession, and was separated from the ordinary means of getting it, *yet he could command it, but he would not*, though for others, on two occasions, he miraculously fed thousands. Again, though he had not "where to lay his head," this did not arise from his inability to command the means, for he could have commanded it like *as he did the money to pay a tax*, rather than offend the servants of Cæsar. This is another example. For every purpose of good he never failed to exercise his power, but for the purpose of his own fleshly instincts, though he could have as easily exercised it, he retained it latent. He thus set himself forth as an inimitable example, as far as perfection goes, of a living sacrifice for the benefit of others. And as an example, likewise, to his brethren, for the discipline of their moral nature, since it was by this means *he made himself perfect*.—Heb. ii, 10. It was his Father's will that he should be so, and it was in deference to his Father's will that he retained the power he had in secularly benefiting himself. And why? Because he came to fulfil the law and the prophets, and had he fulfilled the desires of his fleshly nature instead, all would have been lost. And we must not forget, that had he not been purely a man of flesh and blood like other men, there would have been no temptation for him to do otherwise than fulfil the law. It would have been an easy matter for him to have fulfilled it—there would have been no fleshly desires to deny, no trial to endure, no battle to fight; but then there would have been no merit, and hence no prize to gain. But so far from this, the very power he had which distinguished him above his fellows, was in itself a temptation in place of a help, for he could have exercised it to serve his natural desires, yet he never did. It is this which intensifies the sublime grandeur of his moral character, and measures the immensity of the sacrifices he had made. The supernatural power he received at his baptism was as much a test of the character he had reared for himself before this, on the basis of his early training, in the observance of the precepts of God, as it was a gift entrusted to him on his being sent forth on the work for which he was designed, as well as the mark of God's favour for him, the measure of God's estimation of him, and the evidence to man of the source from whence his authority to teach proceeded. But this

supernatural power was *not* his wisdom. The wisdom he manifested after his baptism was the wisdom he grew in before his baptism; it was only the more pre-eminently manifested. It was put to a severer trial after his baptism, and made distinguished by the manner he exercised his supernatural power, as it was both in the putting forth of this power, and in the reserving it latent, his wisdom was manifested. And how? Because had he not been a wise son, it would have been in his hands as a sword in the hands of a fool; or otherwise, had the Father not been "well pleased" with him, he never would have been entrusted with it. It put to the test, therefore, the wisdom he had grown in from a child. The temptation tried him. Endowed at his baptism with a power—the supernatural power of the Holy Spirit—which, as far as we have evidence, he had not possessed before, the world opened before him with a freedom much as it does to a man come of age inheriting a great possession. And then began the trial. How shall I spend the riches I have now acquired? or rather, as in his case, in what manner shall I exercise the power I am now entrusted with? Then forth came the influence of his early training to the decision he had to make. And had he not been a diligent student of the word, had he not been thoroughly trained in the precepts and will of God, he never would have been able to have resisted the temptations that *power* opened before him.

The world was at his feet. But see how he resisted. He leaned entirely on the Word of God; he let go his anchor down deep into the bottom of God's written testimony. He quoted the scriptures as a man thoroughly intimate with them; yes, and so familiar with them too, that in the battle he fought with himself, the scriptures seemed to have furnished his fleshly mind with as apt quotations to favour his natural desires, as those with which he met them by the spiritual or moral power he had derived from the thorough understanding of the scriptures. For such is the temptation of the fleshly mind acquainted with scripture, that it can find encouragement for itself from mis-directed quotations, as the spiritual mind can find strength from their proper use. And as such was the battle Jesus fought with himself, the victory he won is the more praiseworthy. He gained it through his disciplined use of the sword of the spirit. It is the better example on this very account. For how could it have been an example; what merit would there have been, had he been supernaturally inspired, to resist this temptation. Doubtless, he was inspired, but the inspiration here was *natural*, not supernatural. It had come *through* the written word to him as the result of his previous study and comprehension of it, and obedient to its precepts.

W.D.J.

(To be continued.)

[Error in former paper—for "shepherd's," read "shepherds?"]

THE POLITICAL HEAVENS AND THE SIGNS THEREOF.

THE Paris Exhibition is the great feature of the moment. By this, the frog spirit is radiating to the ends of the earth. The crowned heads of the world, far and near, are drawn to France, and bathed in the influence which has been complicating European politics for the last fifteen years, and which is destined, in the providence of God, to bring them all together, under Russian leadership, into the neighbourhood of "the beloved land," for final conflict with him who comes anon to judge the world in righteousness. On the surface of things,

this influence appears to work peaceward. The month has been brilliant with festivities. The royal visitors have been received with the highest honours. The Emperor Napoleon has spared no cost, and omitted no courtesy. Splendid receptions at railway stations, ovations in the streets, gorgeous fêtes and levees, on a scale of unprecedented magnificence have, for days, kept Paris in a whirl of excitement; and honeyed words of peace and goodwill from the royal mouths, which, only two months ago, were smoking with the incense of wrath and impending war, have

gilded the picture with an artificial sunshine, and kept the funds from falling. Yet, with all the blaze and the merrymaking, there is something behind which makes people, and even the crowned heads themselves, feel uncomfortable. Uneasiness prevails in spite of the imperial consolations of the Paris Exhibition. The fact is, the meeting of sovereigns at Paris is a hollow show; it is the pageantry of hypocrisy from beginning to end. It is a desperate move on the part of the political gamester of the Tuileries, who feels he is losing ground, and is not yet in a position to do what is necessary to regain it. By getting the crowned heads to Paris, under the auspices of the Exhibition, he postpones the impending struggle, and gets time to prepare for the mighty effort which he sees to be forced upon him, if he means to keep his position in Europe. He also gets the opportunity of forming and strengthening those political friendships favourable to his designs. This grand peace festival is ominous; it will be followed by one of the most desolating wars the world has ever seen. The rulers will go every man to his place, and prepare with greater determination than ever, for the irrepressible conflict which is descending upon Europe.

The following remarks, in the letter of a newspaper correspondent at Paris (*Birmingham Journal*, June 8th), are to the point—

“Throughout the whole of the fetes which have hitherto been given does there hang a dread, a fear, a consciousness of future trouble, which is visible in the silence and the thoughtfulness of those who come to be amused, and the evident pre-occupation of those who have undertaken to amuse them. Does not the hand of Fate seem as if stretched out over all these rejoicing, merry-making sovereigns! The King and Queen of Belgium have already disappeared from the assembly—silently stealing away in consequence of the hopeless state of the Empress Charlotte, or it may be the violent death of the Emperor Maximilian. Does not the Emperor start at the slightest noise, and betray, in spite of himself, the high state of nervousness into

which he has been thrown by the peril to which the Prince Imperial has been so long exposed? And even during the most voluptuous dances and the most exquisite music of last night, was there not, hanging over all, the idea of that dark cloud approaching Paris—the King of Prussia and Count Bismark—upon whose yielding or resistance depends at this moment not only the peace of every country, but the security of every throne, in Europe? Uncertainty worse than all has taken place of the mistrust and defiance hitherto experienced. The dread of war grows more powerful every day, because, in spite of the good fellowship apparent to the world between the sovereigns, we have the preparations for hostilities against each other proceeding with as much vigour as if they had never met. It is generally believed that the very object of the visits of the Russian and Prussian monarchs is to come to a perfect understanding with the Emperor Napoleon, who is no longer to be suffered to tamper with the fears and interests of Europe as he has hitherto done. Gortschakoff has already expressed his opinion concerning this tendency of the French Government. Bismark has never sought to conceal his contempt and abhorrence of all that surrounds the Emperor. They, at all events, will create no surprise by their insistence; and the result must be either a modification of the terms on which peace can be maintained or a determination to proclaim immediate war. We are in the midst of the deepest anxiety: every look, every word, every gesture, is examined and commented upon, and yet, to the vulgar herd, the national vanity seems fed to plethora, public prosperity is at its height, and all goes merry as a marriage bell.”

The *Globe's* Paris correspondent, writing on the 21st of May, remarks as follows:

“Although, for the moment, peace between France and Germany is certain, and though the Prussian monarch is about to come to see the Great Exhibition and embrace Napoleon III. (how he must love him!) the acute eyes of diplomacy, I am told, see a cloud rising between the two countries, which seems to them to be charged with war. There is, as all the world knows, a formidable fortress at Rastadt, in the Grand Duchy of Baden, not far from the French frontier, and destined to check an invasion of Germany from France, or to favour one of France from Germany. Over this fortress, Prussia naturally desires to gain control, and the Government and people of Baden desire nothing better than to place it in her hands. But, gracious heavens! what would become of ‘the security of France’ and ‘the dignity of France’ if the Prussians were in possession of Rastadt? The French Emperor, it appears, is already beginning to tremble at the danger, and to be angry at the loss of

dignity which such an event would entail. 'It would be as bad,' he has been heard to mutter, 'as leaving the Prussians at Luxemburg.' Therefore, diplomacy anticipates that before many more moons shall have passed away, a 'question of Rastadt' will be on the *tapis*. They anticipate, too, that Count Bismark will not be so ready to neutralize Rastadt as he was Luxemburg; nay, they doubt that the German people would let him make any concession to France about the fortress, if he were disposed to do so.

"Notwithstanding the existing peace, the French Government, I am assured, is actively making preparations for war. The assurance comes from a quarter which is well informed. The preparations consist in collecting clothing and *material*, buying horses, getting Chassepot muskets made as fast as possible, and having them distributed to the troops as fast as made. Moreover, orders have been given here that another division shall be sent to the camp at Chalons, though the forces collected there are already greater than in any preceding year. Finally, as you are aware, the Government has bullied the committee of the Corps Legislatif on the Bill for the Reorganization of the Army, into consenting to having the army fixed at 800,000 men, for at least one year. By means of that consent it will get all the virile part of the population taught the use of arms, and that will answer its purpose for the moment. In presence of such facts as these, the 'pacific' measures it has taken, the most notable of which are letting their soldiers whose time of service expires at the end of the present year, leave a little sooner (a thing ordinarily done by the way), and the reduction of £20 in the price for which young men drawn in the conscription may buy themselves out of the army—these measures amount to little indeed."

On the 29th May, the *Globe* had the following, under the head of "Foreign Intelligence:—"

"Count Bismark perceives a coming storm, and is setting his house in order. The fortifications on all the exposed parts of the frontier—especially those adjoining France and Austria—are being repaired and strengthened, and a strongly entrenched camp is said to be in contemplation to protect the Middle Rhine. Similar preparations are being carried on in the provinces lately captured from Denmark, so as to guard any attack in the rear."

So much for the general state of the political atmosphere, despite the presumed salubrious effects of the royal meetings at Paris. Turning to the particular elements

of disturbance now at work, we find that the Cretan insurrection, so far from being crushed out, has almost got the upper hand of Turkey's greatest general, Omar Pacha, who was sent to the island with the expectation of instant victory. The intelligence to this effect is as follows:

"All the private news received from Crete is completely at variance with that forwarded to the Sublime Porte. The insurrection, far from being "smothered"—to use an expression of Omar Pacha—seems stronger than ever, and it ceaselessly receives reinforcements, ammunition, and victuals from abroad. The blockade is a mere farce, since the Arcadia has accomplished, unmolested, thirteen or fourteen trips."—*Standard*, June 11th.

"Telegrams from Athens, dated the 12th inst., assert that Omar Pacha has failed in his expedition against Sphakia and Apocorona, with great loss. His junction with Mehemed Pacha is said to have been prevented, and the latter, twice beaten in the province of Apocorona, had been compelled to retreat to an entrenched camp. The Turkish steamer *Isidhi*, which unsuccessfully chased the Arcadia, had returned to Candia severely damaged, and with several of her crew killed and wounded."—*Globe*, June 17th.

The effects of this failure, as tending to the embroilment of Turkey and Greece, and consequent interference of Russia, who is the abettor of Greece, will be manifest from the following further newspaper clippings:

"The Florence papers publish a telegram from Athens, dated 15th inst., which says:—"Omar Pacha, after having suffered a fresh defeat at Heracleion, burnt all the villages which had not been defended by the insurgents, and murdered the inhabitants. The Consuls have announced these atrocious acts to their respective Governments. The commandant of the Italian gunboat "Prince Addone" saved several families, and transported them to the Piræus."—*Reuter's Telegrams*, June 18th.

According to the *Etendard*, the Great Powers have come to an understanding to address a note to the Porte, insisting on the necessity of efficacious measures being taken to put an end to the agitation in Candia, by satisfying the wishes of the Christian populations.—*Globe*, June 3rd.

The marriage of the King of the Greeks with the daughter of the Grand Duke Constantine, the especial advocate of the old Russian creed, is regarded in Russia itself as a declaration that the Government will

espouse the cause of Greece against Turkey. On the other hand, the reception given to the Non-Russian Slavonians who went as delegates to the Pan-Slavonic Congress at Moscow, and the significant terms in which they were addressed by so courteous a ruler as Alexander II. points to a determination to re-assert the supremacy of Russia whenever the fitting opportunity occurs for such an assertion. Prussia, according to the opinion of Russian politicians, may be relied upon in the event of war; the hostility of England will be paralysed by the alliance between St. Petersburg and Washington; France may be bribed by cessions of territory on the Mediterranean coasts; and Austria is powerless. Turkey, if left to herself, must fall to pieces; and then Russia will step in. It is desirable not to hurry the catastrophe; but if it does arrive, the empire of the north will be found ready to act. We are not saying that these calculations are correct; all we assert is, that they are accepted by the men who direct the policy of Russia, and will be acted upon when the hour arrives. How far we can successfully oppose the realisation of this Muscovite "manifest destiny," or whether, if we could, it would be advisable to do so, are points we do not enter upon at present."—*The Spectator*, June 11th.

"RUSSIA AND THE SLAVONIANS.—The enthusiastic reception given to the Slavonian travellers in the Russian capital, culminated in demonstrative interviews and festivities on the 22nd, 23rd, and 26th of May. On the first day a deputation of the feted guests waited upon Prince Gortschakoff, Minister of Foreign Affairs. After an interview with M. Stremonchoff, they were introduced to the Prince, who saluted them in the most cordial manner. On the 23rd, the day devoted to the memory of the Slavonian Apostles Cyril and Methodius, the Slavonians were entertained by the aristocracy. One of the speeches concluded as follows: 'Belief in divine justice will never be smothered in our breasts, whatever sacrifices be demanded of us. God lives, and the shout, 'All hail to the Czar-Liberator!' will some day be heard beyond the Russian confines.' M. Militinovitch, a Servian priest then solicited the assistance of the Russians against the Turks. After him M. Polit, a Croatian agitator, said:—'Thank God, our journey to Russia, our presence in its capital, proves that she is justly called the Pan-Slavonic Power. The creative task of Russia lies not only in Asia, but on what may be called the threshold to her house—the European East. The liberation of the European East is the great deed reserved for her. Turks, Magyars, or Austro-Germans, or whatever may be the name of foreigners ruling over the Slavonian people, they must be stopped in the exercise of their unjustifiable authority. Races must henceforth be independent. The battle of

Sadowa has decided the destinies of the European East. In consequence of it the German world has been separated from the Slavonian. What remains to be done is to solve the Slavonian question—a task to be fulfilled by the Slavonians themselves, and chiefly by Russia. Russia is no longer Russian, it is Slavonian—nay, Pan-Slavonian. The first blow in the great struggle must be the cutting through the Eastern knot. I propose the speedy solution of the Eastern question.'" The Emperor and Empress received a deputation of the guests on the 26th. His majesty addressed a few questions to some of them. One Militishevitch, from Servia, he asked whether the Turks had already evacuated Belgrade when he set off for St. Petersburg. The question having been answered in the affirmative, his majesty replied, 'It is well that the affair has been brought to a conclusion at length.' The Emperor replying to an address, said, 'We have always looked upon the Servians as our own brothers, and I hope that God will allow your affairs to take a more favourable turn at no distant future. God grant that all your wishes be speedily fulfilled.'"—*Globe*, June 3.

"TURKEY AND GREECE.—In a long letter to the *Times*, a correspondent discusses the relative positions of Turkey and Greece, with the manifest object of securing the cession of Candia to the latter power. Looking at Candia after nearly a year of belligerence, he says:—'The Christians have lately gained five battles—on the 18th of April, at Apocorona, on the 19th at Sillissos, on the 29th and 30th at Keramia, on the 5th of May near the village of Argysopoulis, in the passes of Callicrate, where the Turks were headed by Omar Pacha, Turkey has in Crete about thirty men-of-war, whose line has been repeatedly evaded by the Arcadian. The troops of Turkey in Crete were 42,000. They are now reduced to less than 15,000. There is no reason why this warfare should ever end. The Turks may have the forts, the insurgents may not be able to fight pitched battles or lay regular siege; but they occupy the strongholds of the island, and will evidently maintain them. The same feeling of nationality and of sympathy with Greece exists not only in Candia, but in all the Turkish provinces where the Christian element predominates. The question is whether it is the interest of Christian Powers to suppress the Christian element to the benefit of the Mussulman, and whether this position especially becomes Great Britain? The Eastern question can neither be put off nor called forth. It is already open. It only remains to be exa-

mined whether it is right for Great Britain to allow the Eastern question to take its own course by revolutions, with the more or less intervention of all the Continental powers, and without her participation. On the one hand, Great Britain cannot wish that Turkey should be mistress of the East, yet by her silence she grants Turkey an army. On the other hand, Great Britain has incurred enormous sacrifices to save Turkey from Russian invasion, yet she allows Russia to place herself at the head of all the Christians in the East, and to lead in her rear all the European powers. To hope that Turkey will suppress the revolution and pacify the Christians is impossible. Would it not be wiser to consider Greece as Turkey's natural heir? If, on the other hand, we believe in the regeneration of Turkey, is it not wiser still to advise her to do what Great Britain has so lately done herself—to follow in Candia, and, if necessary, even in Thessaly and Epirus, the Example that Great Britain gave by the cession of the Ionian Islands? This timely advice would save Turkey from the European powers. It would guarantee to her the remainder of her territory. This arrangement would settle all the Constantinople difficulties; it would pacify Greece by giving her her natural boundaries, and the natural means of living; lastly and chiefly, it would be a barrier against Russia."—*Globe*, June 6.

A letter in the *Newcastle Daily Chronicle* of June 11th, contains the following passages—

* * * "The eyes of the British public are at length beginning to be opened, and the progress of Russia, both in the east and in the west, is beginning to be commented upon in a tone indicative of events looming still in the future, but approaching at a rapid pace, and casting dark shadows before. * * * The fall of Austria, the elevation of Baron von Beust as Austrian Minister, and an entire change of policy under Russian and Prussian dictation, have removed the veil. The situation is now reversed. Germany no longer checks Russia, but is in league with the Czar. Turkey is menaced; and France, isolated and menaced, is looking to this country for amity and real and true alliance. The situation is nearly that of 1813 and 1814, when Napoleon, having lost an army on the march to Moscow, was at length beaten down by Germany united with

Russia, and Dresden and Leipsic were fore-runners of the abdication and banishment to Elba. There are those who now look to see this scene re-enacted under circumstances the reverse of those of 1813 and 1814. It is now Muscovite and Germanic ambition menacing the empire and nation of France, startling all Europe. It is a military coalition, aiming at domination east and west; not the arm of an individual stretched over the European community.

I cannot bring myself to believe that it needs any great gift of perception to enable any calm and candid thinker to perceive the peril of the situation. Here is all Germany, backed by the half-civilised hordes that make up the empire of the Czar, leagued and banded together against France, with a view, if the high-spirited French nation can be overawed or overpowered, to drive the Sultan from Europe, overawe Asia, and predominate, without check or hindrance, over the west and over the east."

RUSSIAN ARMAMENTS.—A letter from Warsaw, which appears in the *Posen Journal*, contains the following:—"Despite the pacific news, Russia has not for one instant ceased her military preparations. She already possesses a considerable number of needle guns. However, the Russian soldiers have a good deal of difficulty in accustoming themselves to this weapon and the evolutions required by the new system of armament. At Warsaw are to be met a crowd of Prussian officers, sent there as instructors in the new tactics. The Russian generals say, without the least mystery, that their Government has contracted an alliance with Prussia. The works for the entrenched camp in the neighbourhood of Warsaw are being pushed forward. For the last fortnight, some thousands of navvies have been occupied there, as the whole is to be finished by the time the Emperor Alexander is expected; that is to say, the end of June, after his return from Paris."—*Globe*, May 25th.

RUSSIA IN INDIA.—The Anglo-Indian journals are at present discussing, with great interest, the surprising progress which Russia has recently been making in the East, and which has now brought her forces within a few days' march of our Indian frontier. The *Times* takes up the subject to-day, but misses the important point. It is true enough that Russia is never likely to attempt a regular invasion

of India. The tremendous mountain-defiles through which our frontier must be approached, the broad stream of the Indus by which it is covered, the lines of railway and the river-flotilla available for its defence, render such a project too chimerical to be entertained. But Russia will avail herself of her position in Asia to disquiet us whenever the Eastern question is re-opened. Her approach to our Indian frontier, the probable attack upon Herat, if not also upon Cabul, will be but a diversion. Nevertheless, these operations will occasion to us no small embarrassment; and one result of them will be, to retain in India a portion of our Anglo-Indian army at a time when it will be greatly wanted to operate in the valley of the Euphrates."—*Globe*, June 12th.

"DIFFICULTIES BETWEEN TURKEY AND PERSIA.—A Teheran correspondent writes that religious susceptibilities are easily aroused in the East, and there are signs of a possible interruption, on that ground, of the good relations between Turkey and Persia. * * * 'Surely Turkey has enough on her hands just now, without a supplementary 'difficulty' with Persia. But the elements of this difficulty certainly exist, and in the directions that I have briefly referred to. Russia, it is plain, seems to think there is something brewing in this quarter, for the Russian Ambassador, who had returned to St. Petersburg on leave of absence, received orders the very day he had got home to start back again at once for Teheran.—*Globe*, June 12th."

INTELLIGENCE.

BIRMINGHAM.—The agitation caused by Murphy's Anti-Romanist lectures in the town has awakened an interest in religious questions of which the brethren are availing themselves to present the truth. At a meeting of the ecclesia, held June 21st, it was resolved to supply every clergyman and minister in the town and district (amounting to about 500) with a copy of the *Declaration*, through the post. It is not expected that any of the leaders of the people will open their eyes and accept the truth, but it is hoped that in conjunction with other past and contemplated efforts, the delivery of the *Declaration* to them, will lead them to talk about the truth, and perhaps oppose it, and thus do it a benefit, for nothing is better for the cause of the truth than opposition; this makes it the subject of agitation, and draws attention to it, which is the thing to be desired on the part of all apprehending its mission. A fly-leaf will be inserted in the copies thus thrown broadcast into the camp of the enemy, stating from whom they have come, and with what object.—In addition to this effort, about 700 have been privately distributed.—At the same meeting, a resolution was adopted, abolishing the monthly Sunday tea meeting and the afternoon meeting from which it took its rise.—The quarterly tea meeting was held on Monday, June 24th. The secretary

reported that the number of the additions for the quarter had been 3; greatest attendance at the table, 62, lowest ditto, 41, average, 52. He also reported that the collections for the quarter had amounted to about £20, in addition to £3 15s. 0d raised for special purposes. The attendance at the Sunday evening lectures continues undiminished.

DUNKELD (SCOTLAND).—Brother Milne, writing on the 17th ult, reports the death of Findlay Cameron, an aged brother, who, he says, has striven ever since he knew the truth, to walk worthy of the high calling. He took an active part in the meeting, and the brethren will miss him greatly. During his illness, he was visited by the local Free Church Ministers; but they made no impression on one whose faith was firmly built on the word of God, in opposition to the lying traditions of which the clergy are the professional vendors. He resisted the devil, and died in hope of the resurrection and the kingdom of God.—In the same letter, bro. Milne mentions the immersion of our deceased brother's daughter, viz., the wife of bro. Bissett, of London, who had come down from the metropolis to see her father before he died. She had for some time known the way of life, but was unable till now to realise the worthlessness of a baptism based upon a belief in orthodox delusions.

EDINBURGH.—Bro. Ellis writes that the Sunday Evening Lectures continue to be well attended. The plan adopted is to select particular portions of the Word for exposition, rather than give out a set subject. This is found, in the circumstances of the Edinburgh brethren, to answer best. On Thursday evening, discussion is encouraged, and interesting meetings have taken place.

GLASGOW.—The Christadelphian Meeting in Glasgow, have lost one of their number by the removal of Robert Forbes to Fife, but has had the gap supplied by the addition of sister Hendry, of whom Bro. Clark says, she was originally a member of the Stockwell Street Meeting, but having during a two years' absence from Glasgow had the mist cleared from her eyes, she found herself unable on her return to fellowship her old associates; remarking that having given up all for the truth, she could not barter it for the friendship of amiable people who did not understand it, or were not faithful to it.—The Christadelphians meet at the Glasgow Institution Class Room, 280, George Street.

GALASHIELS.—Bro. W. Milne reports, with sorrow, the death of sister Bell, who has been in a weak state of health for a long time. Her knowledge of the truth (says brother Milne) was clear and her faith firm. She died with a calm and cheerful prospect of the future, her only anxiety being on account of her husband and children, who are thus left without their best friend on earth. Bro. Milne does not speak hopefully of the prospects of the truth in Galashiels. Be it the praise of the brethren to be steadfast and immovable in their own faith, though all the world mock.

LONDON.—The ecclesia here have received an addition to their number in the person of Mrs. Bissett, under the circumstances mentioned in the intelligence from Dunkeld.

SCARBOROUGH.—Bro. G. H. Kidd, of this place, writes as follows:—"We are of one mind in Scarborough, and humbly endeavouring to spread the good news, notwithstanding adverse circumstances. We have visited Scalby, a village about three miles distant, eight or nine times, taking our stand on the king's highway. Last summer we found the Scarborough sands [as used by the adverse mob—Ed.] rather too sharp for our eyes, and not very pleasant to our ears and necks; but it passed harmlessly off our persons; and that very sand will be a witness against all those who cast us out."—Bro. Kidd invites the visits of brethren.

ANNUAL STATISTICS OF THE TRUTH'S PROGRESS.—The beloved sister who takes upon herself the pleasant duty of reporting progress from time to time, writes as follows:—

The close of another year in the publication of the *Ambassador* renews my pleasing task of noting how far the Word, most surely believed and proclaimed among us, has borne fruit. Though the harvest is still scant, it will gladden the friends of the truth to know that the numbers "added to the church" are larger by. I hope, nearly one third, than in either of the two preceding years. In Great Britain, 79 persons have made the good confession; in Toronto, C.W., 3; in India, 3; in Australia, 2; in New Zealand, 10; besides which, 6 individuals have seceded from Dowieism and joined the brethren, making a total of 103. And further, in the *Ambassador* for October last, several re-immersions are recorded at the Mumbles, S.W.; and in the number for February, letters from New Zealand mention several immersions there, but as the figures are not given, they could not be included in the above calculation. Six deaths have taken place and two marriages, and there have been three withdrawals, two of them on teetotal scruples.

NOTES.

We are obliged to hold over answers to correspondents. "Mystic Times," (Z) and W. E.'s article next month. Both are in type.

We have several criticisms on our remarks on the new translation of 1 Cor. xv, 42-44. We are unable this month to

give them the place and attention which they will receive in due course.

The *Lectures* are not yet ready. The printer's bond applied to an estimated number of pages, which will be considerably exceeded. The work is well advanced and rapidly advancing. We hope in our next to announce its completion.

We bespeak patience on the part of those ordering the *Declaration*. We have had 3,000 from the printer: they are all gone. The fourth thousand, which we are promised in another week, is all ordered, so that fresh orders must wait the arrival of the remaining 2,000, which will not be ready for at least three weeks. The foreign demand is as yet untouched. We are happy to be able to state that in the event of the whole 6,000 going off—which seems more than probable—it is brother Bingley's intention to bring out another edition at the same price.

Parties at a distance ordering copies of the *Declaration* are, of course, expected to pay carriage. Prepayment by rail has been made in some few instances, but this has only been to accommodate subscribers. The amount prepaid will be added to the price of the pamphlets. In future, no parcel will be prepaid, as it is found that delivery is more punctual and certain where the carriage has to be paid at the end of the journey.

MARK ALLEN must apply to Dr. Thomas. We cannot open our pages for the discussion of personalities. If M. A. has been misrepresented, let him send the evidence to the Doctor, whose correction of the mistake would be of more value to him than twenty letters in self-vindication. We know the Doctor, and have confidence in him, and,

therefore, afford him the same unfettered use of the *Ambassador's* pages that he would make of his own periodical. This is only reasonable in the relative position of things. M. A., as a total stranger, cannot expect to be put upon the same footing.

THE "GOOD SUGGESTION."—We have several responses to this (see *Ambassador* of last month), but the matter requires further discussion. Brother Ellis thinks a better scheme would be for the brethren to unite in keeping up the supply of the *Declaration* at the present price, making use of it as an advertising medium; but this is rendered superfluous by the intention of brother Bingley to bring out another edition. Brother Andrew suggests that the *Declaration* should be sent to every Sunday-school teacher in the United Kingdom. This is a good proposal. Sunday-school teachers are a class on whom some impression might be made. The Sunday-School Union publishes lists of their names and addresses, so that the proposal is quite practicable; it is only a question of money. A collective effort might raise enough to carry it out. In addition to a general stroke like this, the ecclesias might do something in a systematic way in their own neighbourhoods (See Birmingham Intelligence). We invite the expression of opinion on the subject.

THE APOCALYPSE PARAPHRASED: *Errata last month*.—P. 141, line 4, verses 1 to 8, should have been altered to *verses 1 to 4*, as the M S. was divided into two. P. 141, line 30, "shout" should be "shoot;" p. 142, line 7. "and heard" should be "I heard;" p. 143, line 1, "Oidins" should be "Didius."

THE AMBASSADOR

Of the Coming Age.

"A wicked Messenger falleth into mischief, but a faithful Ambassador is health."—PROV. xiii, 17.

No. 38.

AUGUST, 1867.

Vol. IV.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

THE JEWS ORGANISING TO RETURN TO PALESTINE.

WEST HOBOKEN, HUDSON Co., N.J., U.S.,
June 24th, 1867.

DEAR BROTHER ROBERTS—My calculation is, that the 2400 of Daniel viii, 14, terminated in the epoch between A.D. 1860 and A.D. 1864; and that thenceforth, something ought to turn up in Jewish affairs (if the calculation be correct) indicating the beginning of the work ultimating in "the cleansing of the holy;" or, the redemption of the Holy Land and twelve tribes of Israel from their present down-treading, and establishment in that land as the kingdom of Deity in subjection to the King Immortal, JESUS CHRIST; and his immortal and glorified brethren, THE SAINTS.

Illustrative of this, some of your readers may be pleased to read the following, which I extract from one of the New York dailies. It appeared therein as a leading article, under the caption of

"A HEBREW GOVERNMENT."

Thus it reads, "A form of government was established in 1864 by the Israelites resident in the United States, for the purpose of guarding the race in America. This organization has been in regular operation ever since its establishment, but so exclusively have its doings been confined to the affairs and circles of those immediately interested, that the public at large has known very little of its existence. The business of this government has now grown so important that the executive is about to call for loans and issue bonds in the name of the Israelitish Government,

bearing seven per cent. interest. This organisation is intended to co-operate with similar associations in other parts of the world, the grand object being a furtherance of the *favorite and traditional Jewish idea, that the whole race of Israelities will ultimately be gathered together in the land of their forefathers.* Then, they believe, the temple in Jerusalem will be rebuilt *preparatory* to the coming of Messiah, to vindicate the truth of the religious belief to which the Jews have adhered tenaciously for so many centuries. The whole number of Jews scattered abroad throughout the world is estimated at six millions."

In another part of the same paper, dated June 6, is the following, which doubtless prompted the leader above quoted.

"AMERICAN ISRAELITISH GOVERNMENT.—The "American Israelitish Government" has issued a manifesto signed "Stellifer Moulton, Executive Israelitish Government of America, House No. 58, West Eighteenth Street, New York, June 5, 1867," and setting forth some of its objects, among which is *the restoration of the Jews to the Holy Land.* The document states that the Israelitish Government "has been in legitimate official operation since October, 1864." It looks after the interests of all Jews alike. Reference is made to the different decrees of the government, prominent among which are "the triple decrees of July 29, 1866, whereby the government, for sufficient cause, decreed its protection over the flag of the Fenian power, the flag of Mexico, and the flag of Italy, and the consequent definitive decrees," and the decree now issuing, inviting the dispersed of Israel and of Judah to come to America, to help to occupy the great and rich countries whereof this government hath secured, and owns the public right of possession and of government, *that we may refresh ourselves for a season, and bring into remembrance the sure mercies of David, resting it in peace that WHEN we shall desire to go to the pleasant land where our fathers dwelt, either for visitation, or to abide therein, WE WILL GO; and the regal might of David and the Almighty God of Israel shall go with you.*"

An appeal is made for subscriptions and loans, and every people are called on for assistance.

Here then, is a fact, that a movement has begun among the Jews in the right direction—that namely, of *refreshing themselves for a season, resting in peace, and occupying themselves in bringing into remembrance "the sure mercies of David."* This is a preparation which, if persisted in, will make them ready and willing to attend to the commands of David II, when they shall be delivered to them by his Ambassadors bearing with them the credentials of their divine mission. The manifesto does not contemplate an emigration to the Holy Land until after the season of peace and rest, and the power of Almighty God shall be ready to go with them. This is scriptural; and the way they propose to occupy themselves in the meantime, sounds very much like the beginning of the fulfilment of the words of prophecy, in which they are "considering their latter end," and remembering Jehovali, in far countries that they may live with their children, and turn again—Ezek. vi, 9; Zech. x, 9.

All great enterprises have small, and often contemptible, beginnings, and the results developed turn out to be far beyond the power of the

original speculators and promoters. So it will be with this Israelitish Government. There will be such a government in Palestine; but this American one, can never be established there. It is all very well as an agitation—something to stir up the Jewish mind to thought, and to arouse it from that Rabbinical stagnation in which it has been immersed for ages. The only government of the nation that can obtain in Jerusalem, is that which shall be organized and proclaimed from Zion by Jesus Christ in person. Still, it may be expected, that there will be organizations of a political character in many parts of the world for the regulation and promotion of local operations. Before the Jews can be induced as a body of people to leave America for the pleasant land, or such a move could be effected, there must be a powerful local executive. I have no idea, however, that Stellifer Moulton and his cabinet, are, or ever will be, members of that executive. Nevertheless, the Star Bearing Moulton and his co-labourers' speculation, is a sign of the times indicative of the tendency of things. Their patronage of Fenianism, Mexicanism, and Red-republicanism in Italy, proclaims them the enemy of established governments and the papacy. This is true Jewish ground, for the mission of David's Son and Lord, is "in the name of Jehovah to destroy them all"—Ps. cxviii, 10-12.

Among their many mistakes, is the notion of a temple being built in Jerusalem, *preparatory* to the coming of Messiah. This will not be, for, it is written, "The man whose name is the Branch * * * He shall build the temple of Jehovah; and shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and shall be a priest upon his throne." But he will be assisted in the work by people from remote countries; for "they that are far off shall come, and build in the temple of Jehovah"—Zech. vi, 12-15. This will be while he is in actual occupation of the throne of his father David, and swaying his sceptre over the House of Jacob in the pleasant land.

But the enterprise of Stellifer does not as yet find approval generally among the Scribes and Rabbis of the Jews. The following letter in the N.Y. Tribune of June 19, referring to the leader before the reader, expresses the ideas of some of the opponents. The writer, after quoting the leader, says to the Editor:

Sir,—The above extract from an exchange is based on a paragraph in the *New York Sun*, which has gone the rounds of the press.

I do not hesitate to pronounce this entire project of a "Hebrew Government," a combination of insanity and knavery on the part of the perpetrators, who will be exposed as soon as their identity can be discovered. The Hebrew people are not as readily imposed upon as were the victims of the Fenian bonds, and nobody is likely to purchase the bonds of this so-called "Hebrew Government," save the most incautious enthusiasts. But I wish to have the impression effectively removed from the public mind that any respectable Israelite is at all concerned in this movement.

We Israelites do not propose to expedite the rebuilding of the temple, or the Messianic Reign by encouraging any such swindle. Our belief in the coming of the Messiah prepares us for *divine interposition* in

hastening the restoration of Israel to the promised land; and we are not so irreverent or Quixotic, as to contemplate such a scheme as that alluded to.

You will serve the cause of truth by giving publicity to this denial of all participation in this scheme by any Israelites other than the crazy speculators who started it—if they be Israelites, which I strongly doubt. I suspect them to be the celebrated “Stellifer, King of the Jews” and his confederate, who tried to create a sensation a year ago.

Respectfully yours, MYER S. ISAACS,

New York, June 17, 1867.

EDITOR, *Jewish Messenger.*

Mr. Isaacs is right in the idea, that divine interposition is necessary to the building of the temple and the establishment of the Messianic reign. This belief exempts him from that class of “respectable Israelites,” who say “We need no personal Messiah. We do not wish to go back to Palestine, or submit to any king. What good can we expect of a son of David?” I wonder if the Editor of the *Jewish Messenger* considers the Israelites for whom the Editor of the *Israelite* utters these blasphemies, are “respectable Israelites!” In a theological point of view, who can define respectability among Israelites, “defiled” as they all are “with their detestable things and transgressions” from which, at the coming of Messiah, they are to be cleansed?—Ezek. xxxvii, 23. There is no respectability in sin, under which all Jews and Gentiles are included, except those of them who believe the things of the Kingdom of God and of the Name of Jesus Christ; and have thereinto been immersed. Before the Deity, who is no respecter of persons, the only “respectable Israelites” are these.

ANASTASIS, I perceive, is being racked and tortured in different parts of the world. This is the fate of the truth, written, spoken, or incarnate, wherever it addresses the sons of men. I have found it impossible, with all my plainness and straightforwardness, so to speak, write, and act, as not to be misconstrued by someone or more. My course is, therefore, just to say what I have to say, and let the world dispute and cavil at it as much as, and as long as, they please. When they get tired, perhaps they will stop. The public can then make their own election to accept or reject the exposition given as they feel disposed. I have neither time nor inclination to dispute for disputation's sake.

What has set the people by the ears in Birmingham? John Bright's enlightened constituents present a deplorable exemplification of the “manifest destiny” of the working man. Earnestly desiring the government of our king,

I remain, faithfully yours,

June 24th, 1867.

JOHN THOMAS.



JUDGMENT AT HOME, SOCIAL AND INDIVIDUAL.

“Judge not that ye be not judged, for with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged.”
“He shall have judgment without mercy, that hath shewed no mercy, and mercy rejoiceth against judgment.”

These words of our Lord and of the apostle James, come with peculiar force to our minds at the present time, when we are living in expectation of the near approach of that great and terrible day, in which God shall reveal the secrets of men, and bring to light the hidden counsels of the heart. How often the necessity for such words are felt in the experience of nearly every christian, as bearing upon some occurrences within his own knowledge and under his own observation.

One of the great mental infirmities to which human nature is subject, is that of giving a verdict or judgment upon things which they do not understand. In the language of scripture, “they speak evil of things which they understand not” and there is not wanting in every society a class of persons, censoriously inclined, who have an inveterate propensity to magnify the *motes* in their neighbours' eyes, into very uncomely, sight-destroying *beams*. To form some kind of a judgment, however, upon things which we see and hear, is a natural instinct, and a very useful and important one—for without it, we should be deprived of that tact and sagacity essential for carrying on our affairs, for self-protection and preservation, and for proper discernment between right and wrong; this is the lawful, legitimate use of the faculty; but like all other faculties which we inherit by natural descent from the first Adam, it has been sadly misused and perverted, as the natural consequence of the blindness and perversion of judgment manifested by the father and mother of our race.

Many persons, labouring under this very unhappy inheritance, allow their judgment to revel in the mazes of conjecture, supposition and imagination, concerning “other men's matters,” and finally decide to condemn the apparently real ways and conduct of others, the inmost recesses of whose private affairs, it is impossible for them to fathom—pronouncing judgment upon things which they understand not. Judgment used in this way, is *misused and perverted*, and is a fruitful source of mischief in any society, but especially among the faithful in Christ who desire to live in peace, love and harmony with each other. There is a natural judgment, and there is a spiritual judgment—or in other words, there is a judgment according to the flesh, and there is a judgment according to the spirit. When we become members of the spiritual family, we must not assert the right to judge our fellows according to fleshly rules, but according to the divine standard, by which all are to be judged. Let no one judge or condemn his brother on account of some infirmity or weakness of character, which causes no special violation of gospel principles or divine commands; the one who does this, is himself the subject of a great infirmity—and, as often happens, is far more culpable, than the object of his censure or condemnation.

It is well understood that all men and all women are compassed with infirmities—otherwise what need have we of a saviour? Our Lord said, “I came not to call the righteous but *sinners* to repentance”—that is, he came not to call the righteous in their own estimation, who, in reality were sinners, but those who knew that they were sinners—with honest and good hearts, notwithstanding all the sins which they had committed—sinners, possessing a love for truth, and consequently with unsophisticated understandings—that is, understandings untrammelled by the intricate meshes and webs of the serpent’s deceitfulness. Such sinners as these were considered fit receptacles for the truth of God, by which they might be cleansed from all unrighteousness. We see that there is a classification of sins in the scriptures.

The heart that is full of serpentine subtilty and deceitfulness, is not a heart in which the truth can take root and bear fruit unto eternal life—but only the honest and good heart, although it may have been guilty of evil thoughts resulting in evil actions. When repentance comes to such, turning them from dead works to serve the living God, they are prepared to accept any conditions, to make any sacrifice, to give up their whole heart with unselfish devotion to the service of God and His truth; completely divested of selfish objects and feelings—having only one object before their minds, viz. the glory of God; that is, the promotion of his truth, the service of his church; the internal culture of their own hearts—showing the triumphant power of the truth over the flesh, the devil. The apostle John says, “Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, he cannot sin because His seed remaineth in him;” nevertheless, he says, in another place, “If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us;” “All unrighteousness is sin;” but there are sins unto death, and there are sins not unto death, for which we may obtain mercy and pardon, if we confess them before the mercy-seat. “If any man see his brother sin a sin not unto death, he shall ask, and He shall give him life for them that sin not unto death.” Those who have in truth been born again and are in reality the children of the kingdom, will not be guilty of heinous offences, or outbreking sins; but still they may be, and frequently are guilty of trespassing against the commandments of God in a greater or less degree, according to the differences in their natural organizations and temperaments; but is it permissible for them to continue in this state of trespassing during the whole of their christian course? Assuredly not; shall we sin because grace abounds? asks Paul—God forbid. The son or daughter who desires to stand high in the love and favour of their Father, cannot do this. We must not rest satisfied with the idea that we shall escape condemnation along with the wicked; it is not only necessary to abstain from committing sins; there are virtues to cultivate, and graces whereby to adorn the gospel of Christ.

This we learn from the parable of the nobleman who gave to his servants so many talents, to each one so many, which they were expected to increase to at least as much again, during the time of his sojourn in the far country. We are not expected to rest contented with having received the talents or talent; we must work away continually to increase

and expand into the fulness of stature, according to the standard of measure. Having ceased to do evil, let us learn to do well; having ceased to manifest the works of the flesh, let us bring forth the fruits of the spirit, which are "love, joy, peace, longsuffering, patience, meekness," &c. "Put on as the elect of God, holy and beloved, *bowels of mercies*, kindness, humbleness of mind; being tender hearted, forbearing one another, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you;" Oh, may we never rest satisfied, until we have so cultivated our hearts as to possess *bowels of mercies*. A heart filled with tender mercy and loving kindness, is not likely to be severe in judgment upon fellow heirs of the saints' inheritance. The more our hearts are filled with love toward our brethren for the truth's sake, the less inclined we shall be to judge them at all; but if at any time it become necessary to exercise the faculty of judgment in any particular case, we shall be careful to judge righteously, according to the Written Word, and not according to fleshly standards.

In the law of Moses it is written "Thou shall do no unrighteousness in judgment; but in righteousness thou shalt judge thy neighbour." This is also according to the gospel, for Jesus said "Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment." It was because of their failure to render righteous judgment, that the eyes and ears of the Jewish people became dim and heavy, and powerless to act for the general good; the Lord accused them of heavy transgressions in this respect, when enumerating their iniquities, which brought down His wrath upon them. If, therefore, He spared not the natural branches because of these things, it behoves us to take heed that we come not under the same condemnation; for the gospel rule is, "with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged." The judicial courts of the kingdom of heaven, being based upon a higher code of laws, will pronounce judgments upon higher principles, than can be attained under the present order of things; for it is written of the supreme judge himself, that "He shall not judge after the sight of His eyes, nor reprove after the hearing of His ears; but in righteousness shall He judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth." Under present arrangements, the sight of the eyes, and hearing of the ears, generally form the only basis for judgment, owing to the limitation of human wisdom, and being disqualified to discern the hidden springs of action; the thoughts, motives and intents of the heart. May we, therefore, who profess to follow Christ, cease to judge after the flesh, but endeavour to form our judgment upon a more enlightened basis. Indeed, it is very essential that we who are to be the future judges and rulers of mankind, should seek to build upon the true basis in this respect as well as in all others. Above all things, let us not judge or condemn our brethren upon light, frivolous grounds; but if, as before stated, it become necessary to exercise our judgment in some particular case, we have the rule; "judge not according to the appearance" and in the mouth of two or three witnesses shall everything be established.

Let not the brother or sister who is gifted with ten talents, condemn the possessor of only one; and let not the possessor of one talent envy

and misjudge the possessor of the ten. The Lord has distributed to all according to His good pleasure, for the furtherance of the gospel; only let all take care that these talents are applied for the given purpose, and not used for selfish objects, that we may receive the blessing in due time, and reap abundantly, if we faint not.

S.

THE APOCALYPSE PARAPHRASED,

ON THE BASIS OF THE EXPOSITION CONTAINED IN EUREKA,
VOL. II. (DR. THOMAS.)

CHAPTER VI, VERSES 9 TO 11.

During the first-four seal-periods, the judgments of God were directed against the Roman heathen, but under the fifth seal, it is the professors of the faith of Christ who become the subjects of the Deity's vengeance. The horses and their riders had now disappeared; so had the four living ones, and hence John and his brethren are no longer invited to come and see the events of the fifth seal; for, instead of being spectators of those events, they were the subjects of them. The disappearance of the four living ones arose from the fact that the unity of the heavenly camp, of which they were the symbols, had been destroyed, and therefore its work was completed at the expiration of the fourth seal; and as a consequence of that disunion, the spirit of the Deity no longer resided in it. Instead of one body, they had become two, each of which claimed the christian name, but, with the addition of "Catholic" and "Puritan" to distinguish one from the other. The latter were very severe in discipline and doctrine, but the former were very lax in both, and used what power they possessed to persecute the Puritans. They had a name that lived, but were in reality dead, and therefore the spirit of the Deity could no longer reside in them. They had nearly arrived at that condition when the threat of the spirit would be fulfilled, to spue them out of its mouth. If the spirit dwelt in any during the fifth seal, it was by faith, as embodied in the word of God, which is composed of the words of the spirit.

And when the lamb opened the fifth seal, A D. 303, I saw an altar; even the mystical Christ Altar, the magnitude of which is equal to the one body of which Christ is the head. The members of this one body being in Christ, are within the altar, for he is the antitype of the altar of earth, or unhewn stone used in the court of the Priests under the Mosaic Law, on which sacrifices were burnt, the blood thereof being poured out at the altarbase in order to cleanse it. Christ is at the same time both the altar and the sacrifice, the former having been cleansed by his own blood. All who touch it are holy, but without touching it, none are holy. When those who are within this altar die, they return

to their mother earth, where they sleep in Jesus until the resurrection; and during that period, they are underneath the altar. Accordingly I saw underneath this mystical-Christ Altar the souls of those who had been slain on account of the word of the Deity, and on account of the testimony which they held. And they cried with a loud voice for judicial vengeance on their murderers, in the same manner that Abel's blood is said to have a voice and to cry to God from the ground. The cry which they uttered was "Until when, O thou who art the despot, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood upon those who dwell upon the earth?—the earth being the Roman habitable, and those who dwell upon it the Pagan authorities. They who are represented as uttering this cry, were desirous of knowing how long the sanguinary conflict between their camp and the dragon would continue before the rider under the first seal, who went forth with a bow, should be crowned with conquest over Pagan Rome. The period comprised under the "how long" began at the termination of the fourth seal and the opening of the fifth, A.D. 303, and lasted until the judicial avengement of their blood on the authorities of Daniel's fourth beast, A.D. 313, a period of ten years, which composed the ten day-years' tribulation recorded in the second chapter;—the severest of all the persecutions inflicted on the Christians by the Pagan power.

The word "Despot" is here used to designate the lamb as the only true Despot, in opposition to the pretensions of Jupiter, as upheld by the Emperors under this seal, who no longer used the title of Emperor, as hitherto understood, to denote the general of the Roman armies; but in a new and more dignified sense as the sovereign of the Roman world; and to this they added that of Dominus or Master, meaning a tyrant, expressive of the despotic power of a master over his domestic slaves. In time, this repugnant meaning was forgotten, and at length the title "Our Despot and Emperor" was bestowed, not merely by way of flattery, but was regularly used in the public laws and customs.

Thus its introduction here is a chronological indication that the fifth seal belongs to the period here assigned to it.

And to each of those underneath the altar were given white robes; external vestments reaching to the feet, similar to that with which the Son of Man was invested when seen in the midst of the seven light-stands burning with spirit oil, and like the holy garments worn by the High Priest when he appeared in the most Holy Place. They were emblematic of the worthiness of those who received them, and their bestowal indicated the deliverance of the symbolic souls from prostration under the altar, by resurrection at the second Advent, when they will be clothed upon with their house from heaven, or white robe of victory, and be exalted to kingly and priestly honors.

And in reply to their petition, it was answered them that they should repose yet a short time, while their fellow-servants and their brethren should be filled up, who are about to be killed even as they; a state-

ment which indicated that from the opening of the seal, there would be a period of *soul-blood shedding* by the dragon power, and that at its conclusion, the judicial vengeance would be manifested. This "short time" reached to A.D. 312-13, when their persecutions were put an end to by the deposition and death of Maxentius and Maximin. The term "fellow-servants" is used to designate those who were Christians in name only, but not in reality, having a name to live but were dead. They were useful in assisting the brethren to overthrow Paganism, on account of which many of them suffered martyrdom, for they were all treated as Christians by the idolators, and were therefore exposed, in common with the brethren, to all the persecutions raised against the Christian community. Nevertheless, they kept not the words of the Spirit, but adhered to the teachings of the Satan, and were, therefore, members of the Satan's Synagogue, being Jews outwardly instead of inwardly. This was the condition of large numbers under the fifth seal, for the Ecclesias generally had now lapsed into that state described by the Spirit as Philadelphian, in which, those who were not "dead" are denominated the "little strength." The brethren were all fellow-servants of the Lamb's household, but the fellow-servants were not all brethren. The demarcation between them began to be drawn about fifty years before the opening of the fifth seal, and as the number of brethren had been continually decreasing, while that of the fellow servants had been as rapidly increasing, ever since the opening of the first seal, the former were by this time reduced to "a contemptible few." Nevertheless the true scriptural understanding of the word was with them, and therefore they were the salt of the demoralized Christian body, and without them, the whole community would have been putrescent.

J. J. A.

TRINITARIANISM AND THE TRUTH,

CONSIDERED IN RELATION TO THE FIRST THREE VERSES OF
JOHN'S GOSPEL.

THE "PRE-EXISTENCE" OF JESUS CHRIST—HIS BEING THE WORD MADE FLESH.

(Continuation of "The Bible as a Law of Life and Immortality," from page 173.)

<p>COMING forth then, from his temptation, like the men from the intensely-heated furnace, unaffected by the trial, he commenced his mission. And having found himself in fashion as a man, though the immediate Son of Deity, as impressed on him by his mother, proven to him by scripture, and latterly confirmed to him by the confession, the authority, and the</p>	<p>commendation of the Father himself, in the first supernatural announcement, the Deity had ever favoured him with, he did not stalk forth amongst his fellows as the heir and Lord of all he surveyed. No. He sought no higher aim than that of equality with man. Aye, and in place of the highest, chose the humblest yet noblest position of man. He sought rather to</p>
---	--

reflect glory and honor upon the poor than upon the rich, and chose the circumstances of the former as the better platform from which he could exhibit the best example. He preferred to submit to power, rather than exercise it. He preferred to restrain the power he had to rule others, than to exercise it as Elijah did, and as his disciples James and John on one occasion desired to do. He could have consumed his enemies, but he did not, his object being to save men's lives not to destroy them. He in short as a man—did justly, loved mercy, and walked humbly before the Deity. But with the power he had, and the fleshly nature he bore, the temptation was to do otherwise. The power he had did not elevate his nature above that of Elijah's or his disciples, James and John. Lastly, he became obedient unto death itself, and that in its most ignominious form, though he had it in his power to avoid it. Even at the last moment, when every friend had left him, his nearest and dearest fast asleep: while the agonies of death were upon him: when in the intensity of his agony, the sweat fell from his brow like drops of blood: when, if it had been his Father's will, he would have dashed from his lips this bitterest of all his cups, if it had been possible (Matthew xxvi, 39); even then, had he chosen his *own* will in place of his Father's, and succumbed to all the desires of his nature, concentrated during the few remaining moments of his personal freedom, in the *one* desire for life; even then, and at the moment he was made a prisoner; he could have commanded "more than twelve legions of angels" to deliver him, but HE WOULD NOT. And why? Because in such a contingency, the scriptures could not have been fulfilled. (Matthew xxvi, 53, 54). Where in all history, have we a picture of moral grandeur such as this? And yet how little would it appear, how insignificant, if Jesus had not been purely a man. It is from his being a man, the pyramidal greatness of his character rises so illustriously into view. In him we see a total abnegation of his own will, and a complete submission to his Father's. Humanly speaking, Jesus' agony in the garden was the most perilous moment in the history of the world. It was a solitary incident unseen by man, from which there was none to trace any important result: still, from a human point of view, as seen in the page of history, it appears if a world had had to watch and contemplate it, a dreadful moment of suspense between

hope and fear. In that agony the whole truth of God, aye, and the world itself, hung upon the tensed resolve of Jesus' will, as it were an immense globe from the extremity of a hair, ready to break and let fall its weight into irretrievable ruin. Like as a faint breeze (scarcely audible as a whisper to one standing by watching the suspension), would have snapped the thread—so would the mere momentary diversion of Jesus' will from that of his Father's, have dropped the prophecies and writings of ages into everlasting destruction. And had Jesus been a man who at any time before, had yielded in one iota to his fleshly propensities, and served, however naturally, his fleshly desires as pertaining to the love of the world, he would have prayed for his twelve legions of angels to deliver him; but then all would have been lost. He would have lost the reward of eternal life for himself; and when in the natural course of things he had ceased to exist, he would have perished as the beasts—nothing more would have been heard of him, or of anything else after death for any man. His resurrection depended on the manner he died. And so it is only from such a point of view we can truly estimate the character of the man. And yet the sacrifice he made is not to be compared with the glory he received. But as compared with the enjoyments of the life he renounced, it stands out as the "left" of a wood, as a sacrifice that can have no comparison. And inasmuch as he had the power to escape from it all, and live like other men, the offering he made was a freewill offering. The Deity did not press him to it; he simply submitted to his Father's will without restraint. He entirely depended upon the Word of God, and hence offered himself freely, first for himself, and then for his brethren; though what he did for himself was not in propitiation of sins committed. He was without sin, yet sin was latent in him. He was of sin's flesh, and all the passions of his nature would have readily turned to lust, had he chosen to satisfy them. In his flesh dwelt no good thing any more than in any other man's flesh, but this *sin-power* was powerless against the resistance he made to it. And in his death it was condemned, and the nature of fleshly things prospectively annihilated. How could sin be condemned in an immaculate body? To condemn the body is to pronounce the body sinful. Thus, in striving against his nature to the very death, Jesus fulfilled

the law, and confirmed the testimony. The sole object of his life was to do his Father's will. In his early training and study of the scriptures, he had learned this. In the volume of the book this was written of him. In the reading of the book he had found it, and having found it, consented to it, and offered himself for the service. "Lo, I come," says he, "(in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God." And so he taught "I seek not MY OWN WILL, but the will of my Father who hath sent me"—(His Father sent him, but he had it in his power to refuse. Yet he came offering his services to God, and God accepted them, and sent him.) And so he prayed "Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me, nevertheless, not *my will* but *thine* be done." He thus confesses his will was different from his Father's. His *will* was not his Father's *will*, therefore he was not Deity, equal with the Father; but he subjected his *own will* so entirely to the will of his Father that it became *one* with the Father's, not in nature, but in action. What he did was the same as if he had possessed the Father's will; but notwithstanding this, the distinction between the two is most important. It is this distinction which brings out to view the real character of the man. In the work of subjecting his will to that of his Father, there was a continual sacrifice of secular advantage. He took no advantage of all the powers he had to serve his own personal necessities: he turned them all to the service of his Father. This sacrifice he made apart from the death he died, was a much greater sacrifice than the one he requested of the young man to make, who had great possessions, "Go, and sell all that thou hast, give to the poor, and come and follow me." This was just what Jesus was then doing, only reversed in its order. What Jesus wanted the young man to do was to give up possession and follow him, as he himself only differed from a possessor in not taking possession of that which he could have possessed. What he asked, then, was not anything in magnitude like to what he was then doing himself. In place of taking possession, he went about doing good. All his miracles were dispensations of love and benevolence. Never a miracle, and he could have wrought many a one; never a miracle did he ever do for his own personal interest. Thus, therefore, was he rich,

yet for his own and brethren's sakes, he contented himself in poverty, in view of the things in the future, both for himself and them. What an example! His riches were immense, but they were unseen; his sacrifices immeasurable, but they were not put into sight; his deprivations were known only to God and himself. But now they are brought to light and rewarded. The talents he occupied in time are now doubled in the eternity he surveys. The consummation now revealed in Jesus Christ breaks down to nothing the sacrifice even he made. And so "the sufferings of this life are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed" in his brethren. Jesus had no example before him to encourage him, but they have. In him, they have a living example; and in his life on earth, a story grand and sublime. It teaches them contentment in the circumstances they find themselves in, and to seek their good, not in the giving place to their ambition, however excellent and well qualified they may be to figure in society, and wield the power of wealth, of law, or the sword, either for their own political advantage, or their country's. In Christadelphianism, there is no room for nationalities, no room for personal spiritual advantages. There is but room for respect and submission to "the powers that be," whether monarchical or republican, consistent with a just appreciation of, and an exact attention to the will of God. This is the moral of Jesus' life in the flesh. It portrays the sublimest virtue amidst the humblest circumstances. His history is a picture of a self-taught man, of a man deeply read in the Word of God, of a man who reaped not from the teachings of schools, nor from the tuition of philosophers; who reaped only from daily meditation in the Word of God. It is the story of a man who wrought with his hands for his daily bread, and yet the while found time to build upon his early acquirements the whole truth of God. And when he ceased to work at his trade to confine himself to his mission, he did not throw himself on the bounties of others, but relied on the Word of God. And inasmuch as all this cannot be unlinked from the training he received; inasmuch as it appears as the fruit of the good seed sown into his infantile mind, both by precept and example in the righteous observance of the laws of God, it is an example for, and an encouragement to parents to

"train up their children in the way they should go" on the assurance of God, as exemplified in his Son, "that when they are old, they shall not depart from it."

Again, as regards themselves, the choice Jesus made was his own choice. He had a will of his own, as they have. He was not forced to do his Father's will, no more than they are. He need not have deprived himself of the pleasures of sense; he had it in his power to enjoy himself as others. He need not have suffered in the way he did; he had it in his power to flee those sufferings. The glory of *his* life was before him, as well as the glory of eternity. But he could not have both, so he chose the sacrifice of sense, to secure the glory of the latter. So it is with his brethren. Salvation hangs on their choice. Between their own wills and the will of God, there is the issue. The example is before them. The life, the character, the temptations, the sorrows, the shame, the rejection, the forsaking, the revilings, the cross, the death of their elder brother—all hard to bear; but, then, they will not be tried more than they are able to bear; and before them again is the reward—the resurrection, the glory, the honour, and the diadem of their elder brother. And what is the sweetness of it all, the joy and beauty of it all? He was a man of like passions with them: And they are heirs and joint heirs with him of the same inheritance. There is the encouragement. His having been of the same flesh and blood with them, a mutual sympathy is created which excites their interest in the story of his life, as their trials now excite in him the compassion with which he continues to regard them.—(Heb. ii, 17.) They, though not born fleshly sons of Deity, after the manner Jesus was, have nevertheless obtained by adoption, the same privileges as he obtained by birthright, and, therefore, a substantial assurance that his conception did not make his flesh and nature different from theirs, otherwise, they could not have been adopted; and as no sympathy, such as is expressed, could exist between him and them, had he been an angel, or of immaculate flesh, *a posteriori*, he was made man for this very purpose. The accounts we have of angels' visits to man show they were sent only to sympathize with and comfort the righteous, or execute judgment on the wicked. But such was not the case with Jesus; his mission was to call sinners to repentance,

and his gospel's object is the same still. His fellow sympathy with man, as manifested on earth, still continues, and it is only explicable, from his having been once a man himself, of sin's flesh like his brethren.—(Heb. ii, 10, 17, 18.)

The manner of Jesus Christ's conception certainly affords us the *rationale* of the perfection with which Jesus Christ attained a character so noble, so spotless, so pre-eminently superior to all men, but it does not afford us any evidence that he was in one iota different in mental and physical constitution from other men. He was but a superior man, of the same nature and organization; and though it is true he was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners, this did not arise from a necessity in his nature, as if he could not have been the opposite of this. Far otherwise; his will was free to choose the evil in place of the good. His separation from sinners arose not from anything in his flesh to prevent his sinning, but from the training he was subjected to, the circumstances surrounding him, and his own diligence and attention to the study of the Word. He could not have been of immaculate flesh, and yet human; he could not have been superhuman, and yet under the law; but he was under the law, and therefore sinless, because he kept the law; for sin is the transgression of law—(Rom. iv, 15; v, 13; 1 John iii, 4.) Hence, sinlessness, the keeping of the law, cannot be imputed to those who are not under it. Those above law, or without law, are not related to sin at all. They cannot sin; they cannot transgress what they are not amenable to. But such was not the case with Jesus Christ. He was under the law, and therefore could have transgressed, but he did not, and hence, was without sin. Law implies restraint, but if there is nothing to restrain, where is the wisdom of the law, or what would be the use of it? Jesus was in all points tempted like as we are, but he could not have been tempted like as we are, had he not possessed the name sinful instincts. If he had been of immaculate flesh, if any good thing had dwelt in his flesh, more than in any other man's flesh, that good thing would have had no relation to the law. It would have been necessarily good, and therefore of necessity without law. It would have been more than sinless; it would have been rather the governor than the governed; and besides, such good flesh would never have been condemned. In

his flesh, sin was condemned on the cross; his flesh was condemned as representing the flesh of all his brethren. Sinless in his moral nature, he was a pure offering; he was not defiled by transgression, but sinful in his, fleshly nature; he was burned without the camp: while his moral nature remained a perpetual incense before the Lord. After his resurrection, his body was changed, but not his moral nature; that which he had begun in the flesh continued, but the flesh itself was annihilated; everything pertaining to sin was destroyed. But this moral nature was a thing of growth, and owed its existence to the leading out of the mental qualities of his fleshly nature into the course for which they were designed. The mentality of his fleshly nature was trained in obedience to the precepts of God, and this obedience developed the power he acquired over his fleshly instincts. He rose to perfection in commanding and restraining all his passions. He was like Paul, he delighted in the law of God after the inward man, and like him too, saw another law in his member's warring against the law of his mind; but he differed from Paul in this respect, that his inward man, or moral nature, had kept pace with the growth of his outward man, or fleshly nature, and had all along been so much the superior in power of the two, that "the good he would" he did, and "the evil he would not" that he did not. It is in this we see the bearing the manner of his conception had on his character. He was a man miraculously conceived, though naturally born, and the natural fruit of this was, that Jesus was born with superior moral qualities which required only to be drawn out by judicious training to make him the man he became; and we are not to suppose that he could have become the man he did had he been otherwise trained. The training he underwent was as necessary as the talents he inherited; and as the one leads to the conclusion he was a man, so does the other. It was not that he was born with a different kind of organization from other men, but with the same organization more happily developed. Children invariably inherit their respective peculiarities from the peculiarities attending their conception. Hereditary diseases, deformities and propensities of both body and mind, whether for good or evil, are all examples of this; and it is on this account, certain marriages are prohibited, some discon-

tenanced, and others highly commended; still, notwithstanding this, there is in the judicious treatment of infancy and childhood, a power so potent in modifying and controlling all the evil tendencies of what may be inherited from conception, as to develop in those thus born with evil propensities, a character of greater worth than that generated in those who, though more fortunate in their birthrights, are left to themselves to grow up under evil influences and bad management. But when things meet in adaptation—evil tendencies with evil influences—good qualities with happy influences—other pictures of character present themselves. And as an example of the latter, we point to Jesus' character as one. In his case, the adaptation was complete. He was conceived and born with such qualities as to receive with eagerness and satisfaction the Word of God; and the circumstances which surrounded his infancy and childhood were such that he could scarce inhale anything else. The law required his guardians to teach him the Word of God, and as they were both of excellent character and esteemed by God, he had both their precept and example as his early impressions. These means in their bearing on a mind highly susceptible of receiving the best impressions, exhibit the beginning of the clue from which Jesus' unexampled history is drawn out. And though on these principles mystery is effaced from the narrative, the value of his history is not depreciated, aye, rather enhanced. The lesson it teaches is made more applicable to man. The conception after the manner related by Matthew and Luke, is made to appear the more necessary, and the truth of their record the better confirmed. And the whole evidence together is no more a contradiction of his being purely a man, than is the biography of Sir Isaac Newton a testimony that Sir Isaac, compared with others of weak intellect, was more than a man; or that Adam *before* he transgressed, was of a different organization and nature from what he was *after* he transgressed.

When Adam came new from the hands of his Maker, he was pronounced "very good," (Gen. i, 31.) but "good" only as related with everything else—the product of his Maker's hands. He had then no character for either good or evil. He was first *without* law, and therefore could not sin, because there was no law for him to transgress; but nevertheless, he exercised

all his passions the same. He was under no restraint, but being good in the sense of serving the purpose for which he lived while *without law*, there is just reason to suppose his actions were in harmony with each other; his mental and bodily faculties were happily balanced; there existed no jarring. Next he was put under law, and for the time—no matter how short or long—he kept that law, he was *without sin*; because while in this position, he *could* sin, whereas before this, it was *impossible* for him to sin. For “as sin is a transgression of the law,” (1 John iii, 4,) “where no law is, there is no transgression.”—(Rom. iv, 15.) Well, so long as he kept the law he was *without sin*, and for the time possessed a character for good—a goodness quite different from the goodness with which his framework and ‘make’ reflected the skill of the hands which made him—a goodness which fell to his own credit. He was then spotless, pure, undefiled. But when he transgressed, then he sinned; his character changed from good to bad, and his passions ceased to act in harmony with his enlightened reason. The yielding to the temptation destroyed the balance of his mental and physical functions, and reversed the order in which they had previously stood to each other. He sinned and degenerated. But nevertheless, body and blood were not changed by his transgression, his organisation was unaltered. His passions and instincts remained the same, save that they had increased in power, and become his masters in place of his servants. He was the same man as before, only fallen—fallen from the power of commanding his instincts to the service of Deity. Until then, sin had not come into the world, that is, into the present constitution of things called ‘the world.’ For, there is good reason to believe sin had existed before in a previous constitution of things “upon” this same globe; but it had been entirely destroyed ere Adam was created. And there is not the slightest reason to assume, that the sin of the previous world was introduced into this world by any evil agent belonging to the former. To Adam alone is due the shame of creating sin in this world; and by the natural law of generation, the misfortune of perpetuating it. The law and sin referred to in Rom. v, 13, is the law of Moses. The transgression of the Mosaic law was in the world from the disobedience of Adam to the official announcement of it at Horeb. But it was never imputed, and it is on this account we have no condemnation of Rachel and

Laban respecting the gods the one had stolen and the other was wroth about, nor no animadversion from the patriarch Jacob’s lips, respecting the propriety of either of them possessing them. There was nothing, however, such as this in the case of Adam. “Every herb bearing seed which was upon the *face of all the earth*, and every tree in the which there was the fruit of a true yielding seed (Gen. i, 29), was given unto him for meat,” so that even through ignorance, he could not have eaten what was afterwards to be forbidden. And besides the law to which he was afterwards subjected, was not made until the garden of Eden into which he was put was planted. And as this need not be presumed to have been the case until after a process of time, the conclusion is that neither the tree of life nor the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, had previously existed before the garden was planted. Sin, therefore, could not have even existed through ignorance in Adam’s case, until the law respecting the garden was announced. And further, as the evidence is presumptive that he had for a time kept that law, sin had not even entered into the world *with* the law, nor even by the serpent. And even scarce with Eve, until Adam himself ate of the forbidden fruit. The serpent was not amenable to any law, and therefore could not commit any transgression against God. The statement it made was emphatically a lie, but it was not responsible for what it was not forbidden to do, inasmuch as no obedience to any law was required of it. It was free to use the intellect it possessed in any way its instincts moved it. It was under no obligation, and inasmuch as this implies it had no moral nature, the punishment it received was arbitrary, not judicial; symbolical, it did not sensitively suffer. Deprived of the intellect with which it had at first been distinguished, and degraded to the level of the vilest creatures, it had ceased to remember the former circumstances, and taken to its baser conditions as naturally as it had done its higher. Whereas, Adam with his wife, both suffered the penalty due for their sinning. Their punishment was purely judicial; they brought it on themselves, and next on their posterity. By Adam alone, sin entered into the world, and as by *his disobedience*, all are made sinners, so by the obedience of one, many are made righteous.—(Rom. v, 19.) The disobedience and obedience, the sinners and righteous, here contrasted, present the several agents

in one relationship to each other as all of one nature and organization, all under one law; the difference being simply obedience on the one hand and disobedience on the other, with both the Adams as the respective representatives of each class, of one parentage. In the first, we have a man new from the hand of his Creator, pronounced "very good," not as to character, but as related to the handiwork his organization exhibited. The character

was left for Adam to acquire himself. A law was made for him, he was not made for it; his fleshly instincts were not made adapted to the law, but the law was poised in opposition to his instincts, and this for a purpose, the purpose—character. But amidst surrounding circumstances favorable to his keeping that law, he transgressed and fell.

W. D. J.

(To be continued.)

THE MYSTIC TIMES OF PROPHECY IN RELATION TO EVENTS PAST AND FUTURE.

THE *times* to which attention is invited, are those noted in the scriptures of truth. By some, it is not admitted that the times therein mentioned are mysterious. To others, however, there does appear to be more or less of mystery connected with numerous times given out by the prophets. This being my own impression, I have designated those hereafter to be considered "Mystic Times." The impression alluded to has been received from a perusal of testimony, wherein the various *times* are set forth; and although this had been carefully and frequently done, the labour was not rewarded by a satisfactory solution of some of them. *Solution*, some readers would say, is not a proper term, for no solution should be sought,—such readers, holding that the words themselves carry their own meaning with them, and so plainly that "he who runs may read." Now let us ask this class whether it is so? To put the question in another form, let us say to them, Do you, then, understand the import of all those prophetic times of Ezekiel, Daniel and John? This question cannot be said to be an unfair one, for the reason that it is suggested by the assertion that the times need no explanation, which clearly assumes that they are understood. It may be asked, does not the fact of so much discussion about the times, do much to disprove the truth of the statement that they carry their meaning upon the face of them? It is not impossible that, foreseeing difficulties that would require much labour to overcome, the task is laid aside with the easy remark, that no exposition is needed; and such forced convictions applied to gain strength from the assent of others, who task the powers or the inclination to "apply their hearts to understanding, and to search for her as for hid treasures." The counsel of Solomon is evidently opposed to the non-exploring party. Perhaps it would not be possible to quote a stronger contrast to the non-explanatory system, than that found in Peter's first epistle, where he says

"The prophets have enquired and searched diligently, what manner of time the spirit did signify when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow." Is it not manifest from this testimony that the terms in which the spirit expressed the *time* of the suffering, and the *time* of the after glory, were enigmatical? The prophets saw the mystery, and diligently laboured to unfold it. It is not affirmed of them as it may truthfully be of certain of their modern students, "Let us not bother ourselves concerning the times. Let us rather strive to develop that character well pleasing in the sight of God." This does not sound amiss as a general exhortation, till it comes to be asked what constitutes the character with which God is well pleased? Is it reasonable to imagine that God can be pleased with those who themselves neglect, and who exhort others to do likewise—to apply their hearts to understand *all the things* written beforetime for their *learning*? The *times* cannot be regarded of minor importance. In this respect they are only second to the events. And where would the events be without the times? That man's organization must be very peculiar who can feel a most lively interest in the events, and be so far indifferent to the times, as to exhort his brethren "not to bother themselves about them." Brethren who are anxiously waiting the Lord's return, can hardly be edified with hortatory advice of this kind. And let me remark, *en passant*, that brethren will do well to let their affections follow, and not precede their judgment. "Hold fast the form of sound words." This is an exhortation which implies attachment between the holders and speakers on account of the "words" spoken.

To the Pharisees and Sadducees, Jesus said, "O ye hypocrites! ye can discern the face of the sky; but can ye not discern the signs of the times? This teaches plainly enough that certain "signs" have been by

Jehovah allotted to certain "times." In the divine arrangements there is a time fixed. "To everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven."—(Ecc. 3, 1.) "And a wise man's heart discerneth both time and judgment."—(chap. viii, 5.) Without a knowledge of the times, the signs cannot be understood, for they are "the signs of the times" to which they have been appointed. No doubt this plan has been adopted to enable "the wise" to "understand" the *sign-periods*, or to "discern both time and judgment." This is perfectly rational. But any pretension of a desire to understand the prophetic oracles, with an aversion to take the times into consideration, seems unreasonable at first sight; and upon mature study, cannot fail of being rejected altogether.

In the prophecies of Daniel "The Kingdom of Men," and "The Kingdom of God," are the two prominent features. These are *both* kingdoms "under the heaven." The former at present occupies the place of the latter. Connected with these kingdoms are many wonderful "purposes." And a *time* having been assigned "to every purpose," it follows that *the times* for the accomplishment of God's purposes in regard to these kingdoms are recorded; and in the prophets, for it is written "Surely God will do nothing but he revealeth his secret unto his servants, the prophets."—(Amos iii, 7.) The events, therefore, forming the history of the two kingdoms under notice, are not left to "happen" and to "turn out" in the common sense of these phrases, but are all certainly under divine control. With regard to each, it has been decreed "Thus far shalt thou go and no farther." The two kingdoms are essentially antagonistic. From the very nature of things pertaining to them, it is impossible that they can *rule* contemporaneously. In all their workings, the deadly "enmity put between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent"—symbols of the opposed classes—is strikingly manifest. How could it be otherwise between a "Holy Seed" and a "Seed of Evil Doers?" It will appear from the remarks just previously made, that the fall of the kingdom of men will be the rise of the kingdom of God. This being so, it results that an acquaintance with the times of the one, gives a knowledge of those of the other, at least as far as regards its commencement. The kingdom of Babylon, in all its phases, is the "kingdom of men." Now to it "seven times" have been appointed. "Let *seven times* pass over him," or "it." (The "*his*" being used when speaking of the kingdom under the figure of a "tree.") It is most obvious that these "seven times" signify a very long period. From Daniel's interpretation of the vision of "the tree," we should conclude that the "seven times"

had their commencement in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, and would terminate in the setting up of the kingdom of God. For the prophet informed the king that "the intent" of the vision was, that "the living might know that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men." And again, "*after that*," the seven times, it should be *known* that the heavens do rule, implying that *during* the times "the living" do not know, or recognise the rulership of the heavens. But when "the heavens do rule," all this will be changed, for "all will *know* the Lord, from the least unto the greatest." Daniel himself will be a member of "the new heavens," most likely a star of particular brilliancy. In this glorious hope, Daniel must be looked upon as a representative man; one of "the stars" which "shall shine" with special brightness, "for ever and ever."

The correctness of the beginning of the "seven times" in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, suggested by the prophet's interpretation, appears to be greatly strengthened by the historic fact that Nebuchadnezzar was the (second) founder of Babylon. From B.C. 608, the probable beginning of "the seven times," to the present year, is 2475 years, and yet "the heavens" do not rule in the ultimate sense of the prophecy, for Daniel and his friends, instead of shining as stars, are at present hid in the darkness of death. Therefore it is certain that 2475 years is not the extent of time indicated by the term "seven times." In vain we look at the expression itself for the information as to the length of time intended by it. It is in fact like many other things connected with the kingdom of God—a mystery, the solution of which must be sought elsewhere. When the term was applied to Nebuchadnezzar, we come to see by history that years were intended; but seeing that it is applied to his kingdom throughout all its succeeding generations, what length of time are we to understand by the phrase? If there were no mystery about the words, such a question would be superfluous. Now the year-day principle, which I believe to be the true one, would render the "seven times" 2520 years. Hence from this writing, 45 years must elapse for the fulfilment of the vision. It scarcely comes within the scope of this article, to expatiate upon the *signs* of the times, which might show the probability from another point of view, of the accomplishment of the predictions of the vision alluded to, in the 45 years next ensuing. The object being to demonstrate the proposition at the head, that there are "Mystic Times" noted in the scriptures, and to add somewhat to the great deal already advanced elsewhere, in explanation of their most probable meaning.

(To be continued.)

Z.

THE MOSAIC GOSPEL.

THE first practical exposition of the memorial name consisted of the command given to Moses. "Go," said the angel of the bush, "and gather the elders together, and say unto them, The Lord Elohim of your fathers, the Elohim of Abraham, of Isaac and Jacob, appeared unto me, saying, I have surely visited you, and seen that which is done to you in Egypt; and I have said I will bring you up out of the affliction of Egypt." Before this deliverance could be realized, faith in the power and willingness of the God of Israel to accomplish it, required to be to some extent formed in the minds of Israel, and also fear and conscious inability to retain them in bondage any longer required to be developed in the mind of Pharaoh. The relative conditions of the taskmaster and slave naturally prepared each for giving the different responses to the gospel of freedom. The practical difficulties to be overcome were not anticipated on the part of the elders who bowed their heads and worshipped, because they heard that the God of their fathers had visited them. The actual power backing up the proclamation was unknown to the king of Egypt, or any of his advisers. The past history of Moses in Egypt and in the wilderness, following the sheep, prepared him partially for the mighty undertaking. But inasmuch as everyone sent upon any mission is fitted to accomplish it in proportion to the understanding of the how it is to be brought about, the Deity, evidently to fully equip Moses for the work he had chosen him for, made him perform in a short time and with few materials, that which was to cover a series of years, and to be effected upon a nation of slaves whose mental condition was very slightly removed from that of the beasts that perish. The rod in the hand of Moses was the instrument by which he manifested his power as a shepherd, and now that he was called of God to be his shepherd to Israel, he himself was to be the rod of Jehovah, or the medium of Jehovah's power for the liberation of Israel. As a shepherd's rod had no power of itself, so by the casting of the rod to the ground it became alive, and in like manner so would Moses become powerful to accomplish Jehovah's will as soon as he went forth in obedience to the command. The evidence of power apart from Moses was perfect and fitted to induce faith in Moses himself, and through him, into the elders of Israel to whom he was sent. The fleeing of Moses from the rod energised by Jehovah, illustrates beautifully the relationship which the truth of God imposes on those who know it. If they cast it from them, or do not wish to obey, after the manner of Moses, it will pursue them until they seize it again, and faithfully carry out

the intentions of the author, or perish in disobedience. Moses had no choice but obey, or be the victim of his own rod. And after the same principle, Paul said "Woe is unto me, if I preach not the Gospel." This sign seems to have a direct reference to the gods of Egypt, and would at once convince Israel that their God could make serpents of greater power out of a piece of wood. "Put now thine hand into thy bosom." This seems to represent the condition of rest, and fitly represents the leprous condition of Israel, in relation to the promises of Jehovah from the days of Joseph to Moses. Jehovah had rested from dealing with Israel until he had requited upon them their sins for their treatment of Joseph. This period is a striking type of the present of Israel, from the sale of Jesus, or rather, from the elevation of Jesus, and the forty years subsequent until the founding like unto Moses be perfected, to gather them bone to bone, cover them with flesh, and put his spirit within them. The extracting of the hand, the symbol of power, from the bosom, indicates the energy now to be put forth for their health and cure. The river symbolized Egypt and its peoples, and pointed Israel to the third result of the mission of Moses, viz., the destruction of the power of the Egyptians, that they might no more oppress Israel for a time. The effect of these symbols on the mind of Moses was not a willingness to go, but the contrary, arising from a consciousness of personal inability to accomplish so mighty an undertaking. Humility is highly pleasing to God: "For to this man will I look, even to him who is poor and of a contrite spirit, and who trembles at My word;" and again, "the Lord resisteth the proud, but giveth grace unto the humble." The humility of Moses in this instance was displeasing, because used as an argument for inaction, a state of mind highly criminal at all times in relation to the truth; and those who have no better reason to plead, when the Lord comes to send His servants forth to subjugate the nations, may expect that the anger of the Lord will burn forth and consume them from his presence, like the slothful servant who hid his lord's money. And the lord said "Is not Aaron, the Levite, thy brother? I know that he can speak well. And also behold he cometh forth to meet thee; and when he seeth thee, he will be glad in his heart. And thou shalt speak unto him and put words in his mouth; and I will be with thy mouth, and with his mouth, and will teach you what ye shall do." This part of the narrative shows that the brothers were being prepared simultaneously, and that both were known to Jehovah, and that both

would go together in order to effect the deliverance of Israel. The elder brother, Aaron, has a striking likeness to the elder brother of the perfect priesthood. Aaron was known and prepared for Moses to come to him, and the mouths of both were filled with the words of Jehovah concerning the proposed deliverance. In age, Aaron was the superior of Moses; but in dignity and honour Moses was superior to him. Aaron was the superior according to the flesh; Moses according to the spirit's choice. The Lord the Spirit combines both these points of superiority in himself. He was the inferior of the Aaronic priesthood according to the law; but the superior in being shadowed forth as a priest prior to the law, and also as being Jehovah's priest by oath and after the power of an endless life.

The brethren of Jesus who meet with him, though he is within the veil and they without, have a gladness of heart which is unspeakable and full of glory; they know that, unlike Aaron, he cannot die in the most holy; for he has already personally been crowned with the glory, the honour, and the life promised, and he has already sent forth the pledges thereof, and that he will in due time come forth to bestow upon

them the power, and honour, and blessing, that they, along with him, may without shame speak with the enemy who is yet sitting in the gate.

This combined mission of Moses and Aaron has also a very marked resemblance to the period in which the Lord was manifested in the weakness of flesh. From the time Jehovah appeared to Moses at the bush, he became the possessor of divine power; and herein he was the manifestation of God in flesh, and subject to its weaknesses. He was in the divine nature in so far as knowledge and mission were concerned; yet he could not, without sin, use any of that power of which he was custodian, except for the specific object for which it was given. It was at this point he failed in the smiting of the rock. And it was here, also, Balaam, and all of like practice with him, fail, by using either the special or common powers of the truth of God, in furthering their own fleshly ambitions. And it was at this point that Jesus proved invulnerable when tempted to put forth his power to satisfy the cravings of hunger, for man cannot attain to the life to come by bread alone, but by obeying every word of God.

W. E.

THE POLITICAL HEAVENS AND THE SIGNS THEREOF.

The following clear-headed, candid, and sober remarks on the position and progress of Russia, from *The Chronicle*, a London weekly journal of some political standing in the country, will be read with interest:

“THE OPPORTUNITY OF RUSSIA.—The absence of a recognised basis of law betokens the chaos into which European politics have fallen. By the events of last summer, the treaties of 1815 have lost their last support, and are thus practically without further significance. These treaties had established a communion of law, with positive rules, among the nations of Europe. The communion of law has disappeared, and the frail communion of interest, which is still maintained, has no guarantee but that of Might. It is impossible to say what changes in the system of Europe will grow out of the present state of things. Only the most general results can be clearly foreseen. This however, seems certain—namely, that the reaction of the war which has split up Germany, must unavoidably promote the preponderance of Russia on the Continent. Here is, perhaps, the most disastrous consequence of the war; disastrous for Germany and for Western civilization.

It will be long before Austria recovers from the shock of her defeat, or Prussia feels herself secure in her new position. No honest reconciliation of the two Powers, therefore, can be expected for a considerable period, in spite of the urgent need they have of uniting against Russia. This is, unfortunately, the position they stand in, because they are not thoroughly aware of the necessity of a policy of union. If they had been, the war of last summer would have been avoided. The fact is that temper plays a prominent part in politics, and often makes nations blind to their most important interests. But in addition to the common interest which Austria and Prussia have in restraining Russia, there are other important matters in which they differ; and these may easily lead to an outbreak of war between them. Since the dissolution of the German Bund, there is nothing to hinder the occurrence of such a war at any time. The most essential and wholesome effect of the Bund was, that it insured the uninterrupted co-operation of Austria and Prussia, notwithstanding their rivalry, and furnished the other powers of Germany with the means of exercising a pacific influence. This has disappeared. Austria and Prussia are now opposed to each other as foreign powers;

and the new Northern Confederation which Prussia has organized, so far from being able to restore harmony between them, only acts as a fresh spur to the jealousy of Austria. Under such conditions, it is difficult to see how a conflict can be avoided. *Prussia and Austria will in future go their own ways, and are likely soon to be drawn—however much against their will—into serving the purposes of Russia, since in the necessary course of things, Russia must, sooner or later, derive advantage from every conflict between them.*

A glance at the map of Europe shews that Russia, relying upon the broad basis of her power in the East, is advancing westward through Poland, and in Poland possesses an outpost which runs like a wedge between Prussia and Austria, and keeps pressing forward with mechanical necessity, except so far as it is kept in check by the counter-thrust of Prussia and Austria. The direction in which this wedge advances lies through Silesia toward Bohemia, where Czechism, a species of Slavism, offers the policy of Russia a new foothold. This has already been used as the basis of a certain amount of *actio per distans*. Czech scholars belong, it is well known, to the most prominent partisans of Pan Slavism. Now, it is a dead straight line from Moscow to Prague, *via* Warsaw and Breslau. This line passes right through the centre of gravity of Russia's power; and she can, therefore, move most easily and most effectively in this direction. It also stands perpendicular to its base; so that Russia advances from her front, while Prussia and Austria must make flank movements to oppose her. Hence the great dangers and difficulties which a war with Russia would, in the present state of things, entail upon Austria and Prussia. But be this as it may, it is quite clear that only the combined strength of these two countries is sufficient to hold the advancing wedge of Russia's power so tightly that, for the time, at least, all movement shall be impossible. In other words, the advance of Russia can only be prevented by the united action of Austria and Prussia. It is easy, therefore, to foresee the consequence if, instead of the necessary combination of these two powers, a state of feud is to exist between them. *Duobus litigantibus tertius gaudet* is an old saying, which applies with double force when the two litigants have been set to watch the third, who, of course, will secure his own advantage, while his neighbours are falling out. Russia is, no doubt, prudent enough not to assert her advantage at once. To push forward toward the West directly would be to call other

nations to arms. By keeping passive for a time on this side, she can the more conveniently pursue her aims in the East, in sure and certain hope that a new extension of power is awaiting her in the West, since there is a split in Germany into which her wedge can be driven as soon as a convenient season arrives.

If any one doubt this, let him consider how Russia succeeded in attaining her present dangerous extension. He will see that this first became possible by the internal decline of Poland, and next, and far more effectually, by the internal dissensions of Germany. After the fall of Poland, Germany alone was in a position to check the advance of Russia; and she would have been more than equal to the task, but for the consumption of her resources by the feud between Austria and Prussia. *Instead of making common cause against Russia, these two powers have alternately associated themselves with her, and thus prepared the way for her preponderance.* It is hard to say which of them has been most to blame. The fault lies with both."

[The article having traced the progress of European politics for the last 150 years, as shewing the gradual increase of Russian power and dominion, proceeds:]

History is called the teacher of statesmanship; and certainly if history teaches anything at all, there is nothing written more plainly in her annals than *the close and uninterrupted connection between the aggrandizement of Russia and the internal conflicts of Germany.* What reason is there then that the consequence of the last war should not prove favourable to Russia? The war has inaugurated a new policy, having for its fundamental principle, might before right. A system so destructive to the law of nations will inevitably serve the ends of Russia. That country stands on an immeasurable and compact natural base, and cannot be shaken. The only intellectual principle known to its people is the doctrine of might and of obedience; but Western Europe is occupied with questions of liberty and progress, and its variously composed members will have no chance of escaping the Russian colossus, if the sanctity of the law of nations, which can alone keep them together, is destroyed. The principle of might, with its contempt of law, will end in the triumph of the East and the defeat of the West."

INTELLIGENCE.

BEITH (Scotland).—Bro. Gillies announces the immersion, at this place, on the 16th ult. of Miss KING, a relative who has been for a considerable time enquiring after the way of the truth.

BERWICK-ON-TWEED.—We inadvertently omitted last month to mention the death of sister Nesbit, which took place toward the close of May last. This melancholy event leaves brother Nesbit for the third time a solitary wayfarer on the highway of life—bereft but not cast down or discouraged in the journey. The deceased, though long an invalid, was by her scriptural intelligence and devotion, a real helpmate to her aged husband. She died in the confidence of an enlightened faith, and leaves him rejoicing in the same. May they have a happy and an early re-union.

BIRMINGHAM.—There have been five additions by immersion during the past month, the new brethren and sisters being WILLIAM WILLIAMS (36), clerk, formerly Church of England; MARY ANNE WILLIAMS (47), wife of the same; CORNELIUS YOUNG (31), glass mould maker, 24, Leazes-street, Gateshead, and his wife, HANNAH YOUNG (32), both having come through considerable religious vicissitudes (latterly in connection with the Methodists at Gateshead, whom they have much perplexed by assigning as their reason of separation, the conviction that the Methodists did not preach the gospel); WILLIAM EGGINGTON (36), glass cutter, brought up as a Baptist, but never associated with any religious body, on account of his dissatisfaction with orthodox teaching. On the Monday following their admission, (viz., on the 15th ult.) a tea meeting of the ecclesia was held, to encourage them in the new path entered, more especially brother and sister Young, whose isolated position in Gateshead will be trying to their unpopular faith. They came all the way to Birmingham, a distance of over 200 miles, to be immersed, and it was considered suitable that they should be sent forth to the battle with a collective "God speed." Many interesting addresses were delivered on the occasion. We may mention as an encouragement to others, that brother and sister Young's enlightenment in the truth is due to the efforts of relatives in Birmingham (brother and sister Dean) who, coming to a knowledge of the truth about a year ago, became anxious that their brother and sister in the flesh, at Gateshead, should share the benefit, and busied themselves constantly in the transmission of books and letters to them. The ecclesia has received another accession by removal: brother Isaac Clissit, of Heckmondwike, Yorkshire, having come to Birmingham to spend the remainder of his days.

We have had a considerable number of enquiries as to how the brethren fared during the recent disturbances in Birmingham, in answer to which, we have to say that no one suffered. Belonging to a community whose attitude is passive in relation to the world's affairs, leaving the world to kindle its own fires, and forge its own weapons, and fight its own battles, they were not involved in the fray, except that in some instances, they made Christadelphian onslaughts on the high thoughts and imaginations that prevail among both Protestants and Catholics, by distributing (by sale) *Declarations* among the crowd, and conversing with the more reputable of them. Sowing on all hands, the brethren know not which shall prosper, this or that; but ploughing in hope, they often discover unexpected fruit of their labours, and are still encouraged to go on. The meetings have been largely attended during the month, notwithstanding the outdoor attractions of fine weather.

EDINBURGH.—On Sunday, July 14th, a large number of brethren and sisters assembled from various parts of Scotland (viz., Beith, Glasgow, Dunkeld, Berwick, Aytoun, Galashiels, Innerleithen, Biggar, Haddington, Dewarstown, Pathhead, Tranent, &c.), and spent a pleasant season with the brethren in this city in converse principally upon the resurrection in three phases, viz., the standing again in relation to the sowing and raising of 1 Cor. xv; the time of Christ's ascension (as the first fruits) to the Father-nature; and the first resurrection in relation to the law of life and death in the millennial age. We are promised a more detailed account for next month. Writing on the 10th ult., brother Paterson reports two additions to the ecclesia, the first being a secession from the Dowieites, and the second, the result of the public labours of the brethren. The first was ANDREW PEARSON (brother in the flesh to sister Isabella Pearson), who joined the Dowieites some considerable time ago, but discovering, from intercourse with the Christadelphians, that his faith, at the time of his Dowieite immersion, though correct enough as a matter of words, was scripturally defective in doctrinal substance, resolved to rectify his position by re-immersion and consociation with the brethren. The other case is that of a young man named PHILIP BROWN, who has a younger brother already in the ecclesia; he was immersed on the 7th ult. There are one or two others who are giving heed to the word of life, and of whose early obedience the brethren entertain hope.

GATESHEAD.—See Birmingham intelligence. Brother and sister Young will be

glad of a visit from any brethren calling in this neighbourhood.

HALIFAX.—Brother Shuttleworth, writing June 25th, says "I have the pleasure of recording the immersion of FRANCIS DUNN (a middle-aged man), of Newcastle (temporarily residing at Halifax), formerly a hired minister amongst the Baptists. He was attracted to our meeting room through the instrumentality of our weekly advertisements. He was immersed on Sunday, June 23rd, and at the close of the lecture, made a public confession of the faith he had embraced." Writing on the 19th ult., brother Shuttleworth says "We have just concluded the course of thirty-six lectures. We have hopes of a few who have become enamoured of the truth, that they will eventually submit to its obedience."

["From this neighbourhood we have two appeals for help; one on behalf of a sister, who was left a widow, by the death of a brother, some years ago, and who has since been barely able to subsist, and the other on behalf of a brother whose case came before the brethren some two years ago. He was trained as a schoolmaster in the Establishment, but embracing the truth, found himself cut off from a system of livelihood which required him to subscribe to the lies of orthodoxy. He has since then struggled to maintain himself and a family of four children, by teaching a private school, but has failed, and finds himself in great straits. The contributions of those who find themselves moved to give, will be thankfully accepted. Communications to the Editor, who will furnish private address where required.]

MANSFIELD.—Brother T. Fisher (whose address is "stonemason, Sherwood Street") has succeeded, during the few months he has been resident in this place, in interesting several persons in the truth. He would be glad of the visit of any brother having leisure and ability to speak.

NOTTINGHAM.—The brethren here have succeeded in engaging the large room of the People's Hall, for the meeting of the ecclesias and the proclamation of the truth. They will henceforward be able to hold the banner of the truth higher. May many through their means, see the light, and become children of the same, in word and deed.

UNITED STATES.

Brother Donaldson, of Detroit, Michigan, writes on the 16th of June, to say that he intends furnishing the readers of the *Ambassador* with intelligence from the American ecclesias, setting forth, in the first instance, particulars as to their localities, numbers, prominent brethren, &c., so as to guide both believers and strangers who may, in travel, or under any circumstances, desire, in any part of the States, to have access to a Christadelphian assembly. He will report, from time to time, the additions made to the ecclesias in various parts, so that friends of Britain and elsewhere may have the same gratification which, he says, is afforded to brethren in the States, by the reports of the truth's progress on this side of the Atlantic. He desires us to state that reports in circulation in the States, to the effect that there has been a division in the meeting attended by Dr. Thomas, are false. The removal from 24, Cooper Institute, New York, to Odd Fellows' Hall, Hoboken, which has given colour to the report in question, was a change of convenience, and not of necessity, many of the brethren residing in the vicinity of Hoboken. The ecclesia had within a few weeks previous to the time of writing, been strengthened and cheered by the addition of four persons (names not given), after obedience in immersion for a union with the saving name of Jesus anointed.

AUSTRALIA.

Brother Hayes, writing on the 25th of June last, says—"I have just received rather an interesting letter from Melbourne, Australia, from an old friend with whom I first became acquainted when residing in Wellington, New Zealand. He is by trade a joiner, but a very intelligent man, and far above the average of his class. He writes me that he and his wife were both baptized into Christ eighteen months ago. He purchased a copy of *Elpis Israel* of me, and I had many and long conversations with him at various times. Man's absolute mortality greatly startled him, when I first broached the subject, but he became fully persuaded of it, and, this obstacle removed, he saw more and more of the truth, so that when I last saw him, my impression was that he ought to pay obedience by being immersed. Acting on the principle of never forcing water on any one, I left him to his own reflections, after supplying him with books and instructing him as far as I was able. From the way in which he writes, however, I cannot help having some misgiving as to the validity of his baptism, and have, consequently, written to him, expressing the great pleasure I should feel in acknowledging

both him and his wife as a brother and sister in the Lord, on being assured that they had been baptised into Israel's hope, on a full understanding of the things which constitute the one faith and one hope of the gospel. But a few extracts from his own letter will show you more clearly the position in which he appears to stand, than anything I can say. Thus he writes: "Our baptism was brought about chiefly through the following circumstances: two years and a half since, Melbourne was visited by Mr. Earl, B.A., of Bethany College, Virginia, formerly a student under Mr. Campbell, a name very familiar to you and Dr. Thomas. He is a very amiable talented man, and drew great crowds to St. George's Hall, every Sunday night, for twelve months. I was in his company on many occasions, talking of the good old paths. Although we differed much, I believe he loves all who love the Lord Jesus with sincerity. I lent him Mr. Roberts's *Lectures*. He kept them three months. I asked him for his candid opinion. He said 'there is much good and much harm—I would advise you to burn it.' I told him although I did not endorse the whole, I thought there was more truth than I had found in any work of the kind. We have had many conversations, but I do not think he gained any advantage, because I found with reference to the prophetic word, I had studied more than he had. I have lent *Elysis Israel* and the *Lectures* to the deacons, with what

success I cannot say."

Subsequently, he says: "Melbourne is in a state of Egyptian darkness. I know of only one minister who believes in the personal reign of Christ, and he is an Irvingite. Last Sunday, the Congregational minister preached from 'Absent from the body, present with the Lord.' His argument went to show that at death the christian was immediately received into glory. He mentioned dreams, &c., which were produced by the activity of the soul. May the time soon come when 'the law shall go forth of Zion,' &c., and a pure language be spoken. Amen. 'Even so, come Lord Jesus.' I was baptised by Mr. Earl, of Bethany College; he has broken bread with Dr. Thomas. I have lent Mr. Roberts's *Lectures* to the deacons of the chapel, but they do not like to speak of them, lest there should be a split in the church. I told them they were traitors to Christ. They repudiate the idea of Christ's coming to earth to reign. What care they about the resurrection? 'Oh, no. They are happy at death, and it is only weak-minded christians that make any noise about it;' so they say."

I have sent my friend a batch of religious publications, including the *Ambassadors* for the current year, and hope in a few months to have a detailed reply to my questions and observations, which I trust may result in proving his position to be such as we desire.

NOTES.

On Friday, the 9th instant, the Editor will leave Birmingham to keep the following appointments: Edinburgh, Aug. 10th; Aberdeen, Aug. 12th; Turriff and neighbourhood, Aug. 19th; Glasgow, Aug. 24th; returning to Birmingham, August 31st.

We have received a new tract on "The way of life," published by brother W. Wood, of Joppa, near Edinburgh, and shall be happy to supply orders; *price one penny*.

We are obliged, for want of space, to withhold our monthly political summary, also "Answers to Correspondents," of which there is a heavy accumulation; and an

article which we had written for this month, on "Church Order, in Relation to the Circumstances of the Nineteenth Century."

THE GOOD SUGGESTION.—We have only one favourable response to the proposal to send the *Declaration* to all the Sunday School teachers in the kingdom; while a considerable number are in favour of advertising the various works expository of the truth. The former suggestion must therefore be abandoned, and the latter proceeded with. To do so to the best advantage, let each say how much he or she will give per month for the object in view. It must be obvious that a

limited monthly advertising, to the extent of a monthly guarantee, will be a better investment of the money, than a meteor-flash display for a day or two, to be succeeded by silence and darkness. A continual dropping will be more efficacious than a water-spout. Let those who

have anything favourable to say on the subject, speak quickly, and suit the action to the word. Communication to the Editor, who will arrange with brother Andrew, for the execution of the project, and report thereon from time to time.

THE FOURTH EDITION OF "TWELVE LECTURES"

WE are at last able to say "Now Ready," an announcement which, after the delay that has taken place, we are glad to be able to make, for the sake of orders that have been so long on the books. While making this announcement, it is necessary to explain that the original estimate of the cost of printing the *Lectures*, has been greatly exceeded, owing to the increased matter (existing only in the brain of the author at the time of the estimate,) having gone largely beyond the number of pages allowed for it. The effect of this will be that after the first thousand is sold at the reduced price allowed by the kindness of friends, viz., ONE SHILLING, the price will be raised to TWO SHILLINGS, unless circumstances should in the meanwhile arise to admit of the issue of the second thousand at the same price. This is possible, as their number is on the increase, who realise the fact that a nobler and a better thing cannot be done than to lay life, energy, and substance on the altar of the truth's service; everyone according to his several ability, the much in much, and the little in little, and not in nothing, as the poor are liable to do. The rule has been, the rich in little, and the poor in nothing, every man taking care, at all hazard, to make sure his own portion in life. This

rule will, no doubt, continue as regards the majority, but an increasing number realize their stewardship to Christ, and make his business theirs, in a practical way. This may lead to the "circumstances" referred to. Should, however, no such circumstances arise, there is this consolation, viz, that the new edition will be cheap at two shillings. Its natural price would be 3s6d., if sold for profit. It is nearly double the size of previous editions, coming not far short of 400 pages, and is got up in a much better style of workmanship. In addition to the five new lectures, there is an appendix, consisting of the following items: 1—A review of the objections usually urged against the New Testament doctrine of resurrection and judgment; 2—A summary of the truth shown side by side (in parallel columns) with a summary of orthodoxy—twenty-six paragraphs of each; 2—A chapter on the present ecclesiastical position of the truth's friends, with a brief directory for the guidance of the enquiring stranger.

Our readers will recognise the wisdom of an early application, as in a short time the *Lectures* will not be procurable at the reduced price.

There will be a small cloth-bound edition at 2s. per copy.

N. B.—Carriage at the cost of subscribers.

THE AMBASSADOR

Of the Coming Age.

"A wicked Messenger falleth into mischief, but a faithful Ambassador is health."—PROV. xiii, 17.

No. 39.

SEPTEMBER, 1867.

Vol. IV.

THE JUDGMENT SEAT OF CHRIST, OR THE SECOND ADVENT IN RELATION TO THE HOUSEHOLD OF FAITH.—No. 7.

We have not yet exhausted the difficulties brought forward by those who deny a resurrection from the dead to judgment at the appearing of Christ. It would be unwise to leave the subject till everything is answered. We, therefore, proceed to notice the remaining points in the summary of difficulties with which this review was opened.

It is contended that the accepted do not appear in unglorified bodies in the presence of Christ when he comes, because John says (1 Jno. iii, 2) that "*When he appears, they shall be LIKE HIM, for they shall see him as he is.*" But this statement of John's is absolutely true without reference to the opposing views in dispute. While in harmony with the idea that the dead emerge from the grave in a state of incorruption, it in no way conflicts with the fact that the dead come forth to judgment, and are subsequently changed. It asserts a general fact which is received implicitly on both sides, viz., that at the epoch of Christ's appearing, the righteous shall be like him and behold his glory. The narrow and imperative construction which would make it teach, that at the very moment of Christ's appearing, his accepted brethren shall be like him, and that, therefore, there can be no appearance of them before him in unglorified body, overlooks the fact that there are details in the general incident which it introduces to notice. "But we acknowledge no details," the prompt objector may say. Answer: "You are obliged to acknowledge details." Let us see. When Christ comes, some of his brethren will be alive, and the great majority dead. What will happen?

Can the living, according to your view, be made "like him" without being gathered and changed; or the dead, without being raised? No. Then you acknowledge two details at least:—the gathering of the living saints and the resurrection of the dead, *which are not expressed in John's statement.* "Yes, of course," you answer, "because it is impossible the righteous can be like Christ at his appearing, without resurrection and change." So far, so good. You are at liberty to recognize details logically and inevitably involved in any statement, though they are not expressed; but while you are at liberty to do this, you are not at liberty to deny the same right to your opponents. If your opponent contends that something else is involved in John's statement, perhaps he can show as good a reason for it as you show for the fact that resurrection and change, though not expressed in John's statement, are necessarily implied. He contends that judgment is involved, and that John had the fact of the judgment-seat as clearly before his mind when he penned the statement in question, as he had the change of the living and the resurrection of the dead. Can you deny this, *if there is to be such a thing as a judgment-seat?* "Why, of course not," you say. Then the question to be settled, in order to a proper understanding of John's statement, is, Shall the dead appear before the judgment-seat of Christ before approval? This is the question. Your opponent answers it by quoting from the very letter in which you find the words which you use for a contrary purpose: "And now, little children, abide in him, that *when he shall appear*, we may have confidence, and *not be ashamed before him AT HIS COMING.*" (1 Jno. ii, 28.) Query: Would John hold before the disciples a fictitious peril? Would he warn them so to act as not to be ashamed in the presence of Christ at his coming, *if it was impossible to be ashamed before him at his coming?* Your theory makes such a thing impossible. You say that none but the accepted are raised at the appearing of Christ, and are immediately made incorruptible like him. If this is the case, nobody appearing before him at his coming will be put to shame; they will all be clothed with confidence, salvation, and joy, and in that case, where is John's exhortation?—"that we may not be ashamed before him at his coming." In John's view of the matter, there was a possibility of being "ashamed before him at his coming." Therefore, your view is not John's view. John's view is sensible. What is more to the point, John's view is in accordance with what is testified in all the scriptures. Daniel says (or rather the angel who appeared to Daniel) "*At that time* thy people shall be delivered, everyone that shall be found written in the books, and many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life and *some to shame and everlasting contempt.*" (Dan. xii, 2.) Jesus says "All that are in the graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth; they that have done good, to the resurrection of life, and *they that have done evil, to the resurrection of damnation.*" (John v, 29.) Again, Jesus says "Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, *of him also shall the Son of Man be ashamed* WHEN HE COMETH in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." (Mark viii, 38.) John is, therefore, in harmony with the other writers of the word, in recognizing the fact

that there is a possibility of being ashamed and rejected at the appearing of Christ. It is true, the righteous will be accepted and made like him; but does this prove there will be no judgment? How can it? It proves the very opposite, for acceptance implies a ceremony or act by which the decision is arrived at and proclaimed. The fact can never be set aside that "WE MUST ALL APPEAR BEFORE THE JUDGMENT SEAT OF CHRIST, THAT EVERYONE MAY RECEIVE IN BODY ACCORDING TO THAT HE HATH DONE, WHETHER GOOD OR BAD." (2 Cor. v, 10.) Any construction of any part of the word that would set this aside must be wrong. Your construction of John's statement does this, therefore, it must be rejected, and another one substituted, viz., this: "We know that when he appears (to judge the quick and the dead), we (if found faithful and pronounced blessed), shall be (made) like him, for we shall see (and taste his glory, being assimilated to) him as he is."

"*I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with thy likeness.*" (Psalm xvii, 15.) This is presumed to teach that David will be in the divine likeness from the very first moment of his restored existence; but there are several objections to this conclusion. In the first place, the words are spoken by David "in spirit," and have immediate reference to Jesus, the Son of David; for only he could say "Thou hast proved mine heart; thou hast visited me in the night; thou hast tried me and shalt find nothing: I am purposed that my mouth shall not transgress." (verse 3.) "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" was a challenge which could only be put forward by Jesus; only of him could it be said "He was holy, harmless, and undefiled: . . . without sin." If the statement apply to Jesus, it cannot be used to prove anything in reference to his brethren. If it be suggested that Jesus is the type and forerunner of his brethren, and that what is true of him, is necessarily true of them, we have only to recal attention to the fact that though there is a resemblance, there is also a great disparity between them. Jesus had not to appear at a judgment seat to give account. His position had not to be decided after his resurrection. The very fact of his resurrection was a proof of his acceptance. Had he not been "an holy one," he must, under the law of sin and death, have seen corruption. That law, commencing in Eden, does not admit of the resurrection of a sinner. Resurrection, in relation to our race, would have been an impossibility, either for justification or condemnation, apart from the guileless Jesus, who became (the means of) "resurrection and the life," through the fact that he was not a transgressor, and that death had, therefore, no legal hold upon him. The law of God applies differently to us, because of the difference of our position in relation to it. God does not deal directly with us, else we could never be saved. He dealt directly with Christ, because Christ could come through the ordeal, and having done so, he has committed all judgment into his hands, and works toward us through him. Christ is Lord and Judge, having been constituted so by the divine will; and under him, a new law operates upon us. If we come under his jurisdiction by belief and obedience of the truth, we become subject to resurrection, whether to justification or condemnation. Our sins (under Christ) will not keep us in the grave, because he has been made Lord

both of the dead and the living, and has been appointed judge of the quick and dead. (Acts x, 41; Rom. xiv, 9,) On this principle, the preaching the word is to one class a savour of life unto life, while to another, it is a savour of death unto death (2 Cor. ii, 18)—more life to the one—more death to the other; to the one, it adds life by resurrection, to the other an extra death by resurrection.

In view of the difference between Christ and his disciples, it is impossible to reason from him to them. Therefore, though it could be proved that he awoke in the divine likeness, nothing would be proved as to their resurrection. But it is doubtful if Jesus did awake in the divine likeness. The types of the law seem to require that, in his capacity of priest, he should enter the presence of the Deity with the nature offered in sacrifice, and this he could not do if he came out of the grave a spiritual body. If his resurrection was the re-animation of the body laid in the tomb by Joseph of Arimathea, we can see how the analogy of things under the law was realized in his subsequent presentation to and glorification by Deity. He then went into the holiest with his own blood, bearing upon him the nature condemned on the cross, and laid with the dead; and was accepted in the flashing forth of spirit-fire upon him for the consumption or metamorphosis of the sacrifice.

But it may be asked, if this was the case, how could David's words apply: "I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with thy likeness." These words are supposed to refer to a likeness to be possessed by Jesus or David on awaking. Even supposing this is the case, they are no less applicable in the view now put forward, than in the theory which supposes that Jesus awoke in the divine likeness. The words do not affirm that the speaker would awake *in* the likeness of the divine, but that he would experience satisfaction with it when he awoke. This is not out of harmony with the supposition that he first awoke in the human before he felt this satisfaction on receiving the divine. But in reality, it does not appear that the verse has anything to do with the subject. The context does not favour the idea that the writer is thinking of the nature to be possessed after resurrection, but rather that he has in view the manifestation of the divine power and glory to be witnessed after resurrection. The first part of the verse reads, "As for me I will behold *thy face* in righteousness;" the second part (*viz.*, the words in question), seem but an amplification, or repetition of the first, after the manner of Hebrew parallelism: "I shall be satisfied when I awake in thy likeness." "Thy likeness" reads like the synonym of "thy face;" "behold," connected with the one, is equivalent to the words "be satisfied" occurring in connection with the other, so that it is a something to be witnessed, and not experienced, that forms the subject matter of the verse, *viz.*, the manifestations of the glory of God in the land of the living, in the person of Jesus, when he comes as "the brightness of Jehovah's glory, and the express image of his person." Doubtless, the beholding of this glory will be connected with a participation in it in the sense of being "made like him," and being clothed upon with incorruptibility and immortality; but it is

the vision of the divine on emerging from the grave that apparently engages David's thoughts "in spirit" in the words under consideration. It is the idea of Job, "Though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet *in my flesh* SHALL I SEE GOD, whom *I shall see* for myself, and *mine eyes shall behold* and not another."—(Job xix, 26-27.)

They who shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world AND THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD," &c.—(Luke xx, 35,) It is argued upon this that mere participation in the resurrection is proof of being accepted, and that, therefore, all that rise are righteous, and of necessity incorruptible. The fallacy of this argument will be apparent at a glance. Jesus does not speak of any particular resurrection, but says generally that those who are accounted worthy of the resurrection from the dead. Now, if "resurrection from the dead" mean simply a coming forth from the grave, then Christ precludes the application of the second death to the resurrected unjust, for they come forth from the grave, and are, therefore, according to this view, counted worthy of the resurrection from the dead, and ought, if the argument is correct, to be included among those who "die no more, but are equal to angels." "But," interposes the objector, "the resurrection from the dead does not mean merely a coming forth from the grave, but means the resurrection at the beginning of the thousand years." Q.—How do you know that? A.—"Oh, because in Rev. xx, it says 'Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection.'" Q.—Then your construction of Luke xx, 35, is not determined by something in the passage itself, but by your opinion of Rev. xx, 6? A.—Well, there it is; what do you make of it? Q.—I have already made something of Rev. xx, 6, by shewing that to have part in the first resurrection, is to be accepted and elevated to life and power to reign with Christ, and that those rising at that time who are not worthy of that part, lot, or inheritance, are given over to the power of the second death. A.—Then what do you make of Christ's words about being counted worthy of the resurrection from the dead? Q.—You yourself have admitted that it does not mean a simple coming out of the grave. Therefore I am at liberty to say it means more. I say so because the unjust are to emerge from the death-state at the resurrection, and yet are not to be blessed or made equal to the angels. In addition to coming out of the grave, it means a rising at the judgment from the condition of mortality to an immortal state. The unjust are made to stand again; they come forth, but they do not rise "from among the dead." They never get above the level of the constitutionally dead, of whom Jesus spoke when he said "Let the dead bury their dead." They come forth, not to a resurrection of life, but to a resurrection of condemnation. The resurrection from among the dead, is the being raised from among those who pertain to the grave, and the being elevated to equality with the angels. Those who, at the judgment-seat of Christ, are found worthy of this elevation from the dead to the living, die no more, and neither marry nor give in marriage. They are the children of God, being the children created by, and surviving the judgment process connected with, the resurrection; and they inherit the world to come, or the kingdom to be established on earth at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.

If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of (or from amongst) the dead.—(Phil. iii, 2.) This passage is on all fours with that in Luke xx, and comes within the same method of explanation. We have before seen that the word “resurrection” when used to express the substance of the Christian hope, extends beyond the act of rising again, and embraces the state to which the act ultimately introduces. In this style of language, the state beyond the judgment-seat is the only thing that can properly be considered the resurrection. Those who rise and are not accepted do not attain to this state. They do not survive the preliminary ordeal. Hence they do not attain to the resurrection from the dead. They continue among the dead and ultimately disappear in the second death. Paul strove so to walk that he might pass the judgment-seat with approval, and so attain to that state which is described as “the resurrection of life,”—a state in which those having part in it, have risen entirely from among the dead. Paul could not mean that he was doubtful of attaining to a standing again at Christ’s appearing, because it was with him a matter of certainty that “we must ALL stand before the judgment-seat of Christ,” (2 Cor. v, 10,) “who shall judge the quick and the dead *at his appearing*,” (2 Tim. iv, 1.) The wicked will rise, for “there shall be a resurrection of the unjust,” but their resurrection is not a resurrection from among the dead, but a mere reproduction of their mortal selves to be condemned, put to shame, and destroyed. Paul’s desire was to have a part in the nett result of resurrection, that is, to attain to the condition of immortal being which will be the only enduring effect of the resurrection of both just and unjust. The immortal ones will be an everlasting memorial and counterpart of the wonder to be accomplished for the dead at the appearing of Christ; the others will vanish away like smoke, so that to be among them is to have no part in the first resurrection, and to fail in attaining to the resurrection from the dead.

As to the distinction between the phrases “resurrection of the dead” and “resurrection *from* the dead,” it is the merest hypercriticism that would deduce from this distinction the idea that one phrase refers to one period of time and the other to another. The “resurrection of the dead,” which by this theory is made to teach the resuscitation at a certain period of every form of life that has ever existed, is an indefinite phrase, which refers to no time or phase of resurrection in particular, but points simply to the abstract idea of resurrection. This is evident from its uses in the New Testament, as well as from the sense of the thing. When Paul asks the Corinthians “How say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?” he did not mean to intimate that some of them denied what is called a “general resurrection,” but that they denied the occurrence of resurrection at all. When he classed among first principles “the resurrection of the dead,” he refers to the fact that there will be a resurrection of dead people, without reference to time or number, and not to a presumed resurrection of all the dead at a particular time. So with the Athenians on Mar’s Hill: “When they heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked;” not that they heard of a purpose to raise all the dead;

for what they heard was that Christ had been raised from the dead. (See previous verse.) It was the abstract proposition that resurrection was possible that excited their derision, and not that there was, at a certain advanced point of time, to be a resurrection of all the dead. It is impossible that Paul could teach such a thing; for the scriptures expressly declare that many will never see the light of resurrection at all, (Psalm xlix, 19, 20; Isaiah xxvi, 14; Jer. li, 57,) while the fact affirmed by Paul that God winked at former times of ignorance, and by Jesus, that there is no responsibility in a state of blindness (John ix, 14), establish a principle that excludes the great majority of mankind from resurrection.

The attempt then to give a specific colour and construction to the phrase "resurrection of the dead," is illogical, hypercritical, and absurd; and, of course, the suggestion that "the resurrection from the dead," in contrast to the other, points to an exclusive resurrection of the righteous, is equally far from the purpose. This we have already seen. There is nothing in the words themselves that teach it. They simply affirm that there will be a standing again of some, which will result in their being lifted from the death state into the immortal state, but when this is to be, and what are to be the judicial adjuncts of the event, it tells us nothing. This information we have to glean elsewhere; and by the aid of the information, we are enabled to see that "resurrection from the dead" occurs in connection with a general inquisition on the part of the judge of quick and dead, into the affairs of those who profess his name in the present state, and become amenable to the terrible judicature to be set up at his appearing, at a time when the unworthy come forth to a resurrection of condemnation. This commands us to reject imperatively the suggestion that the resurrection from the dead, is a selection and glorification of the righteous from the grave, without judgment. Such a suggestion assails a vital part of the truth. Christ's office as judge must be upheld with the same jealousy that we guard his position as a king. It is a pillar in the temple of the truth, the removal of which weakens the structure, and ultimately tends to general dilapidation.

"*The dead in Christ SHALL RISE FIRST.*"—(1 Thess. iv, 16.) This is plausibly presumed to mean that the righteous will be gathered from the grave before those who are to be rejected. Detached from the context, it seems to mean this, but interpreted in the light of the context, it assumes an entirely different complexion. Paul is not discussing the position and salvation of "the dead in Christ," in reference to another class of dead. Were he doing so, no other meaning could be put upon his words than that contended for by those who deny the judgment, but it will be observed that it is in reference to a *living class*, and not a dead class, that Paul says "the dead in Christ shall rise first." Let the reader peruse Thess. iv, 13-18, and he will see this. Some of the Thessalonian believers had died, and the survivors seemed to be under the apprehension that the deceased were losers by death, as if they would miss something by being out of the way if Christ should appear. Paul writes to correct this feeling. Having alleged the resurrection of

the dead at the manifestation of Christ, he says, "this we say unto you by the word of the Lord that we who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord *shall not prevent* (precede, or go before) *them which are asleep*. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first, (that is, before the living are saved). THEN we who are alive and remain shall be caught up (away) together with them in clouds, to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever (or, according to Griesbach, "all") be in the Lord." The comparison is between the dead righteous and the living righteous, and not between the righteous dead and the wicked dead. Hence the statement quoted at the top of the paragraph, which is much relied upon by those who deny the judgment, does not bear in any manner upon the question whether the unjust rise at the time when "Jesus Christ shall judge the quick and the dead."

But, the objector may say, although this point may be surrendered, that the whole of this quotation from 1 Thessalonians, is dead against the supposition that the unfaithful are to take part in the "meeting with Christ;" they are not recognised in any way; there is no place in the scene described by Paul for a judgment which is to include them. The answer to this is, that the argument is good *only on the supposition that Paul mentions every detail connected with the coming of the Lord*. Does he do so? The objector, eager to establish his case, may unthinkingly say "Yes," but from this position he must instantly withdraw, because he will find that details admitted by him to pertain to this event are omitted in Paul's description. There is no mention of the change of the living from the mortal to the immortal. There is no mention of reward meted out according to works. There is no mention of even the mild judgment-seat believed in by those who deny a judgment for life and death. Hence, even to harmonize with the objector's view, the existence of ellipsis in the chapter must be admitted. Now, if there are ellipses at all, there is a place for the truth of the matter, for surely the way to fall in a scriptural ellipsis, is to procure the matter covered by the ellipsis, from other parts of the word. Adopting this principle, there is no difficulty in dealing with the chapter under consideration. It was quite foreign to Paul's subject that he should introduce the judgment or the unfaithful here. He addresses himself to the consolation of those in Thessalonica who were mourning the decease of some who had died in the faith. Hence the position of the faithful, generally viewed in connection with the advent, naturally forced itself upon his attention, to the exclusion of details not bearing directly on that position in its ultimate form. He lays hold of the consolatory features connected with the coming of the Lord, and presses them upon the attention of the mourners for their own sake and the sake of the dead. He exhibits in one bold, brilliant sketch the triumphant issue from death of both the living and the dead saints at his appearing, and pointing to it, says "Wherefore, comfort one another with these words." But are we to say that because he does not mention the judgment-seat here, there is no judgment-seat?—that because

he does not say here, the saints must all appear before the judgment-seat to receive the reward of good or evil, as their lives will be shown to have been, therefore the statement that he makes to the Corinthians (that they will) is untrue? that because he does not say here that hidden things of darkness will be brought to light, and shame poured upon those who are ashamed to confess the Son of Man now, therefore the statements elsewhere that declare both will be done at the coming of the Lord, (1 Cor. iv, 5 ; Mark viii, 38,) are not to be accepted? The very proposal brings its own condemnation. The true principle of interpretation when elliptical statements are concerned, is to find a place for all that can be ascertained to be true of the subject in hand. Applying this principle here, we must find a place in 1 Thess. iv, 13-18, for the rising again of the dead to judgment, the relation of the living to the judgment-seat, the appearance of the unfaithful, their rejection, the acceptance and glorification of the faithful, for all these details have been demonstrated in previous articles. Paraphrasing the scripture in question so as to do this, it would read as follows:—"We who are alive and remain shall not go (to be glorified,) before them who are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God, and the dead in Christ (for no other dead shall awake at this epoch,) shall rise first, (before any step is taken for the salvation of the living). Then, (the dead having been raised) we, the living, shall be caught away with them in clouds through the air, to meet the Lord, and (having appeared before him and become subject to the judgment, which results in the separation of the unfaithful from those who are worthy, and the immortalization of those who are declared 'good and faithful servants'), so shall we all be with the Lord."

We have now, so far as we know, completed the survey of all those portions of the scripture which are believed to teach the glorification of the righteous without judgment. We leave the reader to decide for himself whether the task attempted is accomplished, viz., the harmonization of all apparent conflict among the several testimonies relating to the subject. Such a result must be arrived at on one side or other. The scriptures cannot contradict themselves. There is no real conflict. There is only that diversity of aspect and expression which always arises when a subject is treated incidentally and by different writers. That diversity is quite compatible with the unity of the doctrine of judgment considered as a whole. In fact, it is necessary, to enable us to take in the doctrine in its entirety. It is preferable to a uniformity of expression, which would leave us without those stereoscopic effects that enable us to realize the subject. No subject, in either human or divine communications, is treated in the stiff monotonous style that would be connected with set phrases always used. The free and natural action of the mind indulges in variety of allusion, in which there is diversity without a breach of unity. It is only hypercriticism that can develop discrepancies from such materials, and the discrepancies developed by this process are not real, but have a mere appearance of discrepancy produced by an incapable or an unconscientious play upon words, leaving out of sight some premisses in the argument. This style of argument,

as applied to the doctrine of judgment, is lamentable in its results. It destroys the truth of the matter while preserving the form of it, so far as mere words are concerned. It robs the coming of Christ of every element of judgment, while it applies the term judgment to the scene that he transacts. By excluding the unfaithful from the scene, it presents the advent to us, not as "a terror of the Lord," bringing with it the fearful issues of life and death, but as an occasion of unmingled joy, to be present at which, is to be saved. By this error, it divests the great event of the Lord's coming of that anxiety with which it has been divinely associated, as a means of present incentive to purity and circumspection. It abolishes an element of the truth of the gospel, and thus becomes an evil to be resisted with determination and steadfastness. This we have endeavoured to do in the series of articles which we now bring to a close. We hope it has not been without effect, as regards those who truly fear God and hope in his mercy, trembling at the voice of his word. It cannot but profit every well-constituted mind to look the subject in the face, endeavouring to realise the sobering consideration that there is a day appointed when God will judge the secrets of men by Christ Jesus. It will sustain everyone who, having been enlightened and joined to the brotherhood of Christ, is working with a single eye, as seeing him who is invisible, and it will tend to correct and purify those who, in a similar position, may be tempted to diverge, through temporal pressure, from the path of truth and duty. The record exhibited at the judgment seat is written now in the lives of those who will appear there. The one will be the exact reflex of the other. A faithful stewardship sustained now will be honoured then with praise, recognition, and promotion; while an opposite course will bring exposure, shame, condemnation, and death. "The wise shall inherit glory, but shame shall be the promotion of fools."

EDITOR.

August 17th, 1867.

THE APOCALYPSE PARAPHRASED,

ON THE BASIS OF THE EXPOSITION CONTAINED IN EUREKA,

VOL. II. (DR. THOMAS.)

CHAPTER VI, VERSES 9 TO 17.

AT the commencement of this seal, (the fifth,) A.D. 303, the Roman people were under the dominion of two emperors of the first rank, styled Augusti, whose names were Diocletian, surnamed Jupiter, and Maximin, surnamed Hercules, and two of an inferior grade, styled Cæsars, whose names were Galerius, son-in-law to Diocletian, and Constantius, son-in-law to Maximin and father of Constantine the Great. Of these, Galerius was the most cruel—indeed it may be truly said that the slaughter of this seal was

almost wholly attributable to him. After much importunity, the other three agreed to his proposal to commence a general persecution against the christians, with a view to exterminating them. Accordingly in A.D. 303, a general edict was published, in which it was enacted that all ecclesiastical edifices should be demolished; all who engaged in any secret meeting for religious worship should be punished with death; all copies of the sacred scriptures should be given to the magistrates to be publicly burnt; and all ecclesiastical property to be at once confiscated for the benefit of the civil authorities. This decree was carried out with great severity, and was followed by a series of cruel edicts issued by Diocletian, which were "written," says Guizot, "if I may use the expression, with the point of a dagger." He declared his intention of destroying the christian name; to accomplish which, the provincial governors were directed to apprehend all persons of ecclesiastical order for the purpose of reclaiming them, by every method of severity, to the national superstition, and, subsequently this rigorous order was extended to the whole body of fellow-servants and brethren, all of whom were exposed to violent and general persecution. Immediately afterwards, Diocletian divested himself of the imperial office, and his example was followed by Maximin; by which acts, Galerius and Constantius were elevated to the first rank. The latter, though a Pagan, entertained no dislike to the religious principles of the Catholics, and being of a mild and humane disposition, he established a system of toleration in the countries over which he ruled, Britain, Gaul, and Spain. Galerius, however, continued his fierce persecution for a short time, and then he became convinced that the most violent efforts of despotism are insufficient to extirpate a whole people, or to subdue their religious opinions, and to assemble in safety as they thought fit, provided they manifested due respect to the established laws and government. Thus closed the most memorable of all the endeavours to extinguish christianity from the Roman Habitable, in which effort the strength of Paganism was completely exhausted. It has never been accurately ascertained what number of brethren and their fellow-servants fell in the conflict, but it is quite certain from the testimonies of the enemies, that it was very great and the cruelties intense.

And I saw when the Lamb opened the sixth seal, (A.D. 311-12,) and behold a great earthquake occurred, symbolising a popular convulsion of the people, who are figuratively styled the earth; a convulsion which revolutionized the whole Greco-Latin Habitable by overthrowing Paganism and installing the Holy Catholic church in its place. And the sun—the Imperial Civil Power of the Greco-Latin political universe—became black as sackcloth of hair; and the moon—the Imperial Ecclesiastical Power—became as blood; and the stars of the Pagan heaven—the subordinate powers dependent for glory on the Imperial glory—fell to the earth, as a fig tree casts its unripe figs, being shaken by a mighty wind; all of which indicate the infliction of great wrath on the rulers of Daniel's Fourth Beast Dominion, and a great change in the appearance of the Roman heavens. The consequence was that the Pagan heaven departed as a scroll rolled up, and every mountain and island were removed out of their places. The combined operation of all these phenomena are designed to present a

political universe in a state of awful and terrific tumult. (*See Note.*) Indeed so awful were the events here referred to, that the kings of the earth and the great men, and the rich, and the military chieftains, and the mighty ones, and every bondman and every freeman concealed themselves in the caverns and among the rocks of the mountains; and they said to the mountains and the rocks "Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him who sits upon the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb; for that great day of his wrath has come, and who could have been caused to stand."

This seal terminated A.D. 324, and thus occupied a period of twelve years. The events which it comprises are of a very important character, but as they are presented more in detail in the twelfth chapter, they will be more fully explained on arriving at that part of the Apocalypse.

J. J. A.

NOTE.—There are some persons who carry their zeal for reading the Bible, in a literal sense, to such an extreme as to contend that the sun, moon, stars, and heaven are invariably used in a literal, and not a symbolic, sense in scripture prophecy. In so doing, however, they appear to forget that the same figurative mode of speech is often used in ordinary writings. The following extracts from our daily press present a few of the most recent and significant illustrations:

"Yesterday the air was thick with rumours. The unsettled aspect of the *political heavens* had produced its usual effect, and reports of every shape and degree were freely current."—*Daily Telegraph*, March 1st, 1867.

"The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Lord Stanley, and several *lesser lights* in the *ministerial firmament* were the guests of the Corporation of the Trinity House on Saturday night."—*Morning Star*, June 24th, 1867.

"The *political barometer* refuses obstinately to stay at the "set fair," where it had been placed by the enthusiasts who augured a golden age after the royal visits. The *horizon* seems now to be *darker* than before those *brilliant suns* from Russia and Prussia condescended to *illumine* Paris with the *light* of their countenance."—*Morning Advertiser*, June 26th, 1867.

Here we have air, heavens, firmament, horizon, suns, lesser lights or stars, darkness and light, all used in a symbolic sense to describe political events; all of which have been adopted to represent similar events by the Spirit of God—the only difference being that the above extracts contain the explanation of the symbols, whereas in scripture we are left to search out their meanings.

J. J. A.

TRINITARIANISM AND THE TRUTH,

CONSIDERED IN RELATION TO THE FIRST THREE VERSES OF
JOHN'S GOSPEL.

THE "PRE-EXISTENCE" OF JESUS CHRIST—HIS BEING THE WORD MADE FLESH.

(Continuation of "The Bible as a Law of Life and Immortality," from page 196.)

IN the second Adam, we have another man of the same flesh and blood with the first, but in its degenerated nature. He was miraculously conceived, yet was he conceived in sin, shapen in iniquity, and therefore, naturally born. To presume that the miraculous conception interfered with the law of man's degenerated nature

as inherited from the first Adam, is to presume his body was formed in the womb by a miraculous formation apart from the life blood of Mary herself, or in other words, affirm, with the Mother of Harlots, that "his mother was immaculate as well as himself." The effect of a miracle is not the miracle itself. It is that which

produces the effect that is the miracle, and the effect of a miracle must be in exact accordance with the like effect produced by natural or ordinary causes, otherwise the operation producing it and the effect together must be placed among some other phenomena. Jesus, therefore, in being naturally born, though miraculously conceived, had a character to acquire as well as the first Adam, and being in his beginning but an infant, he was incapable of knowing good or evil. He had therefore both to be nursed and trained—a strange process for a child not only miraculously conceived, for which we have evidence, but presumed to be both miraculously shapen, and miraculously born, for which we have no evidence. Why was he not also miraculously fed, or supported without any food at all? Why, his training and nursing is a sufficient evidence he must have been a child of the species, man. And if so in infancy, so also in maturity. Well, as to his training, the Deity in producing him in the manner he did, descended as we have already said in a former paper, from the position of a Creator to that of a father in human relationship, and therefore pursued the course natural to human things in accordance with the law he gave his people for the training of their children. As a father to this child, from a human point of view, he took into his own hands the direction of his education. And so placing him, or causing him to be born and brought up in such Jewish circumstance as would effectually contribute to a successful issue, the child grew in wisdom, and learned to choose the good and refuse the evil. His moral and intellectual nature kept pace with his physical nature. And when the temptation came, he restrained all his fleshly instincts and obtained a victory amidst surrounding circumstances less favorable for his overcoming it, than were those of the first Adam in the temptation to which he yielded. In place of being induced to obey by good things, he suffered: and thus being made perfect, he became the Adam by whom many are made righteous, the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him “In the days of his flesh he offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears to save him from death.” A strange anomaly for one presumed to be both Deity and man! And from this we may understand he did the same to save him from “Sin the sting of death.” All the acts of Jesus show the man. They separate him from the fiction

attached to the Romish tradition respecting him. The sting of death is more to be feared than death itself. He resisted unto blood, striving against sin. The sin he so resisted was no doubt the contradiction of sinners against himself, the sin surrounding him in its many phases apart from himself. But this does not imply he was *without* sin in his members though he was *without* sin in his actions. He had all along mastered himself, and therefore did not need to resist what was powerless in himself, but had he failed to resist the sin surrounding him, had he not resisted *it* unto death, his non-resistance would have been a disobedience of his Father's will, a transgression of the law, and therefore a sin of which he himself would have been guilty. Consequently, the resistance he made, as referred to in the passage we have quoted, was as much a condemnation of his own fleshly nature as it was a condemnation of those whose contradiction he endured. How then could this strife, these prayers and tears of his, have happened, had he himself not been compassed with infirmities like his brethren? It is against the nature of things to suppose immaculate flesh could have been subjected to the ordeal. And it is against reason to suppose that had he been both Deity and man, he would have uttered such prayers, and dropped such tears, so indicative of infirmity. Who ever prayed that never felt a want? Who ever dropped a tear that never felt a pang? Is the Deity ever pained? Is it any grief to him, man's being a sinner? Do the angels pray? Do they ever weep? We need not answer these questions to indicate their relationship to the subject in hand. They throw us back on both the conception and the birth to supply us with the germ of Jesus' crying, tears, and strife, against sin. They show us the conception did not make him one of the same nature with angels, but a man of the same nature with men. They but reiterate what we have already said, that it but served to create in him a more sensitive susceptibility of receiving the truth than other men, but nevertheless, of receiving it after the same fashion; and that the training he was put under was the chief agent in developing his moral nature in antagonism with sin, to the pouring out of his blood. To his conception as related to his training, he owed the invulnerableness of his character: to his birth the vulnerable nature of his flesh, the pouring out of his blood. Being

born of sin's flesh, or of Adam's degenerated nature whose motions are in never ceasing conflict with law, he was, from the sufferings it entailed on him, inured to fighting with it, but not being born of the will of man, but of the will of God, we here have the first link of the chain which connects the victory he achieved with the manner of his conception. But though born of the will of God, he was not born of the spirit, otherwise he would have been a spiritual body like as he was when he ascended, after he rose from the dead, and as he is now, and as those will be who, after they rise from the dead, are found meet for eternal life.—Rom viii, 11. For, as "that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit," he could not have been born of both the flesh and the spirit at the same time, but being born of a woman though not by the will of man, he was notwithstanding this, of that woman's nature—a man miraculously conceived but naturally born, and thus constituted bone of her bone and flesh of her flesh—nothing more. Upon the same principle, according to the same law of nature, a vine tree cannot bear figs, a fig tree olives, nor a fountain send forth at the same time sweet water and bitter. And as his life was not a sweet life, but a bitter one, aye, bitter as wormwood and gall, it shows he was born as other men, "born to trouble as the sparks fly upward." Every thing shows the man. The positive evidence of scripture is therefore, clear and specific on the point. The apostle reasons as much from his observation of the facts as from the necessity for the facts. "For verily" says he "he took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham." The facts truly substantiate this. Then comes the reason for it "wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren," yes, IN ALL THINGS, "that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest." *A posteriori*, he could not have been a merciful and faithful high-priest had he been of immaculate flesh, or conjointly Deity and man. "For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted." Could he not as efficiently have succoured without his having suffered and been tempted himself? The apostle says, No. The Deity succours no man save *through* him. How then could he have suffered had he been equal with Deity? The answer is plain. He was not Deity, but man. There is no

sympathy between Deity and man, save *through* a middle man; but there is between man and man, and he, therefore, must have been purely a man, but in some near relationship to Deity, otherwise he neither could have sympathised with man, nor interceded with Deity. But it might be objected here, that if Jesus was purely a man, and if the Deity could not sympathise with man, save through a mediator, how could he sympathise with Jesus Christ? But this is met by the relationship which the miraculous conception established between Jesus Christ and Deity. The Deity, in deviating from the regular course of things, to bring about the natural birth of a man, to whom, according to the natural law of generation, He became a father, there arose an obligation on the part of Deity, in accordance with his promise, and the law he gave his people concerning parents, "to be to him a father," and on the part of Jesus Christ, from his known paternity, "to be to Deity a son," which obligation on the part of Deity was impossible to any other man *not so conceived*. A parental and filial love was here generated between Deity and Jesus Christ, upon the principle of human relationship as between father and son. Jesus, through this principle, became a fitting mediator between Deity and man. The parental obligation on the part of Deity toward His son Jesus Christ necessitated His hearing the prayer of Jesus without a mediator. Jesus could approach Deity on grounds which no other man could, and being at the same time purely a man himself, he could sympathize with man and at the same time plead with Deity. His intercession proves the Deity was his Father, and confirms the truth of the sacred narrative of his conception, *and as surely as his intercession proves his paternity, so does his fellow sympathy with man prove that he was born a man as others are born men*. "Forasmuch as the children" or those that are tempted "are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same"—that is, of the same flesh and blood, sin's flesh, Adam's degenerated nature.—Rom. ii, 16, 17, 18 and 14.

Still, pointed and clear as this testimony is, the phrases "He took not on him" . . . "He took on him"—to the mind charged with Platonic ideas, suggest the idea of transmigration and necessarily of pre-existence. From the Platonic point of view, the question is suggested—Who was this "*He*" that

"took not on him the nature of angels. but took on him the seed of Abraham?" Platonic philosophy suggests that this "He" must have been a person living in some upper state of existence, and on migrating to this nether world, "took on him the seed of Abraham." Scripturally understood, however, these phrases suggest nothing of the sort. The phraseology is purely idiomatic—an idiom that may be traced to the ideas that so widely prevailed concerning the antecedents of every man as exemplified in the question the disciples, before they became enlightened with the truth, put to Jesus concerning the blind man—"Did this man sin"—that is, did he in his previous state of existence sin "that he was born blind?" This had been their belief in common with the generality of their contemporaries. The Pharisees were of this belief, that souls migrated into human bodies, some for reward, others for punishment, for deeds done in their former condition. And even the lower animals were believed to be receptacles of souls also, and if our memory is correct, the vegetable world as well. The language of the apostle therefore must be regarded as a mere mode of speech which had become common through those varied false ideas, yet, nevertheless, sufficiently appropriate to serve the expression of the truth without entangling it with those ideas. Expressions originating from false ideas widely extended, become from their commonness, the readiest media of expression in the progress of knowledge, for new ideas. And inasmuch as Paul's language was as equally applicable in his time to express the like thing of all men as of Jesus Christ, its application to Jesus Christ cannot be regarded as exceptional, and therefore must be regarded as proving too much, or as a conventional mode of speech to which no weight can be attached. Idiomatic, we must consequently pronounce it in common with the following examples of the like idiom—see 1 Cor. xv, 30. Speaking of wheat or other grain, the apostle says "God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body." Now from the Platonic point of view, we may here as pertinently suggest, what the "it" and "his" refer to in this passage. Something is here said to get a body. What is the something? Is it the seed or the soul of the seed? May not seeds have souls separable from their bodies! May they not have been created apart from their bodies, aye,

and have lived too in a previous state of existence, as well as the souls of men! The phraseology of Paul Platonically viewed, suggests as much! "Again, if God so clothe the grass of the field," &c. What does this imply? Is the grass something apart from its clothing? What becomes of the grass when stripped of its clothing? Does it also exist in a separate soul state, perchance, to render green and beautiful the Elysian fields of Platonism? Yea, verily, verily, stripped of its clothing, it is as fitting an emblem of those fields and the souls that sport there, as it is here, WITH its clothing,—the striking emblem of the men who sport on the fields of this world.

But further, Paul in ii Cor. v, 4, writes "We that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not for that we would be unclothed but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life." The same kind of idiom presents itself here. The language is undoubtedly taken from the pagan mode of speech. A generally received form of thought, creates phrases of speech in every one's mouth so conventionally, as to be readily handled and turned to express other forms of thought in some figurative manner, and thence ultimately outlive the form of thought which first originated them. The case before us is an example. The apostle does not use the pagan phrases to express the pagan ideas of the soul, but the reverse. Platonists may object, but the context proves this. The "groaning" Paul speaks of is *not* for death, but for life, and that life, immortality. He says he groans *not to be unclothed*, but clothed upon. Well, to be "unclothed," according to Platonism, means to be in a disembodied state, a naked soul; but this is evidently the opposite of what Paul means. He groans *to be clothed upon*, *not to be unclothed*. And why? Because, in his faith, *to be "unclothed" is to be dead*, and to be "clothed upon" is to have "mortality swallowed up of life," and because he believes in no naked-soul state apart from the body, see 3rd verse. The naked state in his faith is a state of sin, *not a disembodied-soul state*. In the first and second verses, there are two clothings spoken of, and in the third, another clothing but a figurative one, inferred. The clothings put off, and put on, referred to in the first two verses, are, first, an earthly house, which means a mortal body; second, a heavenly house, which means an immortal body. And between these two states of being, there is neither a

naked state nor a clothed state, simply a non-existent state. He therefore takes no note of what is between, because there is nothing to take note of. Well, what does he groan for? what does he expect? He looks for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ who shall *change his vile body*, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body. It is this he is speaking about—Phil. iii, 20, 23. He is pressing toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus, if by any means he might attain unto *the resurrection from the dead*—Phil. iii, 4. It is for the resurrection, he speaks of groaning. If so be, that being clothed, he shall not be found naked; that is, if so be, that being raised again in his mortal body, he shall not be found in sin, because *sin is nakedness* and unfit for the clothing of immortality. His “vile body” has to be restored ere it can be “changed,” but if not figuratively clothed, as inferred in the third verse, it will be naked and therefore not changed. He only desires therefore, for the clothing of immortality; he does not desire for the resurrection, if he is to be found naked. It is only *if so be* that being clothed with his mortality a second time, he shall not be found *without* the robe of Christ’s righteousness. Compare the 3rd with the 10th verse, and both with Rev. iii, 18, xvi, 15. He teaches in the 10th verse, a resurrection of mortal bodies from the dust, an appearance of them before the judgment seat of Christ. “that every one may bodily receive the things, according to that he hath done whether good or bad.” And if what they have done be good, if they are found clothed with righteousness, then their “vile bodies” so resurrected, are changed. But if otherwise—if their deeds have been evil, if they are found naked, they are everlastingly destroyed—2 Thess. i, 9. It is the soul-body therefore that is punished or rewarded—not the soul, for the soul without the body is as a vapour that passes away. (The italics in the 10th verse should not be read.) “The soul that sinneth it shall die.” The soul clothed with Christ’s righteousness shall be changed and live. There is nothing in the whole chapter to indicate disembodiment. It is simply the Platonic ideas which are brought to bear on it that create the suggestion. The first verse refutes those ideas at the outset, and on the same principle, there is no note taken of anything between death and judgment in the passage “It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this, the judgment,”

though clearly enough the resurrection comes between; so, is there no note made of the long interval between the putting off of the mortal body and the putting on of the immortal, though as clearly enough, both the resurrection and the judgment come between. And the reason is obvious. To man in general, the judgment is the most important event next to death he has to consider. See Paul’s address to Agrippa. But to christians, to men looking for the appearance of the Lord, the putting on of the immortal body is the greatest event and happiest they can contemplate. And as without a resurrection neither the judgment nor the changing of the “vile body” can take place, there is nothing else between death and the resurrection to make mention of. To the dead, the one event follows the other as it were in quick succession, and no one will rise before his neighbour, nor shall the dead that are raised appear sooner than those who are alive and remain.—1 Thess. iv, 15.

Moreover, see 6th, 8th, and 9th verses. To be at home in the body is to be *bodily absent* from the Lord: to be present with the Lord, is to be absent from the mortal body, but *at home in the immortal body*: And “Whether present or absent, we may be accepted of him,” refers to both conditions. In the one condition, faith stands for the real; in the other, faith is supplanted by the real. In both conditions, the robe of Christ’s righteousness is the ground of acceptance. It is a figurative dress and applicable to both conditions, but not to the clothing of either mortality or immortality. The clothing of mortality is man’s lot now; and as the grass of the field is without its clothing, or mortal coil, so is man when he puts off his clothing, or “mortal coil.” Like the grass of the field, so he perisheth; and what this clothing is to man in the present state, such will the clothing of immortality be to him at the judgment. *Without* it, he will be everlastingly destroyed: *with* it, he will be ever with the Lord. Returning then to Jesus Christ, it is plain that he, while in the flesh, was clothed with mortality. This flesh was his earthly tabernacle—the tabernacle referred to in the first clause of 2 Cor. v, 1. And now he is clothed with immortality—his immortal body, “the house not made with hands,” referred to in the second clause. The clothing in both cases is the necessity of being,—the same as with the grass of the field. The clothing of the grass is, to all intents and purposes, the grass itself; and so is the clothing of

mortality and immortality, the beings themselves who are so clothed. Jesus without his mortal body could never have existed at all. It was the necessary antecedent to his clothing of immortality; and now were he not clothed with an immortal body, he could not be otherwise than dead. There is but one circumstance in his death which differs from the ordinary results of death. His mortal body while it lay in the grave, "saw no corruption." It was never "dissolved." This, however, did not arise from anything peculiar in his body more than is in any other fleshy body. It was simply not permitted to remain so long in the grave as to be affected by corruption; and though it may be alleged that this is not so satisfactory a reason to account for his non-corruption as that of his having been of a different flesh, because in warm climates corruption operates very rapidly, it must be remembered that *he died from no disease*, was crucified while in the vigour of health, and that immediately after his death, he was pierced in the heart, or side, *from which both blood and water rushed out*. This emptying the body of its blood served greatly to repel the effects of corruption; and besides this, the spices and ointments that were used in the anointing of the body at his burial, were highly anti-septic. These little, apparently incidental circumstances previous to his entombment go very far indeed to show that his body, though it "saw no corruption," had been nevertheless corruptible. They show the means that were used, doubtless, under the direction of Deity, to preserve the body from corruption, and so fulfil the scriptures, Psalm xvi, 10. They utter a testimony so irresistible to the nature of Jesus' flesh, that reflects its influence over the whole course of his fleshy being, and urges another reason for the interest which surrounded his cradle, than the one that he was the Deity in the form of a babe. Clothed with mortality in the beginning of his days, the circumstances that attended his birth were in character like those we have seen attended his funeral. Had there been anything uncommon in the nature of his body, we should not have had ordinary means applied to serve its preservation in the tomb; and there is the same reason to assume that in his cradle there was nothing uncommon or peculiar in his appearance to command the attention of the shepherds, and the respect the wise men paid him. The shepherds were directed by angels, the wise men, by a star. The star did not

settle its heavenly rays on the face of the child, but on the house he was born in. The child was not described, but his clothes and cradle were. The house, the clothes, the cradle, were the indices to his person. His person, therefore, was not peculiar, otherwise the other peculiarities would not have been necessary. The house was peculiar for a royal birth, and much more so the cradle, but not so the child. What then was it that so magnified this little babe in the esteem of those who did him such distinguished homage? What was it but the fulfilment of a long promised event? What was it but the realization of a long delayed hope? It was the interest surrounding the birth of a Prince; the interest surrounding the hope of a nation long panting for deliverance; the interest attendant on the desire of a people for a Saviour; the exceeding joy the shepherds so exultingly manifested, when, in the midnight watch, the glad tidings fell upon their ears: "Unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord," sounding anew the prophetic announcement of Isaiah the prophet. This was the joyful sound that drew from their lips the heaving sensations of their bosoms, and themselves from their flock, to go and see the babe the Lord had thus made known to them. And when they had seen him, they made known abroad, *not* that he was a wonderful child; *not* that he was a child of surpassing beauty; *not* that he was something uncommon; *not* that he was the Deity in miniature; *not* that a halo of heavenly radiance encircled his brow, and another the brow of his mother, as may be seen in any papal print shop; *no*; they simply made known "the saying that was told them concerning the child. They but reiterated in joyful strain an echo to be re-echoed again from the burning hearts of their believing hearers; the echo of Isaiah's song, "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulders; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Father of the Ages, the Prince of Peace." This was that which created the interest surrounding the birth of the one born of a virgin in a humble sphere of life, and cradled in a manger. Had he been of immaculate flesh, his house a palace, and his bed all draped with gold, we might have been little surprised at the honours vouchsafed him; but being a baby human, the room a stable, and the drapery straw, it creates the deeper thought and sweetens

the reflections of every humble soul with the gracious kindnesses of a loving God. It ennobles life in the lowly walk of the just and righteous poor, and endears the character of him who, though "no respecter of persons," respects the heart that attunes his praise, and honours them who trust in him. It eclipses the might, the glory, the pomp of human greatness, and measures the value at which the Almighty holds it

all in the achievements of his plans. It furnishes an example of the foolish things of the world with which the Almighty chooses to confound the wise; the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty; the base things of the world and things which are despised; yea, and the things which are not, to bring to nought the things that are, that no flesh should glory in his presence.

(To be continued.)

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

CHURCH ORDER IN RELATION TO THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

1, ST. MARY'S PLACE, ABERDEEN,

April 4th, 1867.

DEAR BROTHER ROBERTS.—I was sorry to read the remarks that you made to "J. P.," headed "Deficient Knowledge and the One Baptism," in the last *Ambassador*. Truly, there is but one baptism; and if a person has been instructed in the knowledge of the gospel, and confessed their knowledge to competent witnesses, and all was found satisfactory, and at the earnest request of the said person, they were baptized, is not such a baptism valid, provided there was sincerity along with the knowledge confessed? Such baptism, then, having taken place, how can any interfere with it? We must ever remember what is done by the Lord's friends on earth, is approved by him in heaven; that the Lord's ordinances can not be trifled with, and made to suit the varied notions that any one may take into his head.

You say that immersion is not a church affair. This is certainly a very strange statement indeed. Who are to administer the commandments of the Lord? certainly not the world. Is not the church the pillar and support of the truth? Is it not the duty of the church in admitting members to see that they have the right faith, and that they continue in the faith, and in the practice of the truth?

You likewise say that to introduce the element of rule or authority into such an organization is to mar its operation, and frustrate its object. You might rather have said, could any society exist without it? without authority, there would be nothing but confusion. May I call to your mind what Paul said to Titus, in chap. i, 5, 6. Titus was left in Crete to set in order the things

wanting and ordain elders. You see that the churches in the Island of Crete were not in order without office-bearers, and Paul, in his first epistle to Timothy, chap. iii, introduces the same matter, and mentions the character and qualification that certain office-bearers must have, and one qualification of the elder was this, that he rules well his own house; for, if he does not rule well his own house, how can he take care of the church of God? and Paul, in his last interview with the elders of the church of Ephesus, as recorded in Acts xx, 28, calls the elders "overseers and feeders of the flock." Such being the case, what our churches want most is *rule and authority*, and the want of such, I have no doubt, is the great cause of so many troubles among us. You cannot fail to discern that according to Paul's saying to Titus, churches without elders are not in order. Study the subject, and use your skilful pen in future for the purpose of organizing the churches, and, I have no doubt, but the greatest amount of good the church has ever experienced will be the result.

If you think this worthy of a corner in the *Ambassador*, give it place, and you will oblige your brother,

JAMES MOWATT.

REPLY TO THE FOREGOING.

Only one thing can make baptism valid, and that is, a knowledge of the truth summarized in the phrase "the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ." Where this knowledge is wanting in any of its material elements, the favourable opinion of "competent judges," and the concurrence of ever so many persons composing a "church" will fail to make immersion in water the one baptism. A "church" is only an aggregate of persons who do not, in their aggregation, acquire a power which they do not possess individually. A "church" can do nothing between a man and his Maker. It can only stand by and help. Baptism is not

in the hands of "the church." That is to say, its efficacy does not depend upon its administration by "the church." If it did, no one of this generation could be saved, for there was no "church," to begin with, to administer it. But now that a community of called-out ones (collectively designated *ecclesia*) exists, it is of course natural and proper, and inevitable, that they, and not the unbelievers, should help those who believe, to obey Christ's commandments. But, as we said in April, the part they take is purely ministerial and expedient. They are only mechanically accessory to what is done by those who have a desire to be saved. The baptism of a man acquires not the slightest value from their ministrations. Its efficaciousness depends entirely upon the qualification of the person baptized. If he believes the truth, and is of an honest and good heart, his immersion is valid, whoever administers it. It does not require a church's sanction to make it valid, although it is good and comely, where an *ecclesia* exists, that it should take part in it. On the other hand, if from ignorance, he is not a believer of the truth, the "church's" sanction is of no more value than his own sincerity. God's appointment vaults over all. The truth is the agency he has appointed to cleanse men in baptism, and not the officiation of fallible men, who at present have no more power to alter or determine the spiritual relations of their fellows, than they have to control the weather or fix the course of the stars. If they are content to take the humble part of servants and administrators, good and profitable will be their work; but if they begin to imagine that there is any sacerdotal virtue in their services, they will rapidly degenerate to the position taken by the church of Rome.

As regards the particular case referred to in the foregoing letter, we know nothing personally of the facts. The opinion expressed in April was hypothetically put, and in this form we are prepared to repeat it, that if the individual in question is really convinced of the inadequacy of his faith at the time of his immersion, it is his duty to be immersed again—the opinion of "competent witnesses" to the contrary notwithstanding. It is his own business entirely. Two immersions are not two baptisms. That only is the "one baptism" which is based upon a correct and hearty apprehension of the one faith.

The Lord only approves in heaven of those things done by his friends on earth which are right. He will not endorse their mistakes. If they, through inadvertence or deception, baptise a person who does not understand the truth, he will not recognise that person any more than he would recognise any other ignorant person, who might be baptized by his enemies. The proceedings of his friends must be strictly in

harmony with his will before he will approve them. We cannot beforehand assume his approval of anything done by his friends, except on this principle. The judgment will disclose who and what meets with his approval. All we can now do is to modestly and patiently do our best to understand his will, and do it. His will in this matter is unmistakable, and that is, that those only who understand the truth should be immersed, and that the knowledge of the truth, and not the ecclesiastical sanction of his friends, is the circumstance that determines the validity of immersion.

"Varied notions taken into one's head" may be but a description of the truth received; for the truth is constituted of varied notions, and must go into one's head before it can be of any use. An endeavour to conform more strictly to "the Lord's ordinances" does not appear to us to be a likely way of trifling with them.

A "church" is the pillar and ground of the truth, in proportion as the people composing it are clear-headed and hearty advocates, defenders, and lovers of it; and, unquestionably, it is "their duty in admitting members, to see that they have the right faith, and that they continue in the faith and practice of the truth," but this does not involve the conclusion that they possess spiritual power or jurisdiction. They see that candidates for immersion have the right faith, because Christ has made the validity of baptism depend upon the right faith, and not because they have power to make baptism valid or invalid. They see that the members continue in the faith and practice of the truth, not because they have authority to dictate or interfere in other men's matters, but because the countenance in fellowship of that which is opposed to Christ's will would work evil, and involve them in condemnation. These functions they can perform without the existence of rule and authority in their midst. In fact, under existing circumstances, an *ecclesia* burdened with such an element could not properly discharge those functions. How are such duties to be performed? Only by the collective will of an *ecclesia*. Does a candidate apply for immersion? The mind of the *ecclesia* must be taken, and the result must abide their decision. Is an offender to be dealt with? The *ecclesia* must concur in any course proposed, or the proposal falls through. But if there were established in their midst, a class of men invested with power to use their authority, there would be an end to this system of management. Fraternal deliberation would be set aside by the *ipse dixit* of authority. The collective voice would disappear before individual dictum. An odious dictatorship would be established in the place consecrated to mutual service and brotherly co-operation, and the general interest and enterprise of the

brotherhood would be repressed and extinguished by the knowledge, that after all said and done, the individual at the head, who might happen to be stupid and self-willed, would have his own way. In fact, to countenance such an institution, in any shape or form, would be to lay the germ of the system which has cursed the world with Popes and inquisitions. While absolutism is the best system of government when allied to infallible wisdom and magnanimity, it is the very worst possible in the absence of the spirit, when the poor resources of human nature are all we have to fall back upon.

But our correspondent enquires: How can a society exist without rule or authority? We have indicated the answer to this question. A mutual submission to the collective judgment is the basis on which vaster societies than the ecclesia will ever become, are established. Under such a system, official brethren are not rulers, but officers. They merely carry out the wishes of the rest. They give effect to the decision to which the brethren have come. They act as servants of the ecclesia, not as its governors. Authority is impossible with them. Authority is no authority unless a man can say, like the Roman centurion, "Do this," and use power to enforce his command. Who would assume such a position among those united in the truth on terms of absolute equality? No wise man would consent to accept such a position in the house of God, even if requested to fill it, unless indeed God commanded. The spirit of the entire institution of the ecclesia excludes it. The only remedy against recalcitrants is the passive one of withdrawal. We are not yet entrusted with authority. We are on trial for it, and have, meanwhile, to show ourselves worthy of it, among other qualities, by an utter destitution of inclination to exercise it.

But brother Mowatt calls attention to Paul's words to Titus: "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee." He also refers to 1 Tim. iii, in which Paul defines the qualities of the men to be selected as bishops, or overseers, and lays especial emphasis on Paul's language to the elders of Ephesus in Acts xx, 28, where he exhorts them to "feed the flock of God over the which THE HOLY SPIRIT HATH APPOINTED YOU overseers." Now, the argument intended by these references is answered in the passages themselves. The overseers set over the ecclesia in early times were appointed, *not by the ecclesias themselves, but by the spirit operating in Paul and those who co-operated with him in the work of ecclesial organization.* This gave the elders an authority, which (divinely constituted) they could wield without pre-

sumption or offence. Their appointment by the spirit was a guarantee to the ecclesias that they were fit to be entrusted with authority, and commanded for their word a deference which enabled them to rule with effect, while the gifts of the spirit which they individually possessed, were an evidence of their divine station which none could gainsay or resist. The fact that natural qualifications were requisite, is only a proof that the right men were appointed, and that the men so appointed were men in whom the ecclesias could confide, and to whose authority they could submit without danger or humiliation. Doubtless, there are men in our own day possessing those qualifications, but where are the inspired men to appoint them? There are no Pauls, no Timothies, no Tituses, through whom the spirit can signify their election. The spirit is voiceless in our day, except so far as it is heard in the things already written for our instruction. We are, therefore, left to do the best we can. "What our churches want more than anything else," says brother Mowatt, "is proper rule and authority." No doubt of it; and the brethren, as a whole, would hail with joy the establishment of "proper rule and authority;" but how can such things be realised in the absence of the spirit to appoint individuals to exercise authority; Brother Mowatt might say "Paul defines the qualifications; we have only to select the men possessing them;" but here's the point; who is to judge as to whether the qualifications are possessed in a given case? Two sections of the same ecclesia might disagree very much on a point like this. One part might think a certain brother too partial, too excitable, and too little influenced by the teaching of the word to rule, while another part might think him eminently qualified for the office, and how could such a difference be reconciled? The finger of the Spirit would command the submission of all, but when left to natural judgment, so long as men are differently constituted in mind and disposition, there would be an utter impossibility of agreement on such a point. To establish such a principle of appointment would be to import into the pale of an ecclesia the elements of disturbance and contest. Twenty men may be qualified to act as President of the United States, but only the man who is chosen by a popular voice receives the submission of the nation. So there may be men among the brethren capable of ruling the ecclesia, but in the absence of the spirit's token, it is impossible to command adhesion to the appointment of any of them to such an office, and from the great liability of putting a wrong man in, it is highly inexpedient to sanction his appointment by any other means. All we can do is to bring wise counsel to bear on the collective deliberations, and thus give to the col-

lective determination all the value of a wise individual authority. In this way, the wise men of an ecclesia, who, in the days of the spirit-dispensation might have been chosen to rule, will give the ecclesia the benefit of their qualifications. Authority itself is out of the question. It is child's play to assume it where there has been no appointment; it is something worse, for the exercise of it will either create rancour or drive away intelligence and independence from the meeting. "Oppression maketh a wise man mad." This is true in all its degrees. The brethren would submit to any appointment God might make, but the airs of a man of limited intelligence and narrow mind, who might take it into his head that he is called upon to use authority, would be a nuisance which men of ordinary mental parts would feel to be intolerable. He who

is the most fitted to govern has the least disposition to dictate to others. The most that can be done is to appoint officers to perform the duties arising out of an ecclesia's operations. These require the spirit of service, and do not admit of "the element of rule and authority." In the present state of things, so far as the management of an ecclesia's affairs are concerned, there can be no authority but the collective voice expressed by vote. The republican constitution of things is the only one practicable; and this is quite serviceable (though not so effective as a spirit-delegated authority would be) for the main object in view, viz., the promotion of each other's welfare in things spiritual and temporal.

August 9th, 1867.

EDITOR.

INTELLIGENCE.

GATHERING OF BRETHREN IN EDINBURGH.

(Reported by Brother R. Paterson,
of Edinburgh.)

NEXT to the reception of the truth, the most important duty is the building up in it. It is necessary that we should not remain on the surface of things, or be only partially covered with the armour of God; for not only is the enemy in our front, but we are encompassed by him on all sides, and from no quarter are we assailed with more dangerous effect than from those who, while professing to be our friends, are our deadliest foes. But if we have so digested the "strong meat" of the truth as to be covered with the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left, and, by reason of use, have our senses exercised to discern *good* and *evil*, we shall be able in the day of proof to discriminate *who* are our friends, and of consequence the truth's; and we ourselves shall be, as the Master tells us, like unto a man building his house upon a rock—nothing shall break down our foundations. In the realisation of this, the brethren in this city invited many brethren throughout Scotland, and also a few in England, to meet with them on Sunday, 14th July last, to spend the day in the examination of some of those points of our faith, which have been the subject of controversy within the more immediate circles of professed allegiance to the truth. To

this was added the social element, as one calculated in an eminent degree to strengthen the ties that bind us together by fostering the feelings of love, mutual help, and forbearance one towards another.

The following brethren and sisters attended:—From Aytoun—J. Yule; Alloa—James Durie and David Evans; Berwick—John Nesbit; Beith—John Gillies; Biggar—Gavin and Sister Cree; Dunkeld—James Milne and Sister C. Swanson; Dewartown—G. Fairgrieve and A. Pearson; Glasgow—F. Cameron, W. Clark, W. McIntyre, and Fleming; Galashiels—W. Milne and Sister Annie Milne; Haddington—W. Armstrong and Sister Shiels; Innerleithen—W. Dew; Pathhead—J. Lamb; Tranent—Brethren R. Strathearn, J. Archibald, A. Blackhall, D. Beveridge, J. Cunningham, A. Duncan, J. Henderson, C. Hogg, M. McLeod; Sisters M. Hastie, Henderson, and Isabella Strathearn.

In the first part of the day, brother Charles Smith delivered an address on the manifestation of Jesus the Christ, and in connection therewith, examined and refuted the doctrine of his "pre-existence." Referring to the latter part of his subject, he observed, that were the doctrine to be found only within the pale of the names and denominations of Roman and Protestant superstition, we could pass it over as a matter unworthy of remark in a meeting of the household of faith. But the case was not so; for there were men, who would claim us as their brethren, who propounded

the doctrine that Jesus Christ existed as a living, acting agent, *in fact*, before the earth was. He dwelt for some considerable time on various scripture principles, which, in their proper understanding, altogether precluded the possibility of Jesus' personal existence before his being born of Mary,—such as—he had come in the flesh, he put away sin by the sacrifice of himself, and that he was made sin;—and then proceeded to examine one or two of the more prominent passages taken as direct proof on the subject of which the following is the substance:—"And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, the Son of Man who is in heaven." The first thing we require to understand is that expression, "The Son of Man who is in heaven." In what sense was he in heaven? We read, chap. i, 18, "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son *who is in the bosom* of his Father he hath declared him." Jesus, then, was in heaven in the sense of being in the bosom of the Father. He was so by the word of the Father being *the law of his life*, and by the spirit of the Father dwelling in him without measure. The Father, in this way, was manifested to Jesus himself and to Israel; for says he "No man hath seen God at anytime." Jesus in person had not seen God, and yet he was in the bosom of the Father, and in heaven. In mental or moral relationship, he was in direct union with God, and was, therefore, in the heaven. He was in an earthly condition of heavenly things, and it was this he referred to when he said to Nicodemus "If I have told you earthly things and ye believe not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you of heavenly things." The earthly things he had been speaking of were the manifestation of the spirit of the Father in him and the consequences flowing from that manifestation. Having this in our minds, let us turn to John vi, 63, "What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before." This verse contains the same idea as the one we have been looking at in chap. iii. But here the context will help us to understand what the expressions mean: "He that came down from heaven," and "Ascend up where he was before." In this chapter, the leading subject on which Jesus is speaking is eternal life and resurrection from the dead, the first being consequent upon the latter. He tells them to "Labour for the meat which endures unto everlasting life;" and again, "My

Father giveth you the true bread from heaven, I am the living bread which came down from heaven, the bread is my flesh;" and again, "I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." All this is very high figure, and in it Jesus was speaking of his death and resurrection, but they could not comprehend him. Many, therefore, of his disciples, when they had heard this, said "This is an hard saying; who can bear it!" Jesus said "Doth this offend you; what and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before." Keeping in mind that he was speaking of death and resurrection, and that before this took place, he was in the heaven, in the bosom of the Father, let us read the statement of Paul, that "He that ascended, who is it, but he that descended first into the lower parts of the earth. He that descended (from the earthly manifestation of heavenly things) is the same also who ascended far above all heavens (connected with this earth), that he may fulfil all things. For he is the head over all things to the church, which is his body. the fulness of him (the Father), who filleth all in all. From this it will be seen that these two passages do not refer to Jesus before his manifestation to Israel. I shall now notice that passage in John viii, 58: "Before Abraham was, I am;" and that one in chap. xvii, 5. I shall treat both these passages upon one principle, and that is, that with God all things exist. The Deity is a Builder, and he also is his own Architect. He had his plan all arranged before he began his work. Now take away from this plan the Lord Jesus in his glory, and what would it be? It would only, in the language of the dreamers of the Apostacy, be a collapse—a "crash of worlds." In the existence of Christ's glory, the Christ existed, but only in purpose, from the beginning. The Word of the Deity relates to all this glory, and he gave this word to Jesus. Jesus, in giving it to the Apostles, addresses the Father: "The glory which thou gavest me, I have given them." In this sense, he existed before Abraham; for Abraham's existence was in view of the Christ. The promise or covenant made to Abraham referred to this glory; and it was confirmed in Christ 430 years before the Mosaic Law. This statement of Paul's in itself proves that Christ existed then only in type; for had he existed in person, the confirmation of the covenant would have required his personal death.

Brother Smith was supported by brethren Strathearn, Yule, Cree, and Nesbit.

(We are obliged, for want of space, to hold over the second part of the foregoing report till next month.)

TOUR IN SCOTLAND.—The lateness of the month prevents the appearance of any narrative in the present number. Something may be expected next month on the several matters suggested by a visit to Edinburgh, Aberdeen, Fetterangus, Turriff, Glasgow, Wishaw, and Beith.

THE STATE OF AFFAIRS ON THE CONTINENT.—Absence in Scotland, combined with pressure of matter, has interfered with the preparation of our monthly summary of political events transpiring on the continent. We have the usual bunch of newspaper material from brother J. J. Andrew, of London, who acts the part of watchman and recorder in the political observatory; and this material is of the most hopeful description, showing the increasing fermentation that is in progress among the nations, and the steady development of the Roman and Eastern questions in the right direction. We are, however, from the cause mentioned, prevented from giving our readers the benefit. We hope next month to make up for the present defect.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS, from causes mentioned, are inevitably held over. Next month will probably afford the opportunity of bringing up arrears to some extent.

THE ONLY AUTHORITATIVE VOICE.—A brother having written to Dr. Thomas, requesting his "authoritative voice on points of doctrine submitted," the Doctor remarks in reply, "If I were to consent, I should be set down for a pope at once. Let the voice of the truth, in fraternal and kind contention for the faith, be the authority for each. There are partizan adherents to all causes, who surrender their minds to personal

authority, and endorse whatever comes from that source without examination. I am opposed to 'authoritative voices,' other than the voices of the prophets and apostles, and even theirs must be understood to be beneficial."

THE NATURE OF CHRIST.—A.E.B.—Your answer to sister Lassius on this subject is unsuited for the *Ambassador*. It is not an answer to her general argument, but a criticism on only one point of the subject, and that of a purely subordinate character, and one which in itself, is speculative, abstract, and comparatively unimportant. The question whether Christ could have sinned, is of no moment in view of the fact that he did not sin. The vital point is, Who was he?—eternal God incarnate, or "a man anointed with the holy spirit and with power?" On this point, if we apprehend you aright, you do not disagree with sister Lassius, and hence, there is no just reason for your attitude of apparent hostility to her views. We are prepared to accept, "the co-operation of the intelligence of scripturally-enlightened brethren and sisters," in getting up the *Ambassador*. We desire such co-operation, and as a matter of fact, we avail ourselves of it, so far as it is within reach in a useful form; but this policy must be kept strictly subordinate to the interests of the truth, the interest of the reader, and the interest of the *Ambassador*. It would not be conducive to any of these interests to publish everything that sincerity may put on paper. Sincerity is sometimes ignorant, and sometimes unable to use itself to the profit of others. We are obliged to exercise the degree of supervision, necessary occasionally to hold back the productions of such a state of mind—productions written from the best of motives, but too feeble to be effective for good, too flimsy and hypercritical to be useful, or too narrow (and perhaps a little mistaken) in the apprehension of the subject dealt with, to be profitable.

Several items of intelligence are held over till next month, in consequence of the pre-occupation of space.

THE FOURTH EDITION OF TWELVE LECTURES.—Our readers will please take notice that the *shilling copies of the new edition of the Lectures are all sold*, and that in future, the price will be TWO SHILLINGS.

THE APPEAL FOR HELP.—We have the following responses to the appeal which appeared last month on behalf of a needy brother and sister:—a friend, 5s.; a brother, 10s.; Liverpool ecclesia, £1; a sister, 2s.; a brother, 9s. (viz., 6s. for the brother and 3s. for the sister); a sister, 2s.; Leeds ecclesia, 10s.; a sister, £1; a brother, 2s.; a friend, 4s.

THE ADVERTISING SCHEME.—This awaits the action of friends. A few have spoken, but more is required before anything effective can be done. The cause of the truth is on the move with accelerating speed. Shall we give the chariot an extra push by the way? This can be done by endorsing brother Andrew's proposal, and supporting it with 2d., 6d., 1s., 2s.6d., or 5s. per month, for (say) six or twelve months, according to our ability. Occasional advertisements in the literary press will be so many finger posts put up for the perchance guidance of benighted travellers.

A SUGGESTION AS TO THE DATE OF CHRIST'S APPEARING.

DERBY, Sep. 1st, 1867.

DEAR BROTHER ROBERTS,—Will you please find a corner in the *Ambassador* for the following suggestions to the heirs of the coming kingdom, for their deeper search into the teachings of the Lord God of Israel on Mount Sinai, concerning the three feasts that were to be kept unto him in the year, (Ex. xxiii, 14-17), and more detailed in Lev. xxiii, 23. The first feast—the Passover—was antitypically fulfilled in the death of Christ on the very day (Nisan 14) that it was instituted. The second—the feast of first fruits, which began the morrow after the sabbath from Passover, and ended on the day of Pentecost—was also antitypically fulfilled in the person of Christ, who on the very day on which the sheaf was waved for acceptance, by resurrection, became the “first fruits of them that sleep.” The two loaves—being the perfected produce of the sheaf—were waved on the day of Pentecost at the end of the seven sabbaths. We find this also antitypically fulfilled in the result of the Holy One's resurrection and exaltation, viz., the shedding forth of that which the men and brethren saw and heard. (Acts ii, 37.) The third feast began on the first of the seventh month, by the blowing of trumpets and the calling an holy convocation. On the 15th day was the feast of tabernacles in remembrance of the dwelling in booths in the wilderness. Has this feast ever met with its antitypical fulfilment? Is the “ingathering” of Christ's brethren accomplished? May we not look for that event on the 30th of September, which is the first day of the Jewish seventh month? To what can the word TRUMPET refer in Matt. xxiv, 31; John v, 25; 1 Cor. xv, 52; 1 Thess. iv, 16; except to that which the Lord God gave as a type of those events named in the texts. By analogy drawn from the fulfilment of the

first two feasts on the very days of their celebration, we may justly expect that that harvest which relates to “Christ as the first fruits” will be completely gathered on the day appointed for the Jewish feast of “ingathering,” inaugurated by the blowing of trumpets on the first of the month Tisri, whatever year that may be; and if among the various views held concerning data, the Phocan decree should be the correct beginning of the “revelation of the man of sin,” then the Son of Man will cause the dead to hear his voice this year.—Amen. “Come, Lord Jesus.” I am, yours in Christ,

H. BANNISTER.

THE EUROPEAN SITUATION.—The *Glasgow Evening Post*, of August 26th, thus summarizes the state of affairs on the Continent:—

A Constantinople despatch, dated Saturday, announces the destruction of the famous blockade runner, *Arkadi*. While the Turks have succeeded in ridding themselves of this by no means inconsiderable enemy, difficulties seem to be accumulating around them elsewhere. In Bulgaria the unfortunate Turks have also to cope with an insurrection, and Vienna advices inform us that a conspiracy is on foot in Montenegro, with the avowed object of overturning the government and uniting the Principality with that of Servia. It is only the other day that 9,000 Prussian needle guns were seized on the Hungarian frontier, on their way to the Danubian Principalities. Turkey, in fact, appears to be beset on all hands, and it will be strange indeed, if with so many trains on fire, a violent explosion does not take place. The whole European Continent, indeed, seems restless and dissatisfied, and men's minds anxiously anticipate future trouble. It is hardly possible, as affairs are at present, that a war could be begun in Europe without becoming general, and on a scale compared to which that of last year would be trifling.

TO AMERICAN SUBSCRIBERS.

Our American agent (bro. J. Donaldson,) has been sick, and unable, for several weeks, to answer letters from American subscribers. Those having any business unattended to he requests to write again. He also wishes us to state that the *Marturion* is the only paper on the American side of the Atlantic set for the defence of the truth, and that it is worthy of all support. He will book the names of subscribers.

THE AMBASSADOR

Of the Coming Age.

"A wicked Messenger falleth into mischief, but a faithful Ambassador is health."—PROV. xiii, 17.

No. 40.

OCTOBER, 1867.

Vol. IV.

ENLARGEMENT OF THE AMBASSADOR.

In accordance with the promise given in the August number of last year, the *Ambassador* is this month enlarged to twenty-eight pages, without extra charge. A steady increase in the circulation permits of this, thanks, principally, to the zealous industry of brother Donaldson, of Detroit, Mich., U.S., who, of his own motion, has created a large American subscription list, when there was no reason to hope that such a thing would ever exist. A proposal for a final enlargement to thirty-two pages and some considerable increase of price, will probably be made in a short time, when the close of the Bankruptcy Court, by the new Act, will compel the Editor to choose between devoting himself entirely to the truth, or returning to newspaper employment, and giving up the *Ambassador*. Our readers will be called upon to decide for themselves, which of these alternatives shall be adopted. In the former case, while providing a livelihood by exertions equally independent and honourable with those which in past times have drawn it from purely secular sources, the Editor would be free, at any time, to serve the truth in any part of the country, being able to command his time at convenience. The business connected with the *Ambassador* has grown to dimensions which preclude its being carried on concurrently with newspaper work. So that it comes to be a necessity, in case of present employment failing, to attend to *Ambassador*-work exclusively, or give it up altogether. It will depend upon the willingness of subscribers to submit to an increased subscription, whether the one decision or the other be arrived at. We mention the matter beforehand, so that it may not come upon them unawares.

September 19th, 1867.

EDITOR.

THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF JUDGMENT.

BY J. J. ANDREW, LONDON.

[Though this subject has been largely treated in recent numbers of the *Ambassador*, it has not been exhausted; and its great importance, from both a theoretical and practical point of view, will justify its further and continued exhibition to the mind of the reader, in the following and succeeding articles from the pen of Brother ANDREW, of London, who writes in a plain, intelligible, logical, and pleasing style.—EDITOR.]

In considering this doctrine, the first point to be settled is, the meaning of the word "judge." In the English language it is used in two different ways; the first is represented by such words as discern, distinguish, consider, determine, estimate, or form an opinion; the second not only comprises this meaning, but it further implies action as the result of the opinion formed, and, when applied to legal matters, is represented by such phrases as, bring to trial, pass sentence, doom to punishment, &c. The first meaning is applicable to animate or inanimate objects, to abstract or concrete questions; but the second has reference solely to the conduct of individuals. The Greek word used in the original text of the New Testament is *κρίνω* (*krino*), and its meaning, according to Liddell and Scott's *Lexicon*, is as follows: "To separate, divide, put apart, inquire, search into, decide (a contest or dispute), judge of, estimate, bring to trial, accuse, arraign, pass sentence upon, condemn."

It will be seen from this that its radical meaning is precisely the same as that of the English word "judge," and likewise that it is applicable to both persons and things. It is only in its application to persons that our present inquiry relates; not, however, in regard to the relationship existing between man and man, but to that which exists between God and man. When man judges man, the innocent often suffer and the guilty escape; but when God judges man, the principles of justice are so infallibly carried out, that no one is punished or rewarded more than he deserves. God first prescribes a course for a man to pursue, and then judges him by the extent of his obedience. This truth is set forth by Paul in the following words: "As many as have *sinned without law* shall perish without law; and as many as have *sinned in the law* shall be judged by the law."—(Rom. ii, 12.) From this it is evident that only those who are acquainted with God's revealed will are responsible to him for their actions, and that all others will be amenable neither to his censure nor his praise. Hence, says the same apostle, "Where no law is, there is no transgression" (Rom. iv, 15.) Seeing that all who are ignorant of God's law are not in a position to fulfil its requirements, it is but in accordance with the barest ideas of justice, that they should not be punished for doing that which it was impossible for them to know was contrary to the divine will. With the other class, the case is different; they are brought under a probationary process, in which they are

plainly informed what course of conduct will entitle them to the Deity's approval, and what will subject them to his condemnation. In the one case, they will receive the gift of immortality; in the other, they will be punished with their many or few stripes, according to their deserts, and, finally, be destroyed. To decide these cases is a most important task, and could only be properly done by an infallible being—the Deity. Paul gives expression to this truth in the following words: "God will render to every man according to his deeds; to them, who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory, honour, and immortality—eternal life; but unto them who are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil."—(Rom. ii, 6-9.) Solomon also informs us that "God shall judge the righteous and the wicked; for there is a time for every purpose and every work."—(Eccles. iii, 17.) In his wisdom, God has seen fit that this work shall be performed by deputy, and hence the apostle says "As many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law, * * * in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel."—(Rom. ii, 12, 16.)

The same truth was also affirmed by Jesus himself: "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the son."—(John v, 22.) This is undoubtedly one of the greatest honours bestowed upon the saviour of men, and its vast importance is evident from the fact that it is in accordance with Paul's gospel—that it is the gospel of salvation as preached by himself and the other apostles after Christ's death.

Respecting this gospel, the same apostle says, on another occasion: "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preached *any other gospel* unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."—(Gal. i, 8.)

If the preaching of another gospel brings a man into condemnation, it follows that if anyone preach the true gospel imperfectly, or in an adulterated form, he is subject to a proportionate amount of censure. It behoves all, therefore, who profess to have believed Paul's gospel, to examine themselves as to whether their knowledge of the divine truth, that "God shall judge the secrets of men by Christ Jesus," is "according to" or contrary to Paul's gospel.

For further testimony to the importance of this truth, we need only refer to the statement made by Peter in the house of Cornelius: "Jesus of Nazareth *commanded us* to preach unto the people, and to testify that *it was he* who was ordained of God to be *the judge of quick and dead.*"—(Acts x, 42.) When it is remembered that neither God nor his son Jesus ever did anything superfluous, or instructed others to do so, it must be seen that this command—said by Peter to have been given to the apostles—is one which must not, on any account, be disregarded, either by those who preach, or those who only believe the gospel proclaimed on this occasion.

1.—The plain fact contained in this declaration, that Jesus Christ is the judge of quick and dead, is one which no one believing in the inspiration of the Bible, would dare to deny. But a mere assent to these words of Scripture, without an intelligent understanding of their meaning, is of no use; any more than is a nominal belief in Jesus Christ, without knowing

who and what he is, and what was the nature of his mission to mankind. For instance, a man might take Paul's statement, "It is appointed unto men once to die, and after death the judgment" (Heb. ix, 27), and without examining any part of scripture, might conclude that Jesus Christ judges men immediately after death; but this we know to be a most grievous error, because we are told that a certain time is fixed for the performance of this duty, and that time is the second appearing of the judge himself: "I charge thee, therefore, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who *shall judge* the quick and the dead *at his appearing* and his kingdom."—(2 Tim. iv, 1.) To believe, then, that Jesus Christ is the judge of quick and dead, comprises first of all the *time* when the event is to take place.

2.—The next point to be ascertained is, are the "quick and dead" to be in presence of the judge when he judges them? That this question must be answered in the affirmative, is evident from the following passage in the epistle to the Romans: "We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ."—(Rom. xiv, 10.) Those who say that the dead are judged while in the grave, nullify this truth, and shew that they do not apprehend the true nature of the judgment; for if their view be correct, what necessity is there for anyone to stand before the judgment-seat? If persons are to be judged before being raised from the dead, there will be no necessity to judge them after that event. To understand correctly, therefore, what the judgment really is, it is necessary to know that the quick and the dead are to be judged while *in the presence of the judge*.

3.—The perusal of the apostle's statement suggests a further question, viz., what is the object for which responsible beings are to stand before Christ's judgment-seat? Is it to hear the condemnation or approval of each one pronounced? This is one object no doubt, but there is something else to precede that, viz., to deliver an account of their actions during their time of probation; for Paul says, in a subsequent verse, "everyone of us shall give account of himself to God." In this statement we see a confirmation of the last conclusion we arrived at—that the dead are to be brought to life before being judged; because it is obvious that they must be alive when they give their account. Here there is another fact comprised in the apostolic teaching, concerning the judgment, that all the disciples of Jesus Christ are *to give an account of their conduct to the judge*.

4.—The last and most important point to be settled is, what are the results which are produced by the judgment on those who are subjected to it? Does it merely define the degree of reward to be bestowed on each person, or does it bring punishment on the guilty and blessing upon the righteous? This question is, we think, very clearly decided by Paul in the following passage: "We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that everyone may receive the things *through the body*, according to that he hath done, *whether good or bad*," (correct translation, see the *Emphatic Diaglott*).—(2 Cor. iv, 10.)

Respecting that which a man "hath done," we read in another epistle, "Whatever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting."—(Gal vi, 7, 8.) The "bad" things are here defined as "sowing to the flesh," and the "good" things

as "sowing to the spirit." The fruit to be reaped for the former is "corruption," while that for the latter is "life everlasting." Those, therefore, who "receive the things through the body according to that" which is "bad," will suffer "corruption," or, as Peter says, they "shall utterly perish in their own corruption" (2 Pet. ii, 12), a result defined in the Apocalypse as "the second death." But those who "receive the things through the body according to that" which is "good," will be endowed with "life everlasting." Hence, when Paul says "*We must all appear before the judgment-seat,*" he alludes, not to the latter class only, but to all the disciples of Jesus Christ, whether worthy or unworthy. It is obvious that neither class reap according to their good or bad deeds, previous to appearing before the judgment-seat; and it, therefore, follows that they must all appear there in bodies capable of either suffering "corruption," or of being endowed with "life everlasting." From this we conclude that *none of them possess immortal bodies when standing at the judgment-seat*, for, if they did, they would have been judged previously; the "dead" would have been judged in the grave, and the "quick" would have been judged before being summoned there.*

Thus we see that to understand the judgment correctly, it is necessary to know what is its object—to *decide who are and who are not worthy of eternal life*; and this implies a knowledge of their condition when they appear before the judge—that they are *all to be destitute of immortality*.

We have now ascertained that an intelligent belief of the divine truth, that "God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ," comprises the following items:

- 1.—That it is to take place at the second advent.
- 2.—That the quick and dead are to appear in the presence of the judge when they are judged.
- 3.—That they have all to give an account to the judge of their probationary career.
- 4.—That after the decision of the judge has been pronounced, the unworthy servants are to suffer punishment, and then be destroyed.

These, we think, are the only logical conclusions to be derived from Paul's teaching concerning the judgment; and, in proof that they are correct, we find them confirmed in other parts of scripture. Let us take,

* NOTE.—If it be asked how the "quick" are to be conveyed to the judgment-seat, we would say that this is a matter of detail not distinctly stated. But, judging from similar incidents recorded in the scriptures, it would appear that they will be transferred by the power of the spirit, somewhat after the manner in which Elijah, Jesus, and Philip were suddenly removed from one place to another. That something of this kind will be necessary, is obvious from the fact that the "quick"—those who are alive at the second advent—will comprise both worthy and unworthy believers; so that even if the former were able, by virtue of the inherent power, which possession of immortal bodies would endow them with, to transfer themselves to the seat of judgment, the latter could not do so: they at least would have to be removed by a power superior to themselves. But when it is remembered for what object they are all to appear at the judgment-seat—to receive the reward or punishment they may deserve—it will be seen that what is necessary for one class is equally necessary for the other. Hence, we conclude that the removal of the "quick" to the presence of the judge, will not in any way depend upon their own will or power, but that it will be effected by the irresistible power of the Deity—even the same power by which the dead are to be brought to life—the spirit of God.

first of all, the teaching of Jesus himself, who illustrated these truths both by narrative and parable.

The twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew contains a full description of this momentous event. First, we have the fact stated that Jesus Christ shall perform his judicial duties when he appears in his glory: "*When the Son of Man shall come in his glory * * * then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats; and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left.*"—(verses 31 to 33.) Then we have the decision of the judge respecting the sheep and the goats, with a statement of his reasons, and, lastly, comes the carrying into effect of that decision. From the circumstance that those who are to be judged are here called "all nations," it is inferred by some that this narrative refers to national judgment; but this is evidently a mistake, because the judged ones are only composed of sheep and goats; and, respecting the former class, we read "Then shall the king say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, *inherit the kingdom* prepared for you from the foundation of the world."—(verse 34.) Until this event has occurred, no judgment on the Gentile nations will be inflicted, because:

1.—In the execution of them the Messiah is to be assisted by the resurrected righteous (Psalm cxlix, 5-9), and "judgment" is not to be "given to the saints of the Most High" until the time comes that they receive authority to take possession of the kingdom (Dan. ii, 22); for as servants of the "king over all the earth" (Zech. xiv, 9), one of the chief reasons why they have to "fight against the nations" (Zech. xiv, 3; John xviii, 36), and "execute upon the kings and nobles the judgment written" (Psalm cxlix, 8), is in order that "the kingdoms of this world (may) become our Lord's and his Christ's."—(Rev. 11-15.)

2.—We are distinctly told that "judgment *must begin* at the household of God; and if it first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God" (1 Pet., iv, 17); so that the nations can none of them be judged until all the members of God's household have first appeared at the judgment-seat of Christ. The most probable meaning, therefore, of "all nations," is that those who stand before the judge will be composed of individuals gathered out of all nations, or, as they are represented in the Apocalypse, "redeemed out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation."—(Rev. v, 9.)

Respecting the second class, the goats, we find these words recorded: "Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand "*Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil [adversary] and his angels*" [messengers.]—(verse 41.) For the persons here mentioned to be brought before the judgment-seat, is a proof that they must have been responsible to God, in some way or other, by a knowledge of his law; because only those who are under his law are to be judged by it, and they who are "without law shall perish without law." The same may also be said of those who inherit the kingdom. These two classes, comprising all who are subjected to this judicial process, are both composed entirely of responsible beings, and not a word is here said about the infliction of

national judgments on the unbelieving Gentiles. If, therefore, the word "nation" is here interpreted to denote unbelievers, it is very strange that nothing is said about the punishment to be inflicted upon them. One portion of the individuals comprehended under the term "nations" enter the kingdom, and the remainder are all consigned to the fire prepared for the political and ecclesiastical adversaries of Christ; thus shewing that this description of the judgment applies only to the household of God. This affords an additional reason for concluding that the word "nations" is here used only to describe those who have been gathered out of the sea of nations by the net of the kingdom.

It will have been observed that the division of the multitude into two classes—the sheep and the goats, or the worthy and the unworthy—does not take place until after their appearance before the judge; and that the approval of the one and the condemnation of the other, follows their separation. The result of approval is entrance into the kingdom, while that of condemnation is the infliction of punishment ending in death. These results are summarized in the last verse of the chapter, as follows: "*These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous (shall go) into life eternal.*" If, as we learn from this narrative, the righteous are in such a condition when before the judgment-seat, that, at their separation from the wicked, they require authority to inherit the kingdom, and, at the close of the judicial process, the judge can consistently say of them "*they (shall go) into eternal life,*" is it not plain that they are not endowed with immortality until after the judgment? According to this description, it is evident that the judgment is for the express purpose of deciding who are worthy of eternal life. To say, then, that they are immortal before they appear there, is to reduce this important event to an empty, unmeaning ceremony—much in the same way as do those who affirm that men go to heaven at death.

(To be continued.)

TOUR IN SCOTLAND.

On Friday, the 9th of August, the Editor left Birmingham by the night train for Scotland, intending a visit, for the truth's sake, to several places in that part of Britain. In projecting and prosecuting the journey, he had to leave out of account and set his face against the evil mind existing in divers parts of the country, believing it better to fight for the good and (implementally) with the good, than for one moment to be turned out of the way by the evil. It were a pity that a right policy should be restrained or twisted to suit the unhappy tempers of discontented people. Good, and not evil, must rule our determinations. There will always rankle jealous and ungenerous

feelings in the minds of those who are incapable of appreciating a high motive. These are not to be taken into account. People of narrow mind and ignoble aim cannot understand a higher state of mind than their own. It is not in the nature of things that they should. A man can only appreciate what he understands, and he can only understand where his own consciousness has some power of reflecting the thing presented. The rogue cannot believe in honesty, and the honest simpleton finds it difficult to credit roguery. A man must, therefore, look at a higher standard than the opinion of his fellows. He must steer by a higher light. He must lay hold

on God, and if necessary, live in himself, while externally holding intercourse with people around him, sustaining Godward a relation of inner being which may not be comprehended by the run, but which, seen of God, is a continual well-spring of strength and tranquillity. The sons of God will understand; the children of the flesh will speak evil of the things they understand not. As an example of the latter, we publish the following, received within the last few days: "Unless you improve your magazine, both from a commonsense and literary point of view, as well as general consistency, the sooner you stop both my father's and mine too the better. I am sorrow to say that you appear to have got so thoroughly puffed-up with pride, so that nothing can be listened to but what panders to that depraved passion. It is no doubt very pleasing to be flattered and caressed, but if this is what you are working for, woe to you at your much talked-of, but little-fearing judgment. "The reprofe of a friend is health." I am one who will stand for truth and consistency, no matter what vagaries others may run into."

The first place visited was Edinburgh. Here there are many hindrances. Orthodoxy is fortified to the heavens. There is a university, several colleges, numerous churches and chapels, and many men, lay and clerical, in reputation for great wisdom. They form a bulwark not to be stormed by the feeble forces now at the command of the truth—an impregnable fortress of the orthodox delusion. The compact is powerful for the maintenance of error. The whole of society is so put together, that each part keeps every other part in bondage. The leaders, when boys, learnt by rote and with unquestioning reverence, the things believed by past generations, and before they had attained the capability of independent judgment, they had committed themselves with ardour, hope and ambition, to the pursuit and maintenance of the system founded on these things; and once in the ranks—the numerous, powerful, wealthy, respectable ranks of orthodoxy—they are bound hand and foot with ropes of silk and chains of gold. Every avenue of escape is stopped up. There is only one thing they can do with safety, and that is, to pillarise the system; to do anything else would be to run against their dearest interests, their deepest prejudices, their strongest preconceptions, their tenderest solitudes. Few men—scarcely any—have either the intellectual strength or moral hardihood to

extricate themselves from the coils. Society jams them into their places; the affections and interests of life bind them to it with sweetest cords. Should one dream for a moment that all is not right, the dawning idea is quickly extinguished by the numbers and the influence of those in the same plight with himself—talented men—venerable fathers—professors—men of 'degrees'—men known to fame—can all these be wrong? Impossible! The united glare—though it be but the merest candle-light in nether darkness—deceives his senses. In the absence of daylight, he mistakes it for the sun, and reconsigns himself to his benighted subterranean abode. Poor men, all! They will rub their eyes in sad consternation, when their underground refuge of lies is broken up, and the blinding sunlight comes streaming in. Meanwhile, they are stumbling-blocks, blinds, and snares to each other. "Aren't we the learned, to whom all the world pays homage? Isn't this the Athens of the 19th century?" And if to themselves a barrier in the way, how much more to the people. These (poor deluded creatures), place the most implicit faith in their talented men, and take it all for granted. Nothing can shake their confidence. With what a glorious laugh of self-complaisance they shake their sides at the suggestion that their wise men are all off the track! Tell them that the blaze of light from that bright firmament of doctors of divinity, professors of languages, learned divines, men of talent of every school, grade, and department, is but an *aurora borealis*—a phenomenon of night—a mere appearance destined to vanish before the rising sun! Why you insult them if you really frame to be serious about it. Aren't they the educated people of Edinburgh? Haven't they a university, more than one college, a school of arts, endless literary and educational institutions, great publishing firms, societies that ramify throughout the world, authors and orators whose names are household words wherever the English language is spoken? Besides, is it to be forgotten that they are the metropolis of Scotland—that the great families have their head quarters there—that lords and ladies are common things, and that the flavour of aristocracy, learning and refinement prevails over all? The people of Edinburgh really feel that they are something above the common run, and ought to understand "a thing or two," and no doubt they have something to be thankful for; but so far as spiritual things

are concerned, they are precisely in the position of the Laodiceans. They are cursed with the meanest and the leanest of poverty, under the specially unfortunate circumstance that they imagine themselves the wealthiest community in the world. This constitutes Edinburgh a bad field for the truth. The people are too wise in their own conceit, and too strong in the confidence they repose in their leaders, to listen to anything so revolutionary as the truth. There is, however, another side to the picture. The prevalence of education and the pursuit of intellectual activity, of one sort and another, for generations, have developed a good phrenological type among the people, and to that extent, "good soil" exists in perhaps a larger proportion than in most towns. The drawback is this, that the good soil is pre-occupied. The whole area is parcelled off into plots, which are almost all of them owned, protected, and cultivated by proprietors who hate the good seed of the kingdom or only require to know it, to oppose. Thus the seed has little chance of entering the soil, and still less of coming to anything, even if it get, perchance, thrown over the wall; for the great plenty of other plants chokes the word, and the careful gardeners quickly root up the suspicious exotic, if it begin to show leaves above ground. Yet, after all said and done, there is more to be accomplished in Edinburgh than has been attempted. The truth has had but little chance yet. In the days when Dowieism was in the ascendant, it had none; for it was then made a merit not to preach the gospel. It was denied there was any right to do it, or any duty in the matter. Concerts and literary lectures were the order of the day. The truth of God was kept in the background. The community which professed to be a pillar of the truth, was a mound that covered it in ruins; instead of being a candlestick on which the light was set, it was a dark lantern, badly trimmed, in which a flickering flame, going out, could scarcely be discerned through the crevices of the outside covering. Times have mended a little since then, but not greatly, so far as Edinburgh's chances of getting the truth are concerned. The brethren who came out from the Dowieites have taken a good while to throw off the stupefying effects of the bad air they breathed so long. They have not yet fully risen to the vigour of witnesses for the truth. They have not as a whole realised their duty to the outer darkness. They are still, some of them, tainted with the conventional delicacies

which keep the truth down at the bottom, and practically exalt temporal well-being as the first concern. They are not yet wholly the Lord's servants. The germ, however, of a more active vitality exists among them. One good sign is that they have adopted the name Christadelphian; this is a symptom of increasing robustness of feeling in relation to their position. The uncertain and the dilutist class—*alias*, the Dowieites—hold the name in abomination. The world-caterised coward, who holds the truth as a theory, but clasps this life to his bosom, is ashamed of it. The thorough-going and the faithful are pleased to be distinguished by it from the great nondescript mass of "christians," who rejoice in the lies and vanities and impostures of the Man of Sin. When we say the Edinburgh brethren have adopted the name "Christadelphian," we do not refer to any collective or formal resolution in the matter, but to the fact that the lecture to be delivered by the Editor, was announced by them under the following heading—

CHRISTADELPHIANS

(*Christou adelphoi*)

AGAINST CHRISTIANS.

We heard say that one or two grumbled at this; this only indicates a lingering trace of the old leaven. The salt of the ecclesia endorsed it, and it is to be hoped that the salt will more and more prevail, till the whole is seasoned as a well-prepared dish for the King.

The editor stayed only one day, and gave but one lecture. He would have given more attention to Edinburgh than this, but for two things: the limited time at disposal compelled a preference for those places that were most in need, and in which labour might probably be more productive. In the second place, the door of utterance was not very wide in Edinburgh, not so wide as it might have been. The brethren are keepers of this door, to some extent, in every place where they exist. It is their business to throw it open as wide as possible, and they are responsible if they neglect their duty. In this case, they did not open it at all. They left the editor to push it a little ajar, and only didn't just slam it in his face. They left it to him to say, he was coming and how long he would stay, and made no suggestion of more extended operations, and no arrangement by which even the

little labour offered should be utilized as much as possible, but crowded into a mere houseapartment, the endeavour which, with a little enterprise, might have had given to it a wider and stronger effect. Such poor-spirited policy is a mistake. What are well-to-do brethren afraid of? Expense? They spend money on their persons, their houses, and their tables; and is the truth less worthy? Ought not the cause of the truth to stand the highest? Or are they afraid of compromising their respectability too publicly? Let them know that shame will recoil with disgrace in the day when Christ comes to acknowledge where he is acknowledged. Is it that they are lukewarm and insensible to their duty, paralysed by the deception practised on the senses by the world, which appears to be real, while all the while it is the merest shadow, flitting with every hour? Or is it that they are afraid of giving too much scope to the stripling? afraid that he will feel too much honoured? afraid that he will get above them? Let them rouse and fling away this nonsense. The stripling has only one earnest business in hand, and has no other interest to serve or object to promote. The paltry jealousy fostered by the tongue of the slanderer is a hindrance. Let the sons of God in Edinburgh throw it to the winds. The stripling has been too well castigated from the beginning to spoil now. He sets but one thing before his mind—and this he pursues by inflexible courses which are sometimes evil interpreted by those who are trampled on the toes thereby—and that is, the promotion of the truth, and *the protection and encouragement of its results among those who receive it.* To accomplish this, he has laboured and spent money for years, fagging body and mind continually, and impoverishing his pocket on every hand. Are brethren afraid to encourage him in this? What is his offence? He is young and plain. If he were a lordly visitor, from parts unknown, with fine clothes, and bumptious "we-are-the-people" airs, wouldn't they exert themselves and make a fuss, and say great things? But being a young man whom they knew as a boy, who makes no brag, and puts on no airs, but does the work, they are afraid to open the door to him. They will repent this perhaps in time. Don't let them delude themselves with the idea that "deep things" are their exclusive property. "Deep things," as they talk, may be but the illusions of morbid ingenuity. "Deep things" are sometimes deep mire in which a man may lose himself. There are deep things, but there is a

medium in all things. About the glorious gospel of the blessed God, there is no mistake.

There are those who slanderously impute evil aims, and say many things that are as utterly false as a lie can be; and there are many to open their greedy mouths and smack their lips over the delicious morsels. This is why the editor submits to the humiliation of putting in a word for himself, that the barriers of an unreasonable and mischief-working jealousy may perchance be removed from the path of the truth's progress, at least among those who ought to be, in Edinburgh, the untiring, the enterprising, the unselfish, and the by all and by any means, effective soldiers of Christ.

As to the Dowieites, it is not to be wondered at that they should be full of bad feeling and evil speaking. They have no answer to our case against them on the merits, and so they indulge in personal disparagements. This we pass by, with the simple observation that no one shall be able, on a fair, close, and personal examination for himself, to verify a single point in the allegations that are made to our detriment. They are every one of them falsehoods.

The report of the meeting at George Dowie's house did not give satisfaction to the Dowieites. This was to be expected. But they actually profess to be shocked at it, as if it were a falsification of what took place. To all suggestions of this description, we simply say they are wickedly untrue. The report we gave was an exact representation of what took place; and one of the more candid of the Dowieites informed us that when it appeared, they were all surprised at its exactness as a production of memory. How dare they say a single word against it, when they themselves prevented those notes from being taken which would have given an unimpeachable record. Some of them profess to give a correct report as against ours, alleged to be false. How do they come by it? Did they take notes? Do they write short-hand? No. Nobody took notes. Everybody speaks from memory. Is their memory infallible? W. Norrie's report of the discussion among themselves is the best evidence of the truthfulness of ours. The reports support each other. But the Dowieites are in straits evidently, and feel the shame of their position, or they would never resort to the low device of denying the truthfulness of a report, which unfortunately, (through their own cowardice) there are

no means, as a matter of evidence, of proving to be correct. They cannot, however, deny their own report; although this was attempted by George Dowie at the meeting in question. W. Norrie, who framed the report from short-hand notes, at once expressed his surprise that his report should be called in question. Geo. Dowie then said that everything that was said was not reported! If this is a just ground of denying its truthfulness, almost every newspaper report that appears may be denied; for rarely is everything reported. It is in a sense *impossible* that everything can be reported. There are repetitions and ramblings into other subjects, of which speeches are denuded in the process of condensation; but reports, nevertheless, fairly represent the sentiments of the persons reported. This was the case with the report by W. Norrie. Surely they cannot impute mendacity to him (one of themselves). Surely they do not think he made wilful omissions, to throw a false light on things published. The speeches published represent the sentiments entertained; and it is the exposure of the sentiments that has given the offence. It is here where the sore is felt. Why not bravely defend the sentiments, instead of striving to shirk the effect of them, by paltry outcries about the report? This would be a manlier course, but good sense does not rule. In default of a good answer on the question at issue, they resort to vilification. This is a very ancient policy, but not to be misunderstood. We take notice of it only to prevent the unwary being caught, and not because it is worthy of it.

The next place of call was Aberdeen. Here the door was set more widely open. The brethren had arranged for a course of lectures to be given—four (on week nights) in their ordinary place of meeting,—a room capable of seating about 200 people, and two (on Sunday), in the “ball room,” a place three or four times the size of the other, situate in the same block of buildings, known as the Music Hall Buildings.

SUBJECTS:—

- 1.—The kingdom of God a gospel proclamation, a prophetic disclosure, and an item of saving faith.
- 2.—The restoration of the Jews a divine purpose, and an element of the scheme of salvation.
- 3.—The promised inheritance in relation to the popular doctrine of heaven and hell.

4.—The Second Coming of Christ the true hope of the believer, and the only cure for the world's affliction.

5.—The immortality brought to light by Christ, and the immortality taught by Plato (and believed in by the religious world) two different things.

6.—The signs of the times, or evidence in the existing state of the world that the coming of Christ is near.

The audiences were good each night, and great interest appeared to be taken. The last meeting was the best. One hopeful fact in the case was, that those interested, supplied themselves at the close with copies of the new edition of the *Twelve Lectures*, which was just out. Twenty-nine strangers did this. The *Lectures*, of which a supply had come with the editor from England, were announced at the close of each lecture, with an explanation that there was no private interest to serve in effecting a sale of them, since they were offered at nearly half cost price. This arrangement, which was entirely unpremeditated, worked well and tended, throughout the journey, to a more extensive and effectual seed sowing than could have been accomplished by mere oral efforts, since interested hearers, under the first excitement, supplied themselves with the means of deliberate and thorough investigation at home. It is probable that more enduring results will, from this cause, spring from what was done than could otherwise have been achieved. It was all a happy accident, humanly speaking.

Something could be done for the truth in Aberdeen, if those who profess it would but unite with earnest and unselfish enterprise to make it known. The first thing is for them to be alive themselves. We use the word “alive” in the highest sense. A man may be in life and incapable from debility, of discharging the duties, of realising the objects of life. Such a man is worse than dead; he is a burden to the living. Spiritual life is governed by the same general law. A man professing to be a brother, but only just knowing the theory of the truth, and that imperfectly, not evincing a great degree of interest in the things that are Christ's or any degree of subjection in his life and behaviour to the law of Christ, while on the other hand he shows a very lively interest in things pertaining to the world, and a quick response to the world's maxims and principles of conduct,—is worse than an alien. His nominal standing in the truth obtains for him currency and recognition in the

truth's territory, and gives him a power for mischief which he unconsciously exerts, and which others are unconsciously smitten with. People look at him as a specimen of what a brother ought to be. They look at the fact that he is a brother, and unconsciously assume, as a matter of course, that it is all right with him, and almost without knowing it, they are dragged down to the level of his spirit, or prevented effectually and for ever from ascending to a higher platform. Now, when a number of such people come together, the gravitation earthwards is something beyond exaggeration. They all keep each other down, without intending it, and without knowing it. There is a talent of lead round every neck. They establish among themselves an invisible but omnipotent standard by which they stereotype the existing mediocrity and sluggishness, and bar the way against any ascent, on the part of any of their number, to a higher life. The slavery is terrible. We do not say this is exactly the state of things in Aberdeen, but there is an approach to it sufficiently close to offend the spiritual sensibilities. The truth ought to be supreme among those who believe it; it ought to amount to a passion; not an irrational impulse, but a calm, deep, deliberate, logical, unquenchable preference for the cause of the truth in all its aspects, as against everything else that is followed as a hobby in the world. Let the heart be to it what a man is to business and a woman to her house. These are not mad; they are cool, rational and consistent, but there is a terrible constancy in their devotion, the one to the counter or the counting house, and the other to the household gods. It is the constancy of logic, but mistaken logic. This life's interests appear to them the chief good; hence their labour and their love. But they are under a mistake. The chief good of existence is connected with higher aims, higher sentiments, and a higher state. These they do not see, because they are blind, as the natural mind is inevitably blind in the absence of revelation. But those whom the truth enlightens have another vision before their eyes, and, for that reason, another line of action in their lives. The truth is committed to their hands in a concrete form. It is a cause which imposes active duties and requires practical measures of service and promotion. It is not a theory to be idly contemplated as the opium-eating Moslem contemplates his reveries. It is not an ideal to be luxuriously stowed away in the

inner recesses of the brain. It is a hard practical system or cause which God has entrusted to the care of those who become the recipients of it. It demands the first affections. It imposes continual study of the holy oracles delivered. It exacts incessant service in divers forms, involving the expenditure of labour and money. There are needy to succour, wayfarers to be entertained, the ignorant to be enlightened, sinners to be saved. Some can do much; some are only able to do little, but all are under the imperative obligation to do what they can, and under all circumstances, to live and rejoice in the truth themselves; for even the very poor man, who appreciates the pearl of great price, and shews his joy by consecrating as much as he can offer, in body, enthusiasm, and substance, (if only two mites,) is a useful and faithful servant, refreshing the hearts of all in the truth, and honouring God in his day and generation. All this can be done without demonstrativeness. Life in the truth is unmistakable, if ever so quiet. In fact, quiet ardour is beautiful, and more to be admired than the dash of shallow water.

Let one or more in Aberdeen, embodying these principles in themselves, put the spur upon their brethren, and drive out the cold, inactive demon who lies upon the meeting like a nightmare. Let them not be cowed into propriety by the frigid *regime* that rules. Let them speak. Let them storm the dead wall of conventionality that would obstruct Christadelphian life. They have a fine meeting-place, at a rent which they ought to raise in ten Sundays, at the very least, leaving them free the other forty-two to do wonders for the worthy cause they have in hand. That they should barely keep open their doors is a shame. Let them not excuse themselves on the score of their poverty. We can point them to another ecclesia as poor as they in proportion, who would put them to the blush, if their provision for the truth's service were to be compared.

While the Editor was in Aberdeen, there was a great trade stir among the tailors, with which, beyond doubt, the "de'il" had something to do; and it was discouraging to find that some of the brethren were mixed up with it, and, still worse, that on one of the trade meetings happening on the same night as one of the meetings advertised for the truth, they actually preferred with their countenance the miserable cavillings of the devil's

servants to the work being done for their own good and the truth's service! This was surely a mistake of judgment. What have the sons of God to do with the broils of the devil? The truth calls them out of the world in every sense but that of submission to the ordinances which the world, socially and politically constituted, may impose; we have nothing to do with the world's schemes, or the world's remedies. We are a separate people, consecrated to principles and duties which leave no time nor energy for the hobbies upon which the world expends its effervescence. It is only where the flesh predominates that this is not realised. A babe in Christ is liable to be deceived into participation in the world's reformatory contrivances, under the specious idea that everything currently considered "good," has a claim on his countenance. On the supposition that such babe progresses to a healthy growth, by subsisting on "the milk of the word" imbibed in daily study, experience will teach him that time occupied in this way is time thrown away—that nothing really good is to be achieved in fellowship with the world—that the world can do no good in the real sense—that evil may be suffered by himself in such fellowship, and done to others by his example, in having the truth dimmed and made a secondary thing by alliance with worldly people, in the bond of other ideas for which the natural mind has a more instinctive affinity, and which, therefore, have a wonderful power of gaining the ascendancy, to the extinction of the little flame kindled by the Spirit. What effect have political agitations, trade organization and discussions, financial schemes against death and burial, upon the mind struggling to give itself over to the exalted cause, calling, and destiny to which we are invited in Christ? Is it not to throw dust in the eyes, to lay a snare to the feet, to check, dampen, chill and paralyse the heart and hand devoted to things unseen? Facts must be our guide. No man fights the world's battles in these things without getting besmeared with the world's dirt, tainted with the world's disease, stiffened and deadened by the world's cold. To speak literally, his mind will inevitably be inoculated to a greater or less extent with the world's notions of things (which are false notions), and the power of the truth, which lies in the mental impressions made by the teaching of the word, (historical, doctrinal, preceptive, and prophetic,) will be greatly weakened and reduced to a

dying state. No benefit achieved will compensate for this. When a man comes to die, he will draw satisfaction alone from a retrospect in which Christ is highest and foremost. Activity in the world will assuredly bring regret. We shall find we have clutched at the apples of Sodom. Let us lay aside every weight. Leave to the world the troubles and pollutions of political agitation, the vain work of social reform, the hopelessly incurable patchwork of trades unions, and the low work of making sure the grave-diggers' salary. The sons of God are not of the world. They are separate from and higher than the world. They have a cause of their own that soars above the thousand earthworm-schemes of the wicked sons of Adam, who keep God and the future of his promise out of all their reckonings. Where is the faith of those who mingle with the ungodly throng, to the neglect of their own culture and the service of Christ's cause, from a fear of temporalities?

But, it may be asked, are we to ignore political privileges, social advantages, trade benefits, received in past times by precisely the agencies now in operation? The answer is, that we are thankfully to enjoy whatever immunity from evil God may have worked out by the strife of evil in the world, but are not at liberty to be the active instruments of these results. The sword of Cromwell gave us freedom to open Christadelphian synagogues in the land; are we to lift the sword? Nay; not now. By and by, the sword will be put into the hand of the saints, but at present their position is essentially a passive one in relation to everything but the truth. In the area of this, we are to be ceaselessly active, aggressive, constructive, enterprising, reformatory, benevolent, kind, addicted to every good work; this is our footing. Outside of the truth, we submit to pay taxes, to obey the laws, to be treated as the rulers may devise. We are to pray that these rulers may be so acted upon that our lives may be quiet and peaceable, but we are to take no part in avenging our own wrongs, or making our own laws. This is Christ's will—that we be wholly given up and separated to him, leaving the world to itself meanwhile; and truly, in view of the magnitude, the greatness, the splendour, the surpassing excellence, the alone truly good, wise, strong, enduring nature of the cause which centres in him—the chief corner stone—we may well with alacrity undo the cords that bind us to the world's gaudy chariot, and embrace with devout

the divine servitude, which in the depths of its hopeless slavery, is the highest and most glorious and exhilarating freedom for created intelligence.

May the Aberdeen brethren realise these facts in the full breadth of a powerful motive, which will make them more and more the servants of Christ, and less and less the slaves of an insensate conventionalism which dictates laws and sentiments opposed to the mind of Christ.

There is another matter in which their amendment would be a cause of joy. At present, they are in fellowship with the Dowieites of Edinburgh. This compelled the editor to absent himself from their breaking of bread. In their present position, they are the Dowieites to every real friend of the truth; and no real friend of the truth would countenance the loose, uncertain, corrupt, and worldly attitude of the Dowieites. There are many reasons why he would not. In the first place, he would not thus be partaker of their evil deeds. To fellowship, if it be fellowship at all, is to homologate, countenance, assist, encourage, sympathise with, promote and heartily abet the thing and the people fellowshipped. We do not speak of the lifeless state of things commonly called fellowship, in which a man is only a formal adherent and not an active supporter and ardent lover of the cause of Christ. We refer to the real thing in which the deep purpose of life runs with unerring and unwearying flow in the channel of christian enthusiasm. Now for a man to extend this sort of support to an evil system is to incur a blame and do a wrong. He cannot do it and be guiltless, because complicity brings culpability. On the other hand, his doing it adds to the system's power for mischief in the ratio of his own influence. On these grounds, a real friend of the truth will stand apart from Dowieism. It professes the name and deals in the phrases

of the truth. For this reason, it is all the more to be avoided, because it is the more likely to receive the attention of the unwary, and to bring its blighting influence successfully to bear on the ripening seed of the kingdom. It holds a little of the truth, and that weakly, while it mixes with the truth the corrupting leaven of superstition and scripture perversion, and in its practical attitude in relation to even what it believes, it is thoroughly Laodicean and exerts a Laodiceanising influence upon those brought within its pale. Why not teach the poor things? it is asked. Did Jesus teach the Scribes and Pharisees? Kindly suasion is only possible where people are in a candid and teachable frame of mind, and where this disposition exists, the moral instincts will intuitively adapt themselves in yearning solicitude to the wants of those concerned. But this is out of the question where men set themselves in stubborn opposition for years, as the Dowieites have done, to many parts of the truth, and those who advocate it without compromise. The only thing left is to come out from among them, and oppose them, leaving to them the responsibility of all that may result from their perversity and blindness. This we have done and mean to do to the end; and whatever the tongue of slander may utter, or the evil heart surmise, we have only one object in view, and that is, the preservation of the truth in its purity and vigour and potentiality over those embracing it. This result is secured by isolating Dowieism from those means of influence which, for good or evil, arise from associational community. To do this effectually, every gap must be stopped, and we therefore felt compelled to refuse a connection with the Aberdeen ecclesia in its present attitude toward the Dowieites.

(To be continued.)

THE POLITICAL HEAVENS AND THE SIGNS THEREOF.

As intimated last month, the state of affairs on the Continent is full of promise, for those who look at the future from a prophetic point of view. The signs of Christ's appearing are hopefully progressing in the direction of maturity. They present them-

selves under certain distinct aspects, which we shall the better exhibit to the reader by adopting separate headings in the arrangements of the matter to be passed under review. The effect of the whole will be brought to a focus in the instructed reader's mind.

There is

1.—THE STATE OF GENERAL
POLITICS—GREAT UNEASI-
NESS AND WAR PREPARA-
TIONS.

Discussing the probabilities of the future, the *Birmingham Daily Post*, of September 11th, has the following: "At this moment, Spain is distracted by revolutionary movements, eastern Europe is in commotion, the Cretans are still battling against their Turkish masters. We ourselves, the very incarnation of pacific tendencies, are just at the beginning of one of those little wars, of which no man, however wise, can estimate the cost, or foresee the end. So much for the past and the present. As to the future, there are signs of abundant trouble. * * * *

All Europe is but one vast camp, in which the busy note of preparation sounds on every hand. We hear of nothing but the reorganization of armies, the trial of new implements of warfare, the purchase of military stores, the concentration and arrangement of all the too-familiar appliances of destruction."

The *Star*, a few days earlier, says "There is no mistaking the uneasy tone of the French press. Everywhere the probability of a war is discussed; in many cases it is accepted as certain that a war must take place before long. Of course, it is with Prussia that the contest is expected, though no immediate cause of the quarrel is set forth. The relations of France and Russia are also spoken of with great distrust. Russia is said to be annoyed at the attitude which France has taken on the Eastern question, while France is believed in this matter to have the moral support of England. Everything seems to betoken war before long."

A Paris correspondent says:—"It would seem that the War Office here is not quite free from warlike apprehension—as Marshal Neil is so busy organizing and preparing, that he has not left town to attend the meeting of the Council General, which had elected him as chairman. In addition, his excellency has just issued the following highly important circular to the various generals in command of active or territorial divisions:—'Sir, I have decided, in consequence of the requirements of the service, that the exoneration of soldiers belonging to the reserve shall be stopped until further orders. The generals in command of divisions will continue to forward quarterly statements of the men under arms they propose for exoneration, but the number thus favoured must not exceed the proportion of one man per thousand, calculated on the number of men stationed in each division.' I consider this very significant."

"A correspondent in Berlin (says the *Globe*

of September) hears from excellent sources, that the warlike feeling is spreading in Germany and France. In Berlin they are quite prepared, and say "they will give us more trouble than the Austrians; but we shall beat them in the end, and we are willing to try." A French friend said the Prussians will go on taunting us till the Emperor *must* go to war: and, finally, a great Eastern authority told me that Fuad Pasha's mission to the Crimea had utterly failed, that Russia was very active in Candia, and the Porte was much alarmed. Of Servia, too, he spoke with fear. Another correspondent, writing from Paris, says:—"The belief that M. de Bismark will shortly do some startling act to force the Sovereigns of Salzburg to declare their policy, or let it be made manifest they have none, is becoming very general."

The following is from the *Liberte*, of date August 27th: "We must acknowledge it: Europe has never had so formidable a crisis to go through; never has a more solemn crisis occurred; never has a future been so dark. M. Thiers was guilty of no exaggeration, when, a few months ago, he exclaimed: 'My memory seeks in vain for a parallel to our present situation.' One dark spot alone on the horizon is enough to warn the experienced pilot of the coming storm. It is not one, but three dark spots, that stare us in the face—north, east, and south—on the Rhine, the Bosphorus, and the Tiber."

"While Prussia is preparing to withdraw the last lingering remnant of her garrison from Luxemburg (says the Berlin correspondent of the *Times*, September 7th,) "a force of some 60,000 men is being assembled in the north-eastern provinces of France. Such is the latest intelligence received here. Although the Prussian government give their Imperial neighbour too much credit for sagacity to suppose him to be meditating the capture of the deserted place, this extraordinary concentration will yet cause them to remind Holland of its engagement to raze the works without loss of time. It is not on the ground of any immediate apprehensions that such a step is likely to be adopted; but, on the one hand, there is the ugly reminiscence that a *coup de main* was actually thought of not many months since, and, on the other hand, Prussia probably deems she owes it to herself to notice a measure almost amounting to a military demonstration. There is a growing conviction in these parts that if Napoleon will not cease diverting the more restless among his subjects by treating them to indefinite foreshadowings of war, it might be neither expedient nor honourable for this government to ignore his conduct entirely."

"A Paris correspondent (says the *Globe* of September 6th) states that the prevailing opinion undeniably is that next year will

bring war. The Emperor's speeches, even the most pacific of them, have persuaded nobody that the hour of action is far removed, and the French Administration is bestirring itself to be ready for all eventualities. Besides the accelerated manufacture of the new rifle, other preparations of a more significant nature are being made. With respect to the new cannon, of which so much has been said, a Toulouse paper has the following: 'The trial of the new small cannon, the most terrible arm yet invented, continues at Meudon. None know their mechanism, except the artillery officers who direct the experiments. Cannon, carriages, and ammunition are brought in leather valises, and the trials take place behind a screen of planks. All that can be known is that at 2,500 metres these arms send a perfect hail of balls against a target two metres high and one broad. At that distance the balls pierce an iron plate two centimetres thick. Each cannon can fire twenty shots in a minute, and two men suffice for the transport of the arm, the carriage, the ammunition, &c. Lately these guns were tried against a clump of trees at 1,500 metres (nearly an English mile.) The trees were mowed down in a few minutes, like a cornfield by a steam mowing machine. It is frightful. Five or six men armed with such an engine could destroy a whole regiment in a few minutes.' Persons who have heard them practising with these new cannon at Meudon have described the sound to me as being almost like the roll of a drum, so quickly do the reports succeed each other. It remains to be seen whether the French military department will be as successful in keeping the secret of these new guns as the Prussians have been in retaining that of the fulminating pea in their needle gun cartridges. The Chassepot cartridges are ignited by means of a fulminating cap contained in them. The *Messenger de Toulouse* adds: "To attenuate the terrible ravages of the firearms, and to restore to the bayonet the importance it seems about to lose, it is proposed to organize battles by night. The tactics of nocturnal combats are studied more carefully than ever at the schools at St. Cyr, the Polytechnic, and staff. Finally, gunboats are being made of a kind easily taken to pieces and conveyed. In a few hours we shall be able to have a numerous flotilla on the Rhine, with a powerful artillery, borne on invulnerable vessels and capable of silencing, in case of need, the fire of Mayence, Coblenz, and Ehrenbreitstein." The same paper asserts that as soon as a battalion has received the Chassepot rifles and learnt how to use them, it is sent off to the eastern frontier. Another provincial journal, the *Moselle Independent*, says that the regiments of the artillery train

are, in number of men, above their full strength.'

2.—THE CRY OF PEACE AND THE UPSHOT.

This went so far as to lead to a great congress at Geneva, for the purpose of bringing an influence to bear on the governments to induce them if possible to consent to disarmament, and the settlement of their quarrels by arbitration. Delegates attended from all parts of Europe, and incongruously enough, Garibaldi, the very incarnation of revolution, was honorary president: but the thing came to sudden grief. So we are informed by the following telegrams:

"GENEVA, SEP. 11 (Evening.)

A long and stormy sitting of the International Peace Congress was held to-day, at which M. Dupasquier reproached the assembly, attacking religion and criticising the American Republic. General Garibaldi left suddenly this morning, without informing anyone of his intention."

"GENEVA, SEP. 12.

A large public meeting was held here yesterday, to protest against the revolutionary and socialist tendency of the International Peace Congress, now sitting. The Paris correspondent of the *Express* says: 'I am informed that the French Government has intimated to the Geneva, authorities that it regards the 'Peace Congress' as a meeting of conspirators against France, and as an infraction of that neutrality which is the condition of the existence of the Swiss republic."

"PARIS, SEP. 12.

Intelligence received here from Geneva states that at the last sitting of the Peace Congress, it was impossible to continue the proceedings, in consequence of violent popular manifestations on the part of the inhabitants of the town. The vehement protests of the minority induced the President to put on his hat, and, subsequently, to declare the sitting at an end."

This episode, at such a crisis, has an air of the burlesque about it. Peace is impossible. War is inevitable. The clouds will gather until they burst. This leads us to consider the specific agencies at work, foremost among which is

3.—THE FROG SPIRIT AT
WORK—THE CONFERENCE
OF THE FRENCH AND
AUSTRIAN EMPERORS—
SPEECHES DELIVERED BY
THE FORMER, AND THEIR
EFFECTS.

The French Emperor went to Salzburg toward the end of August, and met the Austrian Emperor. The two chiefs spent five days together. This meeting has caused great uneasiness. "At present (says the Paris correspondent of the *Globe*, writing August 26th) "this interview produces the greatest disquietude. For, according to the most authentic accounts that have reached us from Germany, and according to what is said here in political circles, the two Emperors have come to an understanding to require the execution of the treaty of Prague, which cuts Germany into two parts; and such a requirement is an act of defiance to Prussia, and a prohibition to the German nation to effect that union for which it has always aspired, and which it seemed on the very eve of accomplishing. The disquietude has been increased to-day by the receipt of telegrams from Berlin, stating that the Government organs have published articles, of which the burden is that the alleged Austro-French understanding is not calculated to maintain peace, and that an alliance between Austria and France will call for a counter-alliance. When such language as this is 'inspired' by a government, the situation is grave." The *Kreutz Zeitung* says: "Europe has a right to demand what has been settled at Salzburg. The uneasiness which weighed on affairs has become aggravated since that interview." On the way from Salzburg to Paris, the Emperor made three speeches, all of which have increased the bad effect produced by the Salzburg meeting. The speeches were made in reply to addresses presented by the municipalities of the towns; and (says the *Star* of August 26th) they are certainly not very clear utterances. We would fain believe that they are of peaceful purport; but it must be admitted that there is enough in them upon which those who take a contrary view may base their opinion. To the Mayor of Arras, Napoleon said: "It is only weak Governments who seek in foreign complications to divert attention from troubles at home. But he who derives his strength from the great body of the nation has only to do his duty and to satisfy the permanent interests of the country; and, while holding aloft the national flag, we should not allow ourselves to be drawn away by intemperate impulses, however patriotic they may be." This may mean either peace or war. The last phrase seems to us to be intended as a check upon those who are crying for war. Again, to the

Mayor of Lille, the Emperor, after alluding to past events in his reign, said "Dark spots, however, have shadowed our horizon. But even as good fortune has not dazzled me, so transient reverses will not discourage me." He went on to say that everywhere he and the Empress were greeted with acclamations, in which were unceasingly associated the name of his son. His visit to Lille, he said, was not merely to celebrate a glorious anniversary, but to endeavour to increase the prosperity of the Department by developing its agriculture and manufactures. He added: "You will aid me in this noble task; but you will not forget that the first condition of the prosperity of a nation like ours is to possess the consciousness of its own strength, and not to allow itself to be depressed by imaginary fears, but to rely upon the wisdom and patriotism of the Government." It is impossible not to see that these words have a tendency dangerous to peace. But they have also a tone of doubt—the doubt of a man who feels his footing to be insecure, and who is anxious to elicit from others assurances that he is safe. Meantime the French press is growing more and more warlike, and their tone is imitated by the Prussian papers. The *France* says that at Berlin designs are on foot which are dangerous to the world, and which ought to be restrained. Then, after the Napoleonic manner, it paves the way for France being looked upon as in the right in case of war. All this has an extremely unpleasant look."

The Paris correspondent of the *Globe*, writing Aug. 29, says:—"The speeches of the Emperor at Arras and Lille have naturally been the general subject of conversation to-day. Are they to be interpreted as a promise of peace or a menace of war? Nobody can tell. In the universal doubt some sagacious persons hold that they ought to be considered as both pacific and warlike. The Arras discourse, say they, is evidently pacific, because it says—"you are right in having confidence in the future:" and the Lille one evidently foretels an approaching war, since it says that there are "black spots on the horizon." The truth is, that the Imperial Oracle was never so hard to divine as in his last utterances. And this obscurity has increased the anxiety which has prevailed for a long time, people being generally of opinion that if the Emperor saw that peace would be maintained, and desired peace, he would say so in language so plain and explicit that there would be no possibility of misunderstanding it." Writing on the following days he says, "the more people read and ponder the speeches of the Emperor at Arras and Lille, the greater becomes their disquietude. The view taken of the situation to-day is certainly more gloomy than it was yesterday, and the Bourse—that thermometer of public feeling—has fallen more heavily;

yet nothing new has occurred. "The speeches do not re-assure.—therefore they give ground for alarm:" such is what political and financial authorities say, and the dictum is accepted as true by the public at large. I have had some conversation with merchants of Nantes, Havre, and Lyons; and it appears that in these towns the impression is the same as that prevalent here. Owing to the disquietude felt, little business is done, and that is only (to use the words of one of the speakers) of "a hand to mouth character. How, indeed," he added, "can I think of engaging in operations which will require months to fulfil, when the political situation is so dark and menacing?" "Better," said another, "have war at once than be paralyzed by this anxiety."

The same writer under date Sep. 5, speaking of the result of the meeting of the Emperors, says on the authority of "a diplomatic source," that the Austrian and French Emperors are firmly determined to maintain the Treaty of Prague against Prussia, and the Treaty of Paris against Russia; and if these two Powers cannot restrain their ambition within the limits of those conventions, they must take the consequences. In case Austria and France should have to draw the sword, the hope is, I hear, entertained by Austrian statesmen that England will be with them, inasmuch as they will be the champions of the public law of Europe. *The Globe*, of Sep. 3, commenting on this view of the case, says "If such be the basis of the understanding come to at Salzburg, it is evident that what the Continent has to expect is not peace but war. Indeed, war could not be more clearly threatened in diplomatic language. Prussia—she it is, of course, that the two Powers have in view—is required forthwith to execute the treaty of Prague as regards North Schleswig; she is to give up all hope of bringing the Southern States of Germany under her domination—that is, in other words, of making Germany one; perhaps even she must surrender her military conventions with those States. To requirements such as these she cannot evidently consent without loss of *prestige*, of dignity, of power, and without exciting the German people, or at least a large portion of them, against her. It is hardly likely that she can do this, and so the sword must be drawn."

The French Government has issued a circular, disclaiming the current views of the Salzburg meeting, but as a Paris newspaper correspondent, writing Sep. 5, enquires, why was not the Emperor equally outspoken in favour of peace in his harangues at Arras, Lille, and Amiens? Why before the Salzburg meeting was over, were alarming telegrams sent to Paris, and communicated to the Paris press by Havas, who is an agent of the Government? Why has the language of semi-official newspapers since

then been so disquieting? Why, above all, have not military preparations ceased, and the measure for re-organizing the army been abandoned? The Paris *Presse* observes that "while diplomacy limits itself to loudly affirming the pacific intentions of this country, public opinion is moved by what is taking place on the frontier of France. Uneasy at those voluntary abdications which are already changing the Confederation of the North into a single sovereignty, at those new armaments, and that incessant pressure on the States of the South to hasten their military organization, it fears to find itself suddenly in presence of a concerted action of Prussia and Russia, to throw both the east and the west into confusion."

4.—ROME — UNPRECEDENTED GATHERING OF BISHOPS AND PRIESTS—DESPAIR OF THE PAPACY—INCREASING BLASPHEMY — IMPENDING DESTRUCTION.

A Roman correspondent, writing on June 22, says:—"The number of priests drawn to Rome, by the approaching solemnities, from every country, but particularly from France, is beyond belief. They are already estimated at 30,000, and, though this may be an exaggeration, their numbers certainly exceed 20,000, and still they come. The procession of Corpus Christi took place the day before yesterday, and was very splendid. It had a special feature in the number of prelates in its ranks, amounting, with the cardinals, to no less than 348. The bishops of the Latin rite all wore white mitres and white capes, without any embroidery; and the cardinals were only distinguished from them by the satin-work on their mitres. The Oriental bishops, with the archbishops, primates, and patriarchs, were, on the contrary, attired in all the magnificence of the East; their mitres embroidered with gold and richly jewelled, and their diadems, which took the shape of an imperial crown, blazing with gems. The Pope appeared, in spite of the doctors, looking very pale and jaded. The French priests assembled in thousands to see the procession, and, confident in their numbers, gave free expression to their zeal, knocking off the hats of those spectators who did not uncover at the proper moment. It may have been in consequence of this violence that a French priest was poinarded in the evening in the Piazza della Maddalene. His wounds are serious, and his recovery uncertain. Yesterday, the anniversary of his coronation, the Pope was present at a service chaunted by Cardinal Mathieu in the Sistine Chapel. The edifice was completely filled by the bishops. The foreign priests thronged the royal saloon and the approaches to the foot of the stairs. The Pope had to traverse the saloon several

times to change his vestments and ornaments in the Pauline Chapel, and on each occasion was received with cries of 'Long live the Pope-King!' The foreign bishops have brought the Pope some munificent presents. Their donations in money alone amount to 1,500,000 crowns, or £300,000, and their other gifts are of great value."

"It is more than probable, it is almost certain, "the *Spectator* says," that one of the strangest scenes is about to transact itself in Rome. It is informed, on good authority, which cannot on such a point be mistaken, that Reuter's unnoticed telegram of the 26th inst. is true, that the papacy, in its despair, has resolved to use its last resource, to wield once more the weapon which for three hundred years Popes have dreaded to unsheath, lest it should be turned against themselves, to summon once more the body which even the Ultramon- tans hold to be greater than the Popes, the mystic depository of inspiration, the Sovereign Parliament of the Universal Church. And, if so, it is not only possible but likely, that in the 19th century the larger section of Christendom may be called on, by irresistible authority—for the decree of a council is to Roman Catholics throughout the world irresistible—to believe that the written utterance of a single human being is equivalent in obligation to a revelation from on high. In other words, the Œcumenical Council of 1867 will proclaim the infallibility of the Pope."

A correspondent of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, writing under date, Rome, August 13th, says: "I understand that the Pope has resolved to spend the whole year in the Eternal City, and that the project of a sojourn at Castel Gondolfo has been finally abandoned, the Holy Father declaring that he will not leave Rome during the prevalence of the cholera. The city is still kept in a state of excitement by renewed agitation of the party of action within, and the movements of Garibaldians without. We are told that Garibaldi is preparing to head in person a descent on the coast at Porto d'Angio, while Menotti moves, with a considerable force, on Viterbo. The officials of Rome persist in saying that there is a secret understanding between the Garibaldians and Signor Ratazzi on the one side, and the Italian Premier and Napoleon III on the other, and that the conditions of the arrangement are, that Italy shall be allowed to seize the Pontifical provinces of Frosinore and Viterbo, as the price of the support she is to afford France in the approaching war. A formal treaty is to be concluded when Signor Ratazzi visits the Paris Exhibition, and the annexation of the two provinces will follow this new interview with the Emperor, as that of Umbria and the Marches followed the interview at Plombieres. You will see that

Garibaldi is regarded as acting under the inspiration of the Italian Government, and he will be let loose at the proper moment. It is certain that the appearance of his volunteers would instantly set the Roman States in flames; and, indeed, a revolutionary movement is with difficulty kept down without their co-operation, the Romans knowing that it would be made a pretext for what they desire—the entry of Italian troops."

A Florence correspondent (according to the *Globe* of September 5th) says "It is probable that Garibaldi will spare the Pontifical Government the agitation of a still nearer approach to the frontiers of St. Peter's patrimony than Orvieto. The Italian Government continues its strict observation of the frontier line, and the garrison of Terni has just been strengthened by a battalion of grenadiers from Spoleto. Garibaldi's harangue at Orvieto indicated his hope to obtain Rome for and not in opposition to the King of Italy. The Government has given orders for the more complete fortification of the Castle of St. Angelo, and a wall pierced with loopholes for musketry is now being built along the right bank of the Tiber, just above the bridge of St. Angelo. The *Osservatore Romano* says: "Not only in Italy, but we may say in all Europe, minds are held in suspense and uncertainty by the expectation of some *coup de main* of the revolution against Rome, under the leadership of Giuseppe Garibaldi, a general in the service of his Majesty, the King of Italy. Every day lamentations are raised over the heavy expense incurred by the Florence Government for the maintenance of 40,000 soldiers on the Pontifical frontier, to prevent Garibaldian bands from invading the Roman territory; the detriment to health and discipline of the soldiers encamped and detached in unwholesome districts in the summer season is deplored, as also the threatening and arrogant attitude of Garibaldi and his followers, who would fain dictate laws to their Government, to Europe, and to the world by wishing to attack, against the express will of the people and governments, the last rag of his ancestral possessions which still remains in the power of the Pontiff. But why does not the Florence Government put a stop to this situation? Why does it not detach a corporal and four men from the 40,000 stationed along the Pontifical frontier, to intimate to Garibaldi that he must desist from his attempts? Why cannot the Florence Government, which has sent 4,000 innocent persons to a forced domicile, send to his chosen domicile General Giuseppe Garibaldi? If, for example, Garibaldi, instead of making preparations for an expedition against Rome, were to enrol men and collect money to get back Nice for Italy, would Signor Urbano

Rafazzi be satisfied with sending 20,000 men to the new frontiers established between France and Italy? The Florence Government either cannot, or will not, reduce to obedience this audacious and intriguing party—there is no medium. If it cannot, where is the force of a Government which has at its command 200,000 bayonets? If it will not, where is its boasted good faith, and the great respect with which it intends to observe the conditions concluded in the Convention of the 15th Sept., 1864?"

5.—THE EASTERN QUESTION— TURKEY'S TROUBLES IN- CREASING—THE CRETAN INSURRECTION NOT PUT DOWN.

The *Fremdenblatt* states that, according to credible advices from Belgrade, a rising was imminent in Bosnia and Herzegovine. A committee has lately been formed at Belgrade to support and propagate the insurrection in the Turkish countries bordering Servia: it is connected with the secret committees of Roumania, Montenegro, and Greece.

A telegram from Constantinople affirms that the Turkish troops are concentrating on the borders of the Principalities, owing to the agitation in Servia. General Ignatieff, the Russian Ambassador, has had another private audience of the Sultan. The Porte has given a negative reply to the demands made by the Foreign embassies relative to Crete.—*Globe, September 9th.*

The *Star* of September 2nd says: "A Vienna telegram says that the Porte has issued a circular to foreign powers announcing that the insurrection is at an end, and that all that remains to be done is to reorganise the political administration of the island. We have heard of this kind of thing before, and yet, spite of circulars to the contrary, the insurrection has gone on. We believe it to be untrue that the insurrection is quelled."

An Athens telegram announces that the Arcadion, Greek steamer, which was burnt and sunk to prevent its falling into the hands of the Turks, was immediately replaced by two more powerful vessels from Syra. The following letter has been addressed by the insurrectionary Government of Crete to the Consuls of England, France, Russia, Austria, Prussia, Italy, Greece, Sweden, and the United States of America: "Askyfo de Sphakia, Aug. 9.—Messieurs les Consuls: The Generalissimo of Turkey, Omar Pasha, having failed in his last expedition, in spite of his immense military preparations, his numerous army, the strict blockade which he had instituted both by sea and land, and his promises to the insurgents, abandoned himself, without restraint, to the dictates of a ferocious heart. The Cretan Government, while exploring these brutal and ferocious acts,

which enlightenment and civilization condemn, protests in the name of humanity to your Governments, and implores their aid that the weak and the defenceless may be saved. We embrace, at the same time, this opportunity of denying the false statement spread by Omar Pasha, concerning the pretended submission of Candia. Far from such being the case, not a child has given in its submission, not a weapon has been delivered up, not a signature has ratified any such proposal; and, let it be well noted, that in Sphakia alone he has now been carrying on war against us for an entire month. Omar Pasha has attempted to delude his own government, and to mislead European opinion, but the christians of Candia oppose to his mendacious words the rattle of their arms and the report of their muskets, which has not ceased, and will not cease to resound from one extremity of the island to the other, until our deliverance, and our union with independent Greece. We beg you to lay this present communication before your Governments." (The signatures follow.)

6.—RUSSIAN DESIGNS AND MOVEMENTS.

The Russian *Invalide* (says the *Globe* of September 10th) has an article on the Bulgarian insurrection. The Paris correspondent of the *Times* says: "There has as yet been no account of any fighting, and, probably, it would be difficult to find any considerable body of men actually under arms. But the thing is understood to be ripening, the *cadres* to have been formed, and various preliminary steps taken. General Ignatieff is considered by no means alien to its development, and full particulars of the scheme might, it is believed, be found in the Russian Chancery at Constantinople, besides which there are committees at Bucharest and elsewhere. After beginning with Crete, Russia is steadily working to get up rebellions in all the provinces of European Turkey. And the belief gains strength that if France and Prussia go to war next year, Russia will seize the opportunity openly, and by force of arms, to prosecute her designs against Turkey."

The Hungarian journal, *Magyar Orszag*, believes that Russia intends to act in the East next spring, and that then, neither Austria nor the other European States can remain inactive, and it thinks that Russia will find Austria and France combined against her. A Paris correspondent adds: "The intentions and state of preparation of Russia are a puzzle to politicians, and the most diverse opinions are held concerning them. That Russia has fomented the insurrection in Candia, now apparently stamped out, and the rising in Bulgaria—which exists, though we hear little of it, and it has not yet taken a very active form

—and that she is doing her best to get up a disturbance in Servia, nobody doubts. At the same time many persons here persuade themselves that she has no intention of joining in any war next year, and that she is unprepared as regards both men and money. Positive information has been received by the French Government that she has bought six large ironclad frigates of the United States. She wants vessels of that class, in which she has hitherto been deficient, her ironclads being chiefly small vessels that could not well come into line in an engagement with ironclad fleets.”

The *Saturday Review* remarks that “the acquisition of the Principalities has long been regarded at St. Petersburg as an indispensable object, for which it was worth while in 1812 to break with Napoleon, and in 1853, to commence the war which ended in the Crimea. Until the provinces north of the Danube are annexed to the empire, it will be inconvenient to proceed with the partition of Turkey; but whenever war breaks out in Europe, a Russian army will probably cross the Pruth, and, possibly, the persecution of the Jews, or the interference of the Western Powers with the intolerance of the Christians, may furnish an excuse for invasion.”

The Paris correspondent of the *Times*, writing August 13th, says: “If Russia were allowed to act by herself, the territory which, in the beginning of the century, formed Turkey in Europe, would be cut up into a multitude of States, more or less petty, of which the subjects, Greeks or Slaves, would have close affinity with the populations of Russia. These States, which would possess a sort of “autonomy,” would be, in reality, the satellites of Russia, whose protection

would be indispensable to them. In this manner the domination of Russia would extend, in point of fact, over the whole of that vast country, covered with a numerous population, traversed by the Danube and other great streams, and bathed by the Adriatic, the Mediterranean, and the Black Sea. Russia would thus form round Austria a continuous enclosure, and would menace Italy, whose frontier she would touch. From that moment, Europe might expect to witness the invasion of Cossacks, which the first Napoleon predicted at St. Helena.”

7.—A BRITISH ARMY ON THE SHORES OF THE RED SEA.

The final determination of the British Government to coerce Theodore, King of Abyssinia, who has for so long a time held certain British subjects captive, in defiance of the entreaties addressed to him for their liberation, will result in the landing of a British army on the shores of the Red Sea. The expedition is being got ready with all despatch. Ten thousand troops are to be sent from India to invade Abyssinia. This seems to promise for Britain the establishment of that military position in the neighbourhood of Egypt, which the prophets warrant us in expecting her to occupy in connection with the final situation.

Sep. 13th, 1867.

EDITOR.

INTELLIGENCE.

ABERDEEN.—Brother Gill, writing Sep. 10th, reports the defection of Alexander Clark, whose heart, it appears, has for a long time been with the Irvingites, with whom he has now declared himself one. Brother Clark, who has thus fallen into the error of the wicked — a victim, probably, to the double influence of Irvingite seduction and Aberdeen frigidarianism — has been connected with the ecclesia from its origin, many years ago, but has latterly shown an entire lack of interest in its proceedings. This could scarcely have happened, surely, if the root of the matter had been in him. Even the

coldness of the north cannot extinguish the fire drawn from the oracles of the living God.

BIRMINGHAM.—The ecclesia has recently been visited by brother Ellis, of Edinburgh, and brother J. J. Andrew, of London, and is now enjoying the society of brother and sister S. G. Hayes, of ———, EVERYWHERE, to accurately describe their citizenship; for they have cut the cords that bound them to Jersey, and are now on the wing, without a settled purpose with regard to future location. —Brother and sister Bingley, who had taken up their abode at Stourbridge, through the

exigencies of business, have returned to the United States, from which their return is doubtful. Their departure is regretted. On Monday, September 2nd, a large tea meeting of the ecclesia (arranged for in the Editor's absence in Scotland) was held, to receive him on his return, and hear a report of proceedings. There have been two immersions during the month, the obedient believers being CHAS. BROUGHTON, (33,) electro-plate fitter, brought up in the Church of England; and BENJ. WITHERS, (42) shoemaker, formerly Methodist. They had been in attendance at the meetings of the brethren for about eighteen months. Their introduction to the truth, in the first instance, was due to the faithfulness of a young maiden sister, who knowing one of them as a neighbour, gave him a bill announcing lectures, and asked him to attend, assuring him that he would hear the truth nowhere else in Birmingham. One came and was struck, and brought the other. We mention this for encouragement. We never know what a faithful word may lead to. Several brethren have lately been utilising Sunday afternoon by attending camp meetings, on a common known as the Brookfields, and doing what is recorded of Paul in Acts xvii, 17, in addition to which, they have been doing what Paul, in the absence of the printing press, was unable to do,—distributing printed invitations to the evening meetings of the brethren. Everything tells, if done earnestly and with a good conscience.

DEVONPORT.—Brother J. W. Moore, writing September 17th, reports the addition to the ecclesia, in Devonport, of THOMAS QUILLER, (31,) formerly connected with the Methodist Free Church, who, having intelligently confessed his faith in the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, was immersed into the name of Christ, for the remission of sins and an inheritance in the kingdom of God. He had been an attendant at the meeting for many months. Brother Moore adds "We have been much refreshed by a visit, a short time since, from brother and sister Hayes. We are away in a remote corner and seldom get visitors, so that it was a treat to us. We should be most happy to receive any others of the brethren who may come our way. We now number twenty-one, and hope shortly to have further additions."

FROME (Somerset).—Mr. Jos. Hawkins, writing from this place, on September 2nd, reports himself an interested believer in the truth of nearly twenty years' standing,

dating the commencement of his belief from the appearance of Elpis Israel, in 1848-49. He also says there are several others in the place of the same way of thinking. This is gratifying intelligence. He mentions active connection with Panton Ham, of Bristol; it is to be hoped the friends at Frome are not in bondage to the derogatory views which that gentleman advocates in reference to the death of Christ, and that they have gone beyond him in their apprehension of the sublime verities of the kingdom of God. A recognition of the mortality of human nature is a good foundation for the truth, but unless a man progress to the understanding of the things concerning the kingdom of God, and a knowledge of the principles involved in the things concerning the name of Jesus Christ, his faith is a dismal negation. In this case, we hope for the best and await further disclosures.

GLASGOW.—The ecclesia in this place has been strengthened by the addition of Mr. JOHN ANDERSON, a middle-aged man, tailor and clothier, 310, Argyle Street, who, with his wife, was, on Sunday, August 4th, immersed into Christ, upon a confession of faith in the things concerning the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ. He was brought to a knowledge of the truth through the agency of brother Bell, of Galashiels, in the first instance, followed up by book lending and other exertions on the part of the Glasgow brethren: which had the happy result recorded.

HALIFAX.—Bro. Shuttleworth, writing August 27th, reports continuous operations for the truth. On the previous Sunday, a sister having procured leave for the delivery of lectures from the Town Hall terrace, two meetings were held, of which the following advertisement had been issued:—

THE BIBLE *versus* THE PULPIT.

(Weather permitting,)

TWO LECTURES will be given, as under, from the Town Hall Terrace, Halifax, on Sunday, the 24th inst.: afternoon, at half-past two, "The Gospel of the coming Kingdom of God;" evening, at six, "The Gospel of Resurrection, Life, and Incorruptibility."

"COME AND HEAR, OR PERISH."

The weather was favourable, and a

goodly number assembled and listened with as much attention as if they had been within doors. At the close, discussion ensued on the several matters advanced. The lectures were given by brother Shuttleworth. The regular indoor meetings continue, occasional advertisements appearing in the local press. We append examples:—No.1. CHRISTADELPHIAN SYNAGOGUE, Grove Street, Halifax.—LECTURE, to-morrow, at 2-30 p.m.—Subject: “Repentance, or the Salvatory Necessity of Separating from the Sects and Denominations. Exposition of the Scriptures every Sunday Morning at 10-30.” No.2. “A MINISTER without price.”—The Christadelphians hereby offer to Preach the Gospel of the coming Kingdom of God anywhere, free of charge.—Address, Synagogue, Grove-st.”

HECKMONDWIKE.—On Sunday, August 17th, brother F. R. Shuttleworth, of Halifax, delivered two lectures in the Market Place, afternoon and evening, the subject and form of advertisement being identical with those adopted at Halifax. There was a large audience on both occasions, and a considerable amount of discussion. A local paper published the following notice of the meeting, in which the confusing effect of light on optics accustomed to the dark is apparent:—“SUNDAY LECTURES IN THE MARKET PLACE.—On Sunday afternoon and evening last, two lectures were delivered in the Market Place, by Mr. Shuttleworth, of Halifax, which were both well attended. The lectures were explanatory of the leading doctrines of the sect which acknowledges as its “guide, philosopher, and friend,” Dr. John Thomas, of America. The tenets, which are rather of a startling character, seem to us to be an odd mixture of Judaism, Socinianism, Materialism, and what is generally understood by the term orthodox Christianity. If we understand the lecturer properly, the disciples of the new sect disavow altogether the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, except in the case of those who believe their tenets. In fact, they seem to disbelieve altogether in the existence of a soul as distinct from the body. In this point, their creed seemed so nearly akin to Secularism, that a person in the crowd belonging to the latter creed, much to their apparent disgust, hailed them as brothers. A considerable crowd assembled, and much discussion followed each lecture.

REMARKS ON THE ABOVE.

DR. THOMAS'S POSITION IN RELATION TO THE TRUTH.— THE CONGRUITY OF THE TRUTH AND THE “ODD MIX- TURE” OF ORTHODOXY.—SE- CULARISM A DISMAL AND BLASPHEMOUS NEGATION.

It is doubtless intended, as a reproach to Christadelphians in the foregoing notice, that Dr. Thomas stands at their head. Now, we tell the newspaper scribe and all whom it may concern that Christadelphians feel no reproach in connection with that fact, but derive strength and courage from it. It is true Dr. Thomas, as a member of the *genus homo* is nothing more than any other man, and of himself knows no more of the truth of God than the untutored savage, and in himself is no more qualified to lead into the truth than the ancient pagans in whom orthodox teachers make their boast. But Dr. Thomas, enlightened by the truth, is different from Dr. Thomas in a state of ignorance. Enlightened by the truth, he is a safe “guide, philosopher, and friend,” in things pertaining to salvation. He is a faithful, fearless, competent expounder of the *word divinely delivered through ancient prophets and apostles to Israel*. Ignorant of these, he would be like the rest of professional dumb dogs—“learned” in the conventional sense, but afraid to bark out the words of confident warning with regard to the future, and incapable of saying anything of the slightest value for the guidance of the blind or the instruction of the ignorant. Great native power of intellect, matured by years of study, has qualified him to discern clearly and declare truly, what is written in the ancient oracles. To what is written therein, he faithfully adheres, and, as our readers know, asks credence to nothing on his own individual authority. His glory is that he magnifies the word of the God of Israel above all, and advances nothing on personal authority; while, at the same time, he applies with great industry and success, the masterly gifts with which God has endowed him, in the elucidation of things requiring a right division of the word of truth, in order to their proper apprehension. To such a man, it is no shame to submit ourselves in the Lord. In such a man, every devout

appreciator of Israel's good things will rejoice. But if any man insinuates a surrender of judgment on the part of the Christadelphians, or hints at degradation in the attitude acknowledged, we repudiate their suggestions as nothing else than the croakings of a narrow mind. We tell such that they show themselves to be ignorant or low-minded. If they knew the truth and were noble-minded, they would rejoice in everything and everybody associated with the truth's success. If they know the truth, and do not this, they are miserable, envious, narrow souls, full of selfish aims, utterly destitute of the jubilant, cheerful, glorious charity which rejoiceth in the truth, thinketh no evil, and hopeth all things; and they shall utterly perish in their own corruption. If they are not narrow souls, but expansive-minded, magnanimous, noble souls, and yet run down the due appreciation of one so set for the defence of the gospel as Dr. Thomas, it shews they are ignorant of the truth, and speak evil of the things they understood not, in which case their position is equally hopeless as in the other. A knowledge and love of the truth will dispose a man to feel very thankful that such a man as Dr. Thomas was ever raised up of God, and deaden him to all sense of the miserable shame of his name that creeps over some, who, but for Dr. Thomas, would have been floundering in the depths of orthodox superstition.

As to the other part of the newspaper notice, it is not to be wondered at that the features of the truth should be startling to the writer of it. Whatever is unusual is startling. A man immured in the subterranean dungeons of Naples for five years, would be very much startled if a ray of sunlight were to be suddenly shot into his cell. The newspaper writer is such an utter stranger to the truth, that when he hears it, it startles him. It seems to him "an odd mixture." Now, the idea of "oddity" is derived by contrast from regularity or harmony. One can never conceive a thing to be odd unless it is something out of the common run of his experience. For the newspaper writer, therefore, to pronounce the truth "an odd mixture" shows that he is very much accustomed to something else which is very unlike the truth, for if it were at all like the truth, the truth would not strike him as "odd." But which is the "odd mixture,"—the truth or that which newspaper writers recognise as the standard of harmony—the religion of the churches and

chapels? What part of the truth is oddly mixed with any other part? If man is mortal and subject to destruction by the grave, is it very odd to mix with that fact the proposition that Christ has been manifested to make him immortal by raising him from the grave. If the grave suspends a man's life for a time, is it an odd or natural association of ideas to say that judgment lies over till the return of the judge of quick and dead to raise those who are to be judged? If death came by the disobedience of Adam, is it "odd" to say that life comes by the obedience of Christ. If man has no claim on immortality, is it odd or natural to suppose that God has dictated conditions on which he may attain it? If God scattered the Jewish nation from Palestine, is it "odd" or natural that he should gather them thither again. If God promised Jesus the throne of David, is it "odd" or natural he should return to occupy it? If the sorest evil mankind lies under is misgovernment, is it "odd" or appropriate that God should propose to provide good government, through a perfect and omnipotent king. If disobedience, weakness and death are the great curses of the present state, is it out of harmony with the fact that God should propose to abolish these conditions from the earth, and fill the world with his glory? What in all or any part of the truth is it that is oddly mixed? Nothing. Everything is appropriate, beautiful, perfect. But let the newspaper writer examine his much cherished orthodoxy, which he asserts, by implication, is a very homogeneous and consistent compound. Will he find no odd mixtures there? Let us see. If the penalty of sin is eternal torment in hell, is it not very odd that Jesus should pay the ransom by—not going to hell to be tormented, but—dying on the cross? If it was immortal souls that were to be saved, is it not "odd" that Jesus should "come in the flesh?" If immortal souls are saved when they leave the body, is it not very odd that Jesus should proclaim himself the resurrection? If righteous souls go to heaven when the body dies, and wicked souls go to hell when the same thing happens, is it not very "odd" that some long time afterwards, the souls should leave heaven and hell, and be joined to their bodies and be judged at the last day? If souls require to believe the gospel in order to be saved, is it not very odd that infants and idiots, ancient pagans and modern "heathens" can be saved

without the gospel? If a state of ignorance ensures heaven, is it not very odd that Jesus sent Paul to turn the Gentiles, "from darkness to light?" If everybody would be saved if they died as babies, is it not very odd that God allows people to grow up to manhood? If the devil be the author of all sin, is it not very odd that God should allow him to go free, while the poor immortal souls he deludes are damned to unutterable woe? If Jesus destroyed the devil through death (Heb. ii, 14), is it not very odd that he is still at large and as successful as ever? If the clergy have the spirit of God, which they profess to have, is it not very odd that different sections of them should say different things, and give each other the cold shoulder? If this christendom is the kingdom of Christ, isn't it very odd that it is cut up into so many contentious parts. If God is love and power, isn't it very odd that the malignant devil, who is weaker than God, should get hold of the majority of mankind, and put them under eternal woe. If there is a God, isn't it very odd that there should be a devil. If men are immortal souls, isn't it very odd they should have mortal bodies. If Adam's immortal soul was the sinner, isn't it very odd that the punishment should be inflicted on Adam's body. If Adam was a reverdying immaterial soul, isn't it very odd that God should say "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return."

Orthodoxy is the "odd mixture." There is no odd mixture in the truth. It is a solid piece of harmony throughout, but to senses perverted by life-long orthodox usage, it doubtless presents a startling and incongruous aspect.

But if the orthodox newsmonger is "off the mark" with his odd impressions, the secularist is certainly more riotously out of the way than he. In supposing there is anything kindred to his blasphemy in Christadelphian faith. The Christadelphian truly believes man to be mortal, but for a reason that the secularist repudiates and scorns. He believes in the supremacy of divine law. He believes the wages of sin is death. This does not the secularist, but with cool effrontery, believes himself the highest intelligence in the universe. What fraternity is there, then, even in this low ground of cold negation? None; the very opposite; enmity, implacable hostility, war to the knife. There is no concord between Christ and the Belialism of unbelief. The Christadelphian does

not rejoice in negations. He would mourn all his life, with ashes on his head, if there were no hope beyond this afflicted state of existence. He acknowledges descent from Adam and recognizes, without a murmur, the calamity in which, with him, he is involved; but while having no confidence in the flesh, he rejoices in Christ Jesus, believing that he rose from the grave to which he was jointly consigned by the Jews and Romans; was invested with omnipotence by Almighty Power; elevated to a position of mediatorship between Creator and created; appointed Judge of living and dead, and the resurrector and immortalizer of the accepted portion of mankind, and the proprietor and ruler of this habitable globe. This faith is the basis of the only brotherhood that it is worth a man's while troubling about. But, of course, orthodoxists and secularists are equally ignorant of the truth, and it is not surprising that they should both make such grievous mistakes about it.

EDITOR.

NOTTINGHAM.—Brother Phelps, writing August 19th, reports the addition, by immersion, of JOSEPH MINCHIN, past the meridian of life, a man who had never previously been a member of any religious sect. He was awakened to a knowledge of the truth by the Lectures given by Dr. Thomas, in Nottingham, during his last visit to England; and afterwards attended the meeting of the brethren for a considerable time. Having made a satisfactory confession of the one faith, he was baptized, and joined to the ecclesia. Brother Phelps adds that the brethren have been refreshed by a visit from Brother Ellis, of Edinburgh, who lectured in the People's Hall (Sunday, August 19th) to a considerable audience, on "The Future Inheritance of our Race." Writing again on the 15th of September, Brother Phelps records the death of sister Elizabeth Martin, who fell asleep August 23rd, aged 67, in hope of a resurrection to life eternal. He also states that the Sunday evening lectures are continued, and that the audience increases in number.

GATHERING OF BRETHREN IN EDINBURGH,

Continued from page 227.

In the afternoon, after tea had been served to the brethren, the doctrine of resurrection was taken up. It was divided into three phases. The first, which was an examination of the teaching of Paul on "sowing" and "raising," in the 15th

chap. of 1 Cor., was expounded by brother William Ellis. The ideas contained in this exposition are doubtless new to most of the brethren; but they are the result of much thought, and on this ground, and also on the ground that, if they can be consistently established, they present a simple and direct teaching in the chapter, they deserve the candid attention of the brethren. 'Brother Ellis' remarks were substantially as follows:—"So also is the resurrection or standing again of the dead ones. It is sown in corruption," &c. These verses have received very different and conflicting expositions from many who have tried to set forth what they mean. Some have set forth that the sowing time is the casting of a dead body into the ground, but this is opposed to the statement of Paul: "That which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die." The body cast into the grave is already dead, and cannot die in the grave after being sown; and besides, it would prove that all who were the subject of the casting into the grave will be the subject of immortality, a conclusion which must be set aside as false, seeing some will sleep and never rise, while others will rise to die the second death. No doctrine is more easily understood, or more clearly taught in the scriptures, than that there will be a resurrection of just and unjust, and a subsequent separation of them, the one from the other. The sowing cannot refer to the two classes, as being sown or cast forth indiscriminately, for the reason given above, that all who are sown or cast forth are raised to incorruptibility, unless we believe that the wicked arise in a deathless body of glory, honour, and power. The sowing cannot refer to the casting of the good seed of the kingdom into a man, for if it die after being sown there, there can be no reaping of life for him. The figure of a man sowing to the spirit does not apply, as in his case he is the sower and not the thing or body sown. If the figure of a believer, being planted into the Christ, be taken, it also miscarries of the result Paul contemplates. as all who have been cast into him or planted into his death have not died in him, nor have they been made alive by the truth, neither can they attain to the promised life. There remains, therefore, but one class to whom the comparison can apply without failure, viz., those who, during their lifetime, received the incorruptible seed of the word into good and honest hearts, and who, consequently, sowed to the spirit.

These, when the wicked are severed from them, shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. The time when they are cast forth then, or sown, is after the chaff has been fanned away, that they, as the good grain, have been cast forth by the Husbandman, that they may flourish and fill the face of the world with fruit. Verse 52: "The dead shall be raised incorruptible" cannot refer to all who ever have died, nor to all who have put on the Lord Jesus Christ, seeing many of these die the second death. We conclude, therefore, that it can refer to those only of the *dead* who stand before the throne of the Christ, and are the subjects of his approval. This idea becomes the more evident, because death is not swallowed up in victory until the living approved and the *dead* approved have all been the subjects of change together in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye. "For we shall not all sleep, but we shall *all* (whether *dead* or alive) be changed."

The following free translation of the 42nd verse on to the 53rd, conveys, perhaps more clearly than anything else, the idea which brother Ellis entertains of Paul's teaching on these points:—

"So, also is the standing again of the dead ones. It is cast forth in corruption, it is perfected in incorruption. It is cast forth without honour, it is perfected in glory. It is cast forth in weakness, it is perfected in power. It is cast forth an animal body, it is perfected a spiritual body. A body animal and a body spiritual there is, even as it was narrated—the first man Adam became a living soul, the last Adam a life producing spirit; the last man out of the ground a groundling, the second, the Lord from heaven. As is the groundling, such are they also who are from the groundling, and as is the heavenly, such are they also who are from the heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. And I say this, brethren, because flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither is it possible for the corrupt to inherit the incorruptible. Behold, I am declaring to you a secret (mystery), all we, indeed, shall not be asleep, but all of us shall be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, in the sounding of the last trumpet; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead ones who have been cast forth in corrupt, weak, animal bodies, shall be perfected in incorruptible, powerful, spiritual bodies, and we who are living in weak, corruptible animal bodies shall be

changed into incorruptible, powerful, spiritual bodies; for it is necessary that this corruptible put on incorruptibility and this mortal immortality."

Brother J. Gillies, of Beith, followed with an address on Christ as the first fruits, being the second phase of the same subject:—Paul, in writing the epistle to the Hebrews, makes the law of Moses the basis of an argument, to prove that Jesus, who sprung from the tribe of Judah, had been accepted by God as the Melchisedec Ruler and High Priest under the new covenant; and also, that the means by which he could attain to that high dignity was through the sacrifice and offering of himself as God's Lamb, first slain; afterwards its blood, which constituted its life, offered in the most holy place—that these were all shadowed forth in the law. But though minutely shadowed forth, "the law did not contain the very image of the things." If the law had been the very image of the transactions it shadowed forth, then the High Priest would require to be slain, his life restored, and then offer himself within the veil, &c.; but this was both unnecessary and useless. The High Priest was a sinner, and could not get his life restored, save only through him who could offer himself without spot to the Deity. The law, therefore, grouped many transactions together into hieroglyphic symbols, no one of which was the image of what is shadowed forth; and so we find that the slaying of the lamb, the offering of its blood, the offerer, and the altar, were all patterns of the better sacrifice which purified the heavenly things. But when and how was this better sacrifice offered and accepted? It could not be accepted while Jesus lay in the tomb, for a body without life cannot be immortal; and for the same reason, he could not offer himself when he died on the cross. His offering and acceptance could only take place after he rose from the dead. He first awoke from the sleep of death; and this waking, living state was clothed with the house from heaven, or put on incorruption. Accordingly, the dead body of the victim was on the altar while the High Priest carried the blood, which was its life, into the most holy place; this was the offering of its blood, and the High Priest being alive became the type of Jesus, who entered into the holy place, not by means of the blood of goats and calves, but by means of his own blood, which it was impossible for him to do had he been raised with the divine nature.

But Jesus did not enter the literal holy place; indeed, he could not, because he did not belong to the tribe of *Levi*, "and no one of any other tribe had any right to officiate as priest under the law of Moses." Jesus entered the holy place only in figure; and in chap. x, 20, the Apostle says the veil was a figure of his flesh, and like the high priest, he passed through the veil (or flesh) before he could offer himself as the first fruits in their nature, and was then clothed with incorruptibility, and has gone into the presence of his Father as High Priest for his household; but his presence there is not perpetual, because "the greater and more perfect tabernacle," of which he is the High Priest, exists not in the heavens, but on the earth. It was all the salvation and desire of not only David and the many names recorded in the 11th chap. of this epistle, as worthy examples, for their firm adherence to those exceeding great and precious promises, but of Jesus also. This constituted the joy that was set before him, and for which he refused not to suffer on the cross.

Brethren Robert Strathearn, of Tranent, and Andrew Tait next took up the last of the three phases into which the subject had been divided, viz., "the first resurrection," and the law of life and death during the millennial age. The opinions they expressed were identical; therefore, their addresses are blended into one; so that not only space may be husbanded, but that the matter may be presented in one perfect whole, rather than in two sections. The ideas they propounded are as follow: The millennial age is one, the pre-eminent feature in which is the *presence* of Jesus the Christ, who is the life of his people, as it is written, "When Christ our *life* shall appear, then shall we appear with him in glory." That he has abolished death, is a great truth; and the fact that it still reigns over his servants, can only be attributed to his absence from their midst. For if it is absolutely necessary that every son of Adam must return to dust and be raised again, before he can obtain the life which is in Christ, then upon no principle of equity can the mortality of the living at Christ's appearing be clothed, "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye," with the house which is from heaven. But we think that it is the greatest blessing of that age, that as death has held undivided sway over the righteous in the ages that will have passed, so then there will be "no more death," save to the wicked, and to them a "perpetual sleep." For if we hold

that Jesus, after his inaugurating that time by judging his household, dividing the good from the bad, and raising up his dead-ones (that is, those who have died, and those who were living at his coming, standing on one level—corruptible) incorruptible, is, with his glorified brethren, the ruler of the world, and administrator of the law of life, then if the righteous die during that age, Christ's functions are divested of their greatest glory. He is the antitypical Moses, and if we admit that he administers the curse—the age-lasting punishment—without an intervening death and resurrection, after the similitude of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, why not the blessing on the same principle? Those who hold the contrary view think they find unqualified support in the 5th verse of the 20th chap. of Rev. But this is but slender ground, seeing that the whole teaching of the Book is the other way; and, moreover, the argument based on this is by no means clear. The words are, "But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished: this is the first resurrection." Now it is a fact worth noticing here that several versions of the New Testament omit the first part of the 5th verse, and read the latter part in connection with the 4th verse, thus, "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them, and they lived and reigned with the Christ a thousand years: this is the first resurrection." This, in the light of the views we have stated, appears to be a better reading of the text. But the word "again" is not to be found in any but the common version. Reading the verse, then, with only this alteration, it appears to us clearly a contrast in the Apostle's version of the "dead ones, small and great," whom he sees standing before the throne, and judged every man according to his works, verse 11 to the end. Some of them sit down on thrones, and live and reign with Christ one thousand years. This is *their* part or inheritance. But the rest of these dead ones who were judged, did not live in the age, but on them, the second death had power. This is further confirmed in the 8th verse of the 21st chap. If it be argued that to have a part in the first resurrection means only the act of rising from the ground, then there is only *one* class in that rising up—they are all righteous. But this is so clearly opposed to the truth of the matter, that its refutation is needless. Amidst a multitude of references

one will suffice, viz., Daniel xii, 2. We are forced, therefore, to a different conclusion as to the words "first" or "chief" resurrection, if we understand this chief resurrection as such, not on account of there being another and a lesser one, but because that to have a part in it is to be of the first fruits unto God and the Lamb, to be one of the chiefs of the aion. Having this idea, therefore, we might paraphrase the verse thus:—"Blessed is he that hath a portion or inheritance in the exaltation of the first fruits, on him 'the shame and contempt of the age' has no power."

The subjects presented, of which the preceding is a digest, were, if not exhaustive, at least highly suggestive; and on this score were much appreciated by the majority of the brethren present, and will, doubtless, receive the same attention and thought from readers of the *Ambassador*.

Another meeting of the same character was fixed for Sunday, October 13th, to which brethren from all parts are invited. The subjects for consideration are 1st, The basis of the faith for fellowship unto true unity; 2nd, the apostolic teaching concerning the corporate manifestation of the saints as the body of Christ

At the last moment we are compelled, for want of space, to withdraw an interesting narrative of labours at Whitby, by brother Shuttleworth, of Halifax; also intelligence from Littlebury, Turrif, Weston-super-mare, Jeffersonville, and Sweetwater, U.S.; all are in type and were intended for this month. For the same reason, "Answers to Correspondents" must still lie over.

ERRATA IN BROTHER JARDINE'S ARTICLE.—*In August number, page 192 col. 2, line 31, for "no room for personal spiritual advantages" read "no room for personal, save spiritual advantages."*

In September number, page 220, col. 2, line 18, for "and the resurrection to make mention of" read "and the putting on of immortality to make mention of." Nineteen lines farther on, for, "It is a figurative dress, and applicable to both conditions, but not to the clothing of either mortality or immortality;" read "It is a figurative dress, merely denoting a quality associated with those conditions, and is, therefore, not in itself the clothing of either mortality or immortality."

THE ADVERTISING SCHEME.—Towards this, we have, during the month, received from a sister, 10s.; another sister, 30s. (in addition to 20s. already sent). If those who have promised would now remit, a start will be made.

THE APPEAL FOR HELP.—In behalf of the needy brother and sister appealed for in the August number, we have, since our last issue, received from a brother, 10s.; and from a sister, 20s.

TWENTY SHILLINGS sent by a sister, by the hands of a brother, for the general service of the truth in Birmingham, has been distributed among poor brethren and sisters, who hereby return thanks.

THE AMBASSADOR

Of the Coming Age.

"A wicked Messenger falleth into mischief, but a faithful Ambassador is health."—PROV. xiii, 17.

No. 41.

NOVEMBER, 1867.

Vol. IV.

THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF JUDGMENT.

BY J. J. ANDREW, LONDON.

(Continued from page 235.)

THE next important utterance of Jesus Christ on this subject, is the parable of the nobleman and the pounds. In this parable, the judge is represented as a nobleman who goes into a far country (heaven) to receive a kingdom, and then returns home (the earth) to take possession of it. Before his departure "he called his ten servants, and delivered them ten pounds, and said unto them 'Occupy (or trade) till I come.'" When he returned, those servants were brought before him, "that he might know how much every man had gained by trading." Although there were ten servants, the cases of three only are given; they are quite sufficient to show the principle on which the whole were treated.

The first said he had gained ten pounds by trading with one pound: whereupon his master said "Well, thou good servant, because thou hast been faithful in a very little, have thou authority over ten cities."

The second said he had gained five pounds by trading with one pound: whereupon his master said "Be thou over five cities." But the third returned the pound as it had been given to him, saying "I feared thee because thou art an austere man; thou takest up that thou layest not down, and reapest that thou didst not sow." To this his master answered "Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee." This he proceeded to do, by showing him that even if his fear for his master's severity prevented him from trading with the pound, it did not prevent him putting it into the bank, that it might simply have gained interest. Then "he said unto them that stood by, 'take from him the pound, and give it to him that hath ten pounds.'"

It is not difficult to perceive that this is but another mode of illustrating the judgment, and is intended to teach an aspect which is omitted in the narrative just noticed; namely, that all who are the true servants of Jesus Christ will be judged according to the manner in which they have, while in his service, used or misused their abilities. It also illustrates Paul's statement, that "everyone of us shall give account of himself to God:" a circumstance not mentioned by Jesus Christ, when speaking of the sheep and goats. Each of the three servants rendered an account of his stewardship; and it was the nature of that account which determined his destiny. The third one evidently did not know what his destiny would be, previously to sentence being pronounced, or he would not have uttered an excuse which enabled his master so triumphantly to condemn him out of his own mouth. And as the approval of the other two followed the delivery of their accounts, it necessarily follows that they also were unacquainted with their destiny previous to their approval being declared; for it will be seen that all the three were brought before him, "that he might know how much every man had gained by trading." Before this was done, it was impossible for him to praise or blame them, because he had been away into a far country, and consequently did not know how they had conducted themselves during his absence. It was absolutely necessary, therefore, that on his return they should deliver an account of their stewardship.

From the circumstance that the number of cities to be ruled over are mentioned in this parable, it is often inferred that the judgment is simply the bestowal of the rewards of the kingdom, in their various degrees, to the righteous after they have received the gift of immortality. But it is evident that this cannot be the sole meaning of the parable, because, firstly, if that view be correct, two at least, and probably the whole three, would have known their destiny before their master had seen them, and thus the delivery of their account would have been quite unnecessary; for if the nobleman had known which of the servants merited his approval, he would also have known what amount of reward they deserved.

Secondly, on such a theory it is impossible to account for the unprofitable servant being summoned at precisely the same time as the other two.

Thirdly, the authority to rule over ten or five cities is, in reality, the same thing as granting an entrance into the kingdom, or the bestowal of eternal life.

In the parable of the talents narrated by Matthew, which is doubtless but another version of the parable of the pounds recorded by Luke, the mark of approval is denoted by these words: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things; I will make thee ruler over many things; *enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.*"—(Matt. xxv, 21.)

For the judge to say "Be ruler over many things," is undoubtedly the same as saying "Inherit the kingdom prepared for you," or "Be thou over five cities," because all who inherit the kingdom will exercise regal authority; hence the Apocalyptic promise "To

him that overcometh, will I give power over the nations." Then, again, it must be noticed that immediately after granting the power to rule many things, the nobleman said "Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." To do this it is requisite to be made like Christ—a partaker of the divine nature, so that if immortality had been previously bestowed, we are led to ask, with what appropriateness could the judge now invite him to enter into the joy of his Lord? Immortality is the gift of the King, with whom is deposited the lives of his faithful servants, and can only be enjoyed through the means of the kingdom; therefore as soon as a person has received that unspeakable gift, he will be certain of being made a "ruler over many (or few) things," for he knows that "*power over the nations,*" and the privilege of *reigning* with the Messiah, is an essential accompaniment of the possession of eternal life.

For these reasons, we think we may safely conclude that the parable of the pounds or talents does not teach that the judgment is merely the apportionment of positions in the kingdom to the righteous, but, on the contrary, that *it is for the purpose of deciding who are, and who are not, worthy to enter that kingdom.*

Such, then, are the two most elaborate of Christ's discourses concerning the mode in which "God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ." One is a simple narrative, and the other a parable. The former represents the whole number of those who are to be judged, but the latter brings before us three cases only as illustrations of the rest. The one is a collective view of the judgment, and the other an individual one. The main facts, however, in each case are precisely the same, and they fully confirm the statements of Paul:—first, as regards the *time*;—that it is to be at the second advent; second, as to the *manner*;—that the household of God are to be in the presence of their Master while being judged; third, in the *results*;—that the unfaithful are to be punished, and the faithful endowed with immortality.

And although the "account" to be given by each individual is not mentioned in the narrative, it is copiously illustrated in the parable. Thus we see that the teaching of Jesus on this important subject harmonises in every particular with that of Paul;—a circumstance which might reasonably be expected, seeing that they were both inspired by the same spirit.

There is, however, one fact in connection with the parable, which it may be advisable to devote a little attention to before passing to another part of the subject. It will be said, perhaps, that the ignorance of the nobleman as to the conduct of his servants is not applicable to the judge of quick and dead, because Jesus Christ, as the representative of God, "knoweth the secrets of the heart," and is therefore so well acquainted with the conduct of all his servants as to know what they deserve before raising them from the dead. This cannot be denied; but it must be remembered that the possession of such knowledge by the Judge will not in any way interfere with the "account" to be rendered by his servants; any more than does the foreknowledge of God destroy man's free will. One of the objects for

which they are to appear before the judgment-seat to give an account of themselves, seems to be,—not to inform the Judge of any facts of which he was previously ignorant,—but, in order that, if their report be unsatisfactory, they may be condemned out of their own mouths; and that thus the justice of the Deity may be fully vindicated.

The Almighty knows everything before it occurs, for it is essential to His attribute of Omniscience, but this does not prevent Him occasionally acting as if ignorant of certain deeds of mankind. An instance of this is to be found in the case of Adam and Eve. It cannot be doubted that as soon as they had sinned, God was aware of the fact; and yet He appeared to them by a representative, and spake to them as if ignorant of their transgression. He first said to Adam "Where art thou?" to which Adam replied "I heard thy voice in the garden and was afraid, because I was naked; and I hid myself." This answer showed that he was ashamed of something he had done; so the next question put to him was "Who told thee that thou wast naked? Hast thou eaten of the tree whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldst not eat?" Then follows the excuse of Adam, who blamed Eve; whereupon the woman was questioned, and she blamed the serpent. After this, sentence was pronounced on all three, and thus the punishment to which Adam and Eve were condemned was not declared until they had actually given an account of their sinful conduct during the time of their probation in the garden of Eden. Hence they were judged by their own words, like the servants in the parable,—the last of whom was condemned out of his own mouth.

When it is remembered that Adam occupied a peculiar position as the federal head of the human race, and that through his sin, death passed upon all men, it will be seen that a more significant case than this could not be adduced to illustrate the doctrine of the judgment as applied to the household of God. Adam was placed by God under a state of probation, with the opportunity of obtaining, by obedience, the blessing of immortality; but he sinned, and when that event occurred, his probational career in the garden of Eden came to an end, and he had to give an account of his transgression to a representative of his Creator, that his own words might condemn him.

All who are to appear before the judgment-seat of Jesus Christ will also have lived under a probationary state, in which they were required to fulfil certain obligations, imposed by the Almighty as a condition necessary to obtain eternal life; and of their performance of these duties, they will have to give an account to the one whom God has appointed to be their Judge. Thus the parallel between the two cases is complete; or, as much so as is necessary to explain how it is that although Christ be acquainted with the destiny deserved by each of his servants, they are nevertheless required to render an account of their stewardship previous to receiving either reward or punishment.

A somewhat similar instance may also be found in the case of Cain killing his brother Abel. God must have known of Cain's transgression as soon as it was committed; and yet we read that "the Lord God said unto Cain Where is thy brother Abel?" To this Cain

answered, with a lie, saying "I know not; am I my brother's keeper?" Had he spoken the truth, he would have imitated Adam, but his conscience was so hardened that he added to the sin of murder that of trying to deceive the messenger of the Almighty. Therefore, to show the futility of this, the Deity's representative at once charged Cain with his crime, and pronounced his sentence. This case shows us that the possession by Jesus Christ of a knowledge of the merits of each individual to be judged by him, so far from being superfluous, is absolutely necessary to enable him to detect whether any attempt is being made to deceive him with evasion or falsehood by his unprofitable servants; for the justice to be administered by him must be infallible.

Another object, and a most important one, for which an account is required to be given at the judgment-seat, is for the purpose of impressing on the minds of those amenable to it, the responsible position they occupy as *stewards of their Lord* and Saviour. This brings before us the moral aspects of the question, in relation to this life; and it shows us that a knowledge of this truth is designed to act as a constant stimulus to the people of God to do right, and a constant check against doing wrong; so that at the day of judgment they may be able to render a good account of their probationary career. The apostle John evidently refers to this aspect when he says "He that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him. Herein is our love made perfect, *that we may have boldness in the day of judgment.*"—(1 John iv, 16, 17.) And also in a previous chapter of the same epistle, where he writes "And now, little children, abide in him, *that when he shall appear, we may have confidence and not be ashamed before him, at his coming.*"—(1 John, ii, 28.) When the apostle wrote these two passages, he doubtless had in his mind the warning uttered by Jesus himself: "Whosoever, therefore, shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, *of him also shall the Son of Man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father, with the holy angels.*"—(Mark viii, 38.) If these important injunctions were fully realised and borne in mind by those to whom they were addressed, they must have exercised considerable moral influence on their minds in regard to their daily conduct; for in reality, they amount to an exhortation to do nothing by which the promised prize of immortality might be lost. For Jesus Christ to be ashamed of any of his disciples at his coming, is in reality to condemn them to "everlasting shame and contempt," to "utterly perish in their own corruption." But to "have boldness in the day of judgment," is to be able to give such an account, that they can with confidence, say with Paul, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day."—(2 Tim. iv, 7, 8.) In requiring from all who have been, or are, in Christ, an account of their stewardship, we see that the Almighty has simply applied to divine things a principle which is quite common in the relations existing among mankind themselves—not in one, but in all classes and grades of society. No sensible man ever entrusts to another any duty to discharge, office to fill, or property to hold or dispose of, without requiring from him at some time or other, an account of the manner in which he has

performed the work assigned to him. Instances of this will readily occur to the mind of anyone, not only in commercial, but also in social and political life; such for instance as the master and his servant, the merchant and his clerk, the captain and his sailors, the general and his soldiers, the constituency and its member of parliament, the House of Commons and its ministers, the shareholders of a company and their directors, or an ordinary benevolent society and its committee. In every one of these cases, the knowledge that an account *can be*, and in many of them *will be required* by those from whom their position is derived, acts as a useful check to keep them in the path of duty. And if this be the case in matters affecting the present life only, is it surprising or incredible that the Almighty should have adopted a similar effective method of influencing for good—and that their own good—those who are entitled to be called the children of God? Individually and collectively, they are entrusted with the knowledge of his truth, which it is their duty, and it ought to be their delight, to employ in the service of their master, who has honoured them with the titles of “brethren,” “sons of God,” “salt of the earth,” “light of the world,” &c. Is it unreasonable then, that he should require them to report to him at the day of judgment, as to the manner in which they have employed their time, talents, and opportunities on his behalf? More especially as they know that they are not their own, but have been bought with a price—even the price of the precious blood of one who was slain as a lamb without spot or blemish.

Those who say that Paul's statement about appearing at the judgment seat to give an account to the judge, is figurative, take away this means of control devised by God, and thus lessen very materially that feeling of responsibility which it is intended to increase. For, if a disciple of Jesus Christ will have to appear at the day of judgment, face to face before his master, to give an account of his good and bad deeds, it is obvious that a knowledge of this fact must exert a very beneficial influence on his conduct; more so than if he knew that he would never be in danger of being condemned out of his own mouth. And it is also obvious that just in proportion as he realises and remembers this important fact, so will “the truth” purify his heart, moulding his character to the divine standard of holiness, by leading him to obey the precepts of scripture, and to bring forth works befitting his high faith and high calling.

On what grounds Paul's statements about the judgment-seat are interpreted figuratively, we are quite at a loss to imagine; for not only are they written in as plain and direct a manner as it is possible for words to make them, but they are comprised in epistles treating little, if any, on scripture symbols. “*We shall all stand*” (all who have been baptized unto Christ), he says, “*before the judgment seat of Christ*”; and to prove that he is right, he quotes from the prophet Isaiah, saying “For it is written, as I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and *every tongue shall confess to God*”; and from this he draws the following conclusion: “So then *everyone of us shall give account of himself to God*.”—(Rom. vi., 10 to 12.) In his epistle to the Philippians, he further alludes to it: “Wherefore God hath highly exalted him (Jesus Christ) and given him a name which is above every name; that *at the name of Jesus every knee should bow*; of those in heaven, those on earth, and those

underneath; and that *every tongue should confess that Jesus is Lord* to the glory of God the Father."—(Philip. ii, 9 to 11.) And we also find the apostle Peter inculcating it in his epistle: "Who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead."—(1 Peter iv, 5.)

Thus we have Isaiah, Paul and Peter, in addition to Jesus himself, all testifying to the important truth that an account must be rendered to the Judge, affording an amount of evidence sufficient to convince any reasonable mind.

The phrase "judgment seat" may not refer to a material structure, such as is generally used, any more than does the term, "throne of David;" but there can be no doubt that its use involves the exercise of the judicial function—a function too, which is to be exercised *when the judged ones are in the presence of the Judge*. The word used by Paul to describe the judgment seat of Christ, is precisely the same as is used to define the seat of judicial authority, occupied by Roman functionaries in the apostle's day. The Greek word is *beema* (Βημα), and its meaning is defined in Liddell and Scott's Lexicon as "a footstep, raised step, tribune, rostrum." This is the word used by Matthew in narrating the trial of Jesus Christ. Speaking of Pilate, he says "When he was set down on the *judgment seat*, his wife sent unto him," (Matt. xxvii, 19.) John also uses it in narrating the same event: "When Pilate therefore heard that saying, he brought Jesus forth, and sat down in the *judgment seat*, in a place that is called The Pavement, but in Hebrew, Gabbatha."—(John xix. 13.)

In commenting on this verse, Dr. Adam Clarke says "The Pavement (*Αἰθροπρωτον*), literally a stone pavement; probably it was that place in the open court where the chair of justice was set, for the Prefects of provinces always held their courts of justice in the open air, and which was paved with stones of various colours—what is now termed Mosaic work. Gabbatha: that is, an elevated place; from "gabol," high, raised up; and it is very likely that the judgment seat was considerably elevated in the court, and that the governor went up to it by steps; and perhaps these very steps were what was called 'The Pavement.' John does not say that 'The Pavement' is the meaning of the word 'Gabbatha,' but that the place was called so in the Hebrew. The 'place' was probably called 'The Pavement;' the seat of judgment 'Gabbatha,' the raised or elevated place."

It will not be denied that Pilate exercised judicial authority when Jesus was brought before him; and hence we may conclude that when the same Jesus occupies a position described by precisely the same word as that which Pilate occupied, he will exercise similar functions. For other instances of a like nature, we have only to refer to the Acts of the Apostles. In the 18th chapter we have an account of Paul being accused at Corinth of breaking the law. "And when Gallio was the deputy of Achaia, the Jews made insurrection with one accord against Paul, and brought him to the *judgment seat*, saying, this fellow persuadeth men to worship God contrary to the law."—(verses 12, 13.) But Gallio would not hear them, because the charge was one that affected only the Jewish religion; so we read "And he drave them from the *judgment seat*. Then all the Greeks took Sosthenes, the chief ruler of the synagogue, and beat him before the *judgment seat*. And Gallio cared for none of these things."—(verses 16, 17.) The 25th chapter

contains an account of Paul being brought before Festus, in the narration of which, we find the following allusions to the Roman *judgment seat*. "And the next day (Festus) sitting on the *judgment seat*, commanded Paul to be brought.—(verse 5.) Then said Paul, I stand at Cæsar's *judgment seat*, where I ought to be judged."—(verse 10.) "Therefore when they were come hither, without any delay on the morrow, I (Festus) sat on the *judgment seat*, and commanded the man to be brought forth."—(verse 17.) In every one of these passages, the word used for "judgment seat" is *Βῆμα* (*beema*), and thus we have a very trustworthy standard by which to determine its meaning, when applied to the Judge of quick and dead. When the Spirit of God, speaking through the mouths of his prophets and apostles, uses the same word in various places, it is customary with those who understand how to "rightly divide the word of truth," to assign the same meaning in each place, unless such a mode produces a contradiction, or the context clearly shows that it requires a different interpretation; and in proof that this method of expounding scripture is a sound one, we need only quote Paul's injunction to "compare spiritual things with spiritual." In each of the cases quoted from Matthew, John and Luke, where *beema* is used, we see that those who were to be judged were brought before the judgment seat, to see whether they were guilty or innocent; and as the context does not require a different interpretation to be put upon this word when it is applied by Paul to divine things, we are not justified in affixing an entirely opposite meaning. The judgment seats on which Pilate, Gallio and Festus sat, were none of them figurative ones; how then can it be seriously contended that "the judgment seat of Christ" is but a figurative expression? The early christians were well acquainted with what a judgment seat was, who occupied it, what their duties were, and for what object individuals were brought before it; and therefore when Paul wrote to the Roman and Corinthian ecclesia about Jesus Christ's judgment seat, it would at once bring before their minds the judgment seats at Rome and Corinth (before both of which Paul himself had to appear), and the uses and objects of the one would form the basis of their estimate as to the uses and objects of the other.* If Paul had used the word in a sense different from that in common use, it is reasonable to suppose that he would have explained it. But he did not use it otherwise; on the contrary, he said that those who appear at the Almighty's judgment seat, will "receive *through the body*," according to their *good or bad deeds*. In other words, in order that the decision may be pronounced, as to whether they are guilty or innocent, and the sentence carried out accordingly; and not decide merely what amount of reward shall be bestowed upon them. No seat of judgment has ever yet been instituted for such an object; and it is a mere distortion of words to apply such a meaning to it. Indeed, so devoid of support is this perverted view, that we cannot but think that those who maintain it are liable to a charge similar to that brought by Peter against some of the early christians, who, being unlearned and unstable, did wrest the epistles of Paul, and other scriptures unto their own destruction.—(2 Peter iii, 16.)

(To be continued.)

* Paul did not appear before the Roman judgment-seats to receive rewards of any kind, but to be tried whether or not he was guilty of certain offences.

THE APOCALYPSE PARAPHRASED,
ON THE BASIS OF THE EXPOSITION CONTAINED IN EUREKA,
VOL. II. (DR. THOMAS.)

CHAPTER VII, VERSES 1 TO 8.

AND after these things—the events of the sixth seal—I saw four angels standing at the four corners of the earth, restraining the four winds of the earth, that a wind blow not against the earth, nor against the sea, nor against any tree, for this is the arena on which the sealing of the Deity's servants was to be performed; an arena comprising the countries of Greece, Italy, Britain, France, Spain, Africa, the Islands and Coasts of the Mediterranean, the Countries of the Danube, the Rhine, and the Heights and Vallies of the Alps and Appennines: all of which constituted the Western Roman Empire. If the earth and the sea had not been thus preserved from the tempests which the winds were capable of creating, the work of sealing would not have been performed.

And I saw another angel, having ascended from the sun's rising—not in the act of ascending, but already ascended—thus showing that he had ascended from the east, (where the sun rises) to the west, and that consequently the work which he was commissioned to perform, was to take place—not in the east (Syria and Egypt) but in the west; because for many ages civilisation and conquest was destined to proceed westward; and hence this would be the Empire of the Apostacy. It was necessary, therefore, to antagonise this apostacy by a community in the west adhering to the testimony of God. This angel consisted of a multitude, as evinced by the use of the words "we" and "our," in addressing the four angels; a multitude which consisted of faithful men, competent to teach the one faith to those around, and constituting a class of true believers, refusing to identify themselves with the fellow-servants, who now styled themselves the "Holy Apostolic Catholic Church." These teachers were engaged in organising a community whose mission should be to witness for the truth, against the apostate church.

And this multitudinous angel had a seal of the living Deity—the emblem of divine instruction; and he cried with a loud voice to the four angels, to whom it was given for them to injure the earth and the sea, saying "Injure ye not the earth, nor the sea, nor the trees, while that we may seal the servants of our Deity, upon their foreheads." The Laodicean Catholic Apostacy richly deserved all the judgments restrained by the four angels, but it was spared their infliction for the sake of the servants of the sealed. The period during which this sealing was effected, commenced at the termination of the sixth seal, A.D. 324, and continued for 72 years, until A.D. 396, in which year the first wind began to blow upon the earth. This, of course, was after the Sun of Righteousness had arisen from beneath the horizon of life; so that the

term "sun-rising" may be understood in a doctrinal as well as in a natural sense. In a natural sense it is fulfilled in the fact that the angel-sealers had taken their departure from the sun's rising; they began, as commanded, to preach the gospel at Jerusalem, which is in the east, and were then to proceed to the ends of the earth, or Roman habitable. This commission they had executed, and now they were seen by John preparing for a new effort against a new enemy in the west. In a doctrinal sense, it is fulfilled in their proclamation of the things of the Name, as the only true doctrinal basis of their faith; they proclaimed the rising of a Sun of Righteousness, whose rays should shed life and vigour, with endless glory, upon all who should be warned by them. From this sun's rising they took their departure; no one could be sealed who did not believe that the Deity had raised him from the night of the invisible, and had placed him in the heavens to rule the day. The death, burial, resurrection and ascension of Jesus, are essential elements of the faith that seals the intellects of men, in order to make them wise unto salvation.

The seal which the symbolic angel held, denotes the impression made by the words of the spirit on the minds of God's servants, who are made new by exact knowledge—in contradistinction to the sacramental sealing of the apostacy, which in the fourth century consisted of merely wetting the forehead with water, and greasing it with oil—a sealing which did not penetrate below the skin; it did not reach the intellect and affections, as is the case with those sealed by the direct or indirect teaching of the Deity. Had it not been for the sealing process of the symbolic angel, at this period real christianity would have become extinct.

And I heard the number of them who had been sealed—a hundred and forty-four thousands, which number is a miniature representation of an unknown number, comprising the whole multitude of the redeemed—a multitude which no man could number. One hundred and forty-four is used, because it is the square of twelve: twelve being the square root of the symbolic city styled the New Jerusalem, which is the Bride of Christ. It is represented as possessing twelve gates, twelve foundations, measuring twelve thousand furlongs, and being encircled with a wall of one hundred and forty-four cubits in length. One portion of the hundred and forty-four thousand is founded upon the twelve sons of Israel, and the other portion upon the twelve apostles of the Lamb. Twelve multiplied by twelve, therefore produces one hundred and forty-four—thousands, furlongs or cubits, as the case may be.

These hundred and forty four thousands had been sealed out of every tribe of Israel's sons; a term which is synonymous with the four living ones under the first four seals, and referring, not to the fleshly Israel, but to Israel after the spirit; those persons, whether Jews or Gentiles, who believe God's promises and obey his commandments, Israelites indeed in whom there is no guile, who are Jews inwardly, not outwardly. And there were sealed twelve thousands from each of the tribes of Judah, Reuben, Gad, Asher, Nephthalim, Manasseh, Simeon, Levi, Isachar, Zebulon, Joseph, and Benjamin; not that the body of Christ is divided into tribes, but that, as the spiritual Israel is founded on the root and

offspring of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and David—Jesus the Christ, who is himself sometimes styled Israel—therefore it is regarded as consisting of twelve tribes, after the manner in which the fleshly Israel is divided. Christ being styled Israel, all who put on his name by the one faith and one baptism, and continue steadfast therein, as a consequence become Israel also. Collectively, this Israelitish multitude constitute the antitypical Urim and Thummim, a foursquare breastplate borne upon the breast of the high-priest in the holy place, wrought of gold, blue, purple, scarlet, and fine twined linen, and containing twelve stones, to represent the twelve tribes of Israel. Urim refers to the lights of divers colours which glittered from the stones, and Thummim to their fulness of number. In the Apocalypse the antitypical Urim and Thummim are presented before us in two states; in the present, when its constituent members are being sealed, and in the future, when they are immortalised and with the lamb on Mount Zion. As the high-priest of all the members of this four-square community in its present, or sealing state, Jesus Christ appears in the presence of the Father, with their names engraven on his heart; for these, and these only, he intercedes with the Deity. Having been enlightened by the law and the testimony, they have become the lights and precious stones of their high-priest's breastplate, the Urim and Thummim. Hence they are enabled to shine as lights in the darkness of the world surrounding them. All who are ignorant of the law and the testimony possess no light in them, and are therefore outside this holy square of twelve; and as long as they continue in this state of intense darkness, destitute of the light of the glory of the gospel, they can be neither Urim nor Thummim, nor in Christ.

J. J. A.

TOUR IN SCOTLAND.

THE EDITOR'S refusal to break bread with the Aberdeen brethren on account of their connection with the Dowieites, was the subject of warm debate at two meetings. He was closely taken to task for his conduct, which he defended on principles familiar to all who are alive to the bearing of the truth. His first answer was that the Dowieites were unfaithful to the truth. This was met by a declaration that we ought not to judge each other. Now, let us look at this for a moment, and we shall find that it is a fallacy of the most pernicious kind. That we are not to judge is true in the sense intended by Christ when he said "Judge not." We are not to decide who of those, believing the truth, are worthy or unworthy of eternal life; nor to carry out our conviction on such a point

by repudiating those whom we may regard unfavourably, except where an open violation of the commandments of Christ takes place. It is Christ's especial function to do this, and to separate the chaff from among the wheat, but it is not true that we are to shut our eyes to delinquency, and extend our fellowship without discrimination. In this we are to judge, in the sense of determining our duty toward those to whom we may stand related. We are to decide where fellowship should be given and where it ought to be withheld. If this is not a true principle, whence arises the distinction between the ecclesia and the world? We come out of the world; we separate from the apostacy; we withdraw from the fellowship of both, and would, one and all, refuse to resume that fellowship by admitting parties belonging

to either class into the ecclesia, and we would even, without dispute, refuse to countenance a disobedient brother. Paul says to the Corinthians (1st Epistle, v, 11), I have written unto you not to KEEP COMPANY if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolator, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; *with such an one no not to eat.*" Again, to the Thessalonians, he says (2 Epistle, iii, 14) "If any man obey not our word by this epistle, *have no company with him*, that he may be ashamed." Again, verse 6, same chapter, "*Withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly*, and not after the traditions which he received of us." Again, (1 Tim. vi, 3,) "If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness, he is proud, knowing nothing, * * * *from such withdraw thyself.*" Now here are plain apostolic injunctions which cannot be carried out without forming a judgment on the matters involved. For how shall we know when to withdraw from another, unless we conclude that a state of things justifying it, exists? And how can we come to this conclusion without observing and considering the matters leading to it? This mental act is the very basis of the withdrawal enjoined. How then can it be condemned? When Christ said "Judge not," he did not forbid what his apostles afterwards enjoined. Is Christ against Paul? Those who deprecate a compliance with Paul's rules for determining questions of fellowship virtually teach that he is. To such we must not listen. If any man contends for a course of action opposed to what Paul commands in his epistles, he puts himself into a position in which, by Paul's command, we are to have no company with him. The Aberdeen answer to "judge not," is no reply to the allegation that the Dowietes are unfaithful to the truth. This fact continues to be a reason for avoiding their fellowship.

But it may be said that Paul's directions on the subject of withdrawal, apply only to matters of conduct, and not to matters of doctrine. To this we would reply, that if it does not apply to matters of doctrine, the Aberdeen brethren themselves have committed the very crime of which they accuse the Christadelphians; they are guilty of schism. Why have they left the Presbyterians, the Baptists, the Morisonians, and the others? Are not all these,

respectable, well-behaved people? plentiful, many of them, in gracious looks, kindly words, and good deeds? On what principle can they defend separation from them? Do not the orthodox communities believe the Bible, and profess the name of Christ? Why have they come away from them? Are they not guilty of having "judged" these "sincere" professors of religion? Yes, in a sense, they are; and they have done quite right, for they are commanded to judge of themselves what is right, and act accordingly. The attitude enjoined in reference to sinful deportment, is also incumbent toward doctrinal defection. It is true the passages quoted above refer mainly to behaviour; but the same duty is elsewhere inculcated in reference to those who obstruct or oppose, or deny the truth in any of its doctrinal elements. 2 John, 9-10, is a forcible illustration of this: "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, (that is, the truth concerning Christ's manifestation in the flesh,) *receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed; FOR HE THAT BIDDETH HIM GOD SPEED, IS PARTAKER OF HIS EVIL DEEDS.*" Paul indicates the same duty in several places. Speaking to the Galatians of certain "false brethren unawares brought in," he says, "to whom we gave place by subjection - no, not for an hour." This was in reference to the Judaistical believers of Paul's time, who taught the necessity for being circumcised and observing the law. He says of them "*A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump. * * * I WOULD THEY WERE EVEN CUT OFF WHICH TROUBLE YOU.*"—(Gal. vi, 9, 12.) He says something to the same effect to the Corinthians: "Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? *Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. * * * PUT AWAY FROM AMONG YOURSELVES THAT WICKED PERSON.*"—(1 Cor. v, 6, 7, 11.) There is nothing more conspicuous in Paul's letters to Timothy, than his jealousy of those in the ecclesia whose influence was detrimental to the truth. He says, "*Hold fast the form of sound words which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus. * * * The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also. * * * Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of*

truth. But shun profane and vain babblings, for they will increase unto more ungodliness, and their word will eat as doth a canker; of whom are Hymenæus and Philetus * * * having a form of godliness but denying the power; FROM SUCH TURN AWAY. For of this sort are they which creep into houses, and lead silly women, laden with sins, led away with divers lusts, ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth. Now as Jannes and Jambre withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth. * * * Evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived, but continue thou IN THE THINGS WHICH THOU HAST LEARNED * * * Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine, for the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine: but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears, and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables."—(2 Tim. i, 13; ii, 2, 15-17; iii, 5-8; 13, 14; iv, 2-4.) The same anxiety about preserving the truth in its purity from the corrupting influence of its loose professors, is manifest in his letter to Titus. Defining the qualifications of an elder, he says he must be a man "holding fast the faithful word, as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine to exhort and convince the gainsayers. For there are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision, whose mouths must be stopped * * * A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject."—(Titus i, 9-11; iii, 10.) To the same purpose are the words of Jude. "It was needful for me to write to you that ye should CONTEND EARNESTLY FOR THE FAITH WHICH WAS ONCE DELIVERED UNTO THE SAINTS; for there are certain men crept in unawares, &c.—(verses 3-4.) The Aberdeen brethren and the Dowieites themselves have shown their apprehension of these apostolic precepts by separating from the sects and denominations of the orthodox world. Upon what principle then can they object to the attitude of Christadelphians towards the Dowieites, on the supposition that the latter corrupt the truth? It is entirely beside the mark to raise the cry of schism; this is a false issue. It is not a question between schism and unity among those holding the truth; it is a question of truth *versus* error among those professing the former. The Dowieites

are consistent in the position they maintain, supposing that their doctrines are the truth: but the Aberdeen brethren have not even that feeble plea. They believe the Dowieites to be wrong in many of their doctrines, and yet they advocate connection with them, although justifying separation from the sects. They do so on the ground that the Dowieites have a great part of the truth: but this is not a principle that can be scripturally defended. There is no authority for making one part of the truth less important than another. A reception of the truth on one point will not condone its rejection on another. Can we suppose that the Judaizers had no part of the truth? Did the Gnostics who denied that Christ had come in the flesh, reject the kingdom of God? Did not the unbelieving Jew hold the truth in great part? Yet Paul counselled withdrawal from them all. Nothing short of fidelity to the whole truth can be accepted as a safe policy. "The things concerning the kingdom of God," and "those things that concern our Lord Jesus Christ," in their scriptural amplitude must be the measure and standard of fellowship. Those who go for less than this must be left to themselves; in this they are not judged; they are only subjected to the action of another man's conception of duty, and are left at perfect liberty to organize themselves on whatever they may conceive to be a scriptural basis.

Paul's injunctions on the subject of dissociation, from those whose influence is adverse to the truth, have their basis in common sense. The truth associates men in a common purpose to prosecute the mission to which it calls them as regards both themselves and others. Thus associated, they are an ecclesia, and their first duty is the preservation of the truth which has created them. Collectively, they are, in Paul's words to Timothy, "the pillar and ground of the truth." That is, in relation to the unbelieving world, they are a pedestal upon which the truth rests, a prop or stay by which it is upheld. Apart from them, the world has little chance of ever knowing it. With them rests the work of inviting men's attention to, and preserving it in a form in which it will be efficacious when laid hold of. If it becomes corrupted in their midst, they cease to be an ecclesia, and degenerate to a mere sect of errorists, of which there are many in the world. If they continue steadfast in the truth, rejecting the divers fables by which, in all ages, it has shewn such a liability to be

nullified and destroyed, they are a beacon of light and a storehouse of life-giving manna by which men may be saved. This is evident from Paul's words to Timothy personally: "Take heed unto thyself and unto the doctrine; continue in them; for, *in doing this, thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee.*"—(1 Tim. iv, 16.) What is true of Timothy in the matter is true of everybody possessing the truth; for neither Paul nor Timothy's power to save men lay in their appointment or their personal gifts or peculiarities, but in the truth of which they were the treasure-vessels. "Who is Paul," enquires Paul himself, "and who is Apollos, but *ministers by whom ye believed.*"—(1 Cor. iii, 5.) It is the gospel that is the power of God unto salvation, (Rom. i, 16,) and not the men who may preach it. Hence, Paul rejoiced that in Rome, some preached the gospel, "of contention, not sincerely, supposing to add affliction to his bonds." He says, "Whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice, yea and will rejoice."—(Phil. i, 18.)

Now, by what means shall a community, based on the truth, preserve the truth in purity in its midst? Obviously by the means indicated by Paul and John, that is, by exacting of all who are in it an implicit adherence to the things, facts, principles, points, tenets, or whatever else they may be called, which go to make up the truth in its entirety, and by refusing to associate with those who oppose or refuse to endorse any of those elements. Some recommend, in opposition to this, the employment or argument with those who may be in error. As a preliminary process, common wisdom and humanity would dictate this course; but if an ecclesia is to go no further than argument, how could its existence continue? An effort would, doubtless, be put forth to reclaim those who are in error; but, where those efforts fail, dissociation by withdrawal is natural and inevitable. The ecclesia is not a place for argument; it is for fellowship in agreement. When a man requires to be argued with, his natural place is outside, and if he will not go outside, separation must be enforced by withdrawal on the part of the rest. The adoption of this policy may be oftentimes hurtful to amicable feeling, but this must not deter from faithfulness; Christ distinctly foretold that the result of his operations in the world would be to sow division, causing father to separate from son, mother from daughter, and the

closest of friends to divide. Therefore, the occurrence of painful violations of friendship need not surprise, or cause uneasiness to, devout minds, as if something were happening contrary to the mind of Christ. Division is the inevitable concomitant of an uncompromising adherence to the truth. Peace purchased at the cost of compromise is doubly dangerous. The truth is the standard, and must alone be allowed to rule. All doubts ought to be solved in its favour. This is the principle of action to which study will ultimately lead. The act of separation is not an act of judgment against those from whom we may separate. It is an act of self-vindication; an act by which we discharge a duty and wash our hands of evil.

The truth has gradually emerged from the fables in which for centuries it had been lost; and only an inexorable policy on the part of those receiving it will preserve it from a recurrence of the disaster which drove it from among men shortly after the days of the apostles. The dissent of the Dowieite professors of the truth from this policy, and their fellowship with and belief of some of the fables of the apostacy, is the cause of the division that now exists. This division must be a cause of deep sorrow on the part of those who love the truth, but the attitude of the individuals in question leaves no alternative to those who desire to be faithful: with the Dowieites rests all the responsibility. Regret at the breach of unity must never overbear the determination to maintain the truth. Should they see their way to the reception of the whole truth, and the repudiation of all the fables with which they parley, and the adoption of a faithful attitude, the present state of Dowieism would come to an end, and the cause of truth and brotherly love would receive a mighty acceleration, which would fill the hearts of the brotherhood with joy. The question of brotherly love must be left alone till then, except among those who band themselves on the side of the truth. The truth first; brotherly love afterwards. "Pleas for unity" are out of place while the truth is being trifled with; they are dangerous; they are treacherous, however well meant. They will not be listened to by those who are set for the defence of the gospel.

"But," said the Aberdeen brethren, "how do we know that the Dowieites, as you term them, trifle with the truth? We have only your word for it?" A question

like this provokes an exclamation of surprise. If men cannot see the false position of the Dowieites after all the evidence that has been brought forth from their own lips and the mouths of others, there must be in the men great dullness of spiritual apprehension, or some sympathy with the position taken by the Dowieites. It cannot be ignorance of what the Dowieites are, unless they have stopped their eyes and ears for a long time. A further evidence of their state will be found in the following correspondence which has lately taken place between the ecclesia in Edinburgh, and a brother who left the fellowship of the brethren through Dowieite sympathy:—

EDINBURGH, June 2, 1867.

“Dear Brother,—Regarding you as we do as a brother whom we love in the truth, we feel great sorrow at your continued absence from our midst. We are therefore constrained to write you, not with the purpose of long exhortation and argument, but in a few simple words of earnestness and truth. You are our brother, united to us by the strongest of ties. We are of the brotherhood of that commonwealth which has for its Lord and Master, Jesus, the Anointed One, who is our great High Priest and Advocate with the Father. We have made ourselves his servants now, and we cannot, if we would, break off that relationship, until after we have appeared at his judgment-seat, to receive the reward due to the faithful or unfaithful servants. And it is, dear brother, in this present time, that we must bring forth fruit to him, in order that in the ages to come, we may no longer be servants, looking for the promised reward, but that we may reign with him as kings. From what we know of you, we are persuaded that you will heartily assent that is an imperative duty on all who are in this position, to manifest their service and love to the Master, and to his words, by loving his brethren with “an unfeigned love;” not forsaking the assembling of themselves together, to exhort and to build up one another in the most holy faith, and, above all, to break bread in remembrance of him, and in the earnest expectation of his coming again, to change our vile bodies, and fashion them like unto his own. We say we believe this is your faith as well as ours; and we are convinced that the reason you have not seen it to be your duty for a length of time so to manifest your love to our Father, who first loved you, in bringing you from darkness to his

marvellous light—by loving us, who are your brethren, the children of the one family of faith—is not on account of a want of appreciation of the truth, and the duty which it involves, but of other things, which are stumbling-blocks in the way of unity between us. These things, if they in reality exist, are of the slightest possible character; and although at present you may esteem them great, we earnestly entreat of you to meet us, so that these obstructions may be removed. We pray sincerely that this united appeal from us as a community, to your heart and understanding, may not be without good results. One or two, or more of the brethren, as representing us, will be most glad to call upon you; or if it be more suitable, that you call upon them, to talk over matters, in order to our unity; in which case would you communicate to me your wish. In the meantime, dear brother, I shall subscribe myself, in prayerful affection, yours in the bonds of the Covenant, on behalf of the brethren,

ROBERT PATERSON, Sec.”

EDINBURGH, June 21, 1867.

“Brother Paterson,—Regarding you as a brother only from what you say in your letter, as I have never seen you personally; but your sayings lead me to understand that you are a believer in the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ: I regard all such as brethren in the Lord, and have therefore been immersed into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. The wise, then, of the time of the end, are those who believe such, and they shall shine in the kingdom of the God of Heaven. I find, from the little conversation that I have with the brethren in South Bridge Hall—at least those I come in contact with sometimes—that they believe the same things. Now I cannot understand why you cannot all meet together as brethren, believing the same things, leaving what we may call opinions to be discussed in a brotherly feeling, and your whole desire to be, like Paul, that you be found worthy of a resurrection from amongst the dead. This is all I have got to say at present. You will be thinking me long in writing; but as I never like doing anything in a hurry, I hope you will excuse me.

Yours in the Lord, . . .

I have no other “stumbling-blocks” in the way at present.”

EDINBURGH, June 28th, 1867.

My dear Brother.—“Before entering on the points in your letter which are a reply to the one sent by me from the brethren in Temperance Hall, it will be necessary for me to explain that my personal connection with this matter consists only in the fact that I am one of the community with whom you were in fellowship, and that my position as secretary to the brethren involves on me the discharge of all such duties as the present. Therefore, my knowledge of you as a brother extends no farther than the testimony of brethren in whose judgment and devotion I can place every confidence. These remarks are occasioned by what you say at the commencement of your note, and are designed simply to make clear that this correspondence is not between you and me as individuals, but between you as an individual and the brethren in Temperance Hall, as a community, and that I am simply the instrument of that communicat.

In order to obtain a starting point, it might, perhaps, be advisable to recur to the terms of the note I sent you. If you recollect, that note, in substance, stated that the brethren esteemed you as a brother in the faith, that they deplored your absence from their midst, that they imputed that absence to circumstances—“stumbling-blocks”—which had no connection with our faith in its doctrinal aspect; and that they desired to confer with you, in order that these supposed obstacles might be removed, and complete union between us restored.

But, from your reply, it would seem that this is not the case. Your difficulty does not consist in inability to recognize *us* as brethren of the one faith, but in the fact that we do not recognize the meeting in Union Hall, South Bridge, who profess to be of the same faith, as faithful to its requirements.

We feel glad, if there is to be a difference between us at all, that it should be one of doctrine; for personal differences are to us highly distasteful. They are the results, in all cases, on one side or the other, of a depreciation in the minds of brethren of the greatness of the truth, and of the responsibility of their position as stewards of that truth, for the use of which, they will have to render account. We are glad, therefore, we repeat, that your objection to us is so broad and so clearly defined, and that we can grapple

with it in the assured conviction that there is only one ground upon which we can rest for an abiding foundation—and that ground is the basis of scripture principle and truth.

In your letter you make the remark that you regard all believers in the Kingdom of God and the Name of Jesus Christ, who have been immersed as brethren in the Lord; and you say that from the language I use (which represents the mind of the brethren for whom I write,) you conclude that I am such a one; and you further remark, that from a little conversation you have had with some of the members of the Union Hall meeting, you think they believe the same things

Now, in reference to this, we would say, that it by no means follows that the simple adhesion to such forms of words as the Kingdom of God and the Name of Jesus Christ, implies that any one has faith in these comprehensive terms in the sense in which God requires it in order to salvation; nor, to go further, does it follow that because one declares his belief, like Paul, in a resurrection from among the dead, or that *life* is in Christ, or that the wise shall shine in the kingdom of the God of heaven in the time of the end, that he thereby *understands* the meaning expressed in the terms made use of. These statements are positive truth, any one of which realized in its fulness, is the power of God unto salvation to all believing it. But, then, we have this fact to meet—that there are hundreds of sects of varied names and denominations, who profess to be Christians, or disciples of Christ, who, if you were to ask them if they believed these things, would unhesitatingly answer that they did. And why so? Simply because these words are mere quotations from a book which they regard as the Word of Deity. To what, then, are we driven, in order to see whether a man who professes to believe the Word, really believes that Word or not.

We demand not only a positive declaration of his faith, but we also demand a positive declaration of disbelief in the nullifying traditions and fables of the apostacy, which has been heaping up its forces since the apostolic era, and which now enshrouds the world in its folds of thick, gross darkness. And herein consists one great difference between us and between the meeting in Union Hall. We cannot, if we reflect a little, think it surprising or beyond our comprehension, that in these far-off times of Gentile dom-

ination, a company of men and women who started professedly on identical ground toward a certain end, should after a lapse of time, be divided in purpose and motive. Why, in supremely better times than these, even when God's special spirit was among men, showing them mighty signs and wonders, and opening up the scriptures to their understanding, things such as these, —aye, things worse than these, happened —if we believe the evidence to be found in the writings of the apostles themselves. Besides, the apostles were among them when these things took place; so that matters of 'opinion' did not require to trouble them; for they had the Comforter in their midst—even the Spirit of Truth. So long as they abode in Him (John 15) whose words were spirit and life: that is to say, were devoted to him with pure and disinterested affection, desiring to believe and obey whatsoever he had commanded, and like Job, to "eschew all evil," he and they and the Father were *one* in mind and purpose, as it would—if the abiding proved a lasting one—be in respect of *nature* in the ages to come.

But because of the falling away which then took place, we find it enjoined upon the brethren by the apostle John who, curiously enough in view of certain arguments which now prevail on the subject, wrote more concerning the *love* which brethren ought to show one toward another than any of the other apostles—to believe not every spirit, but to *try* them whether they 'were of God,' and why? 'Because many false teachers had entered into the world.' And can we say now that the potency of this reason is less than it then was? Surely we cannot. On the contrary, every sensible man will say that its necessity is increased tenfold. But John mentions a notable heresy then prevailing, which was to be a test for all who said they were apostles and were not, but were liars.—(Rev. ii, 2.) Without enquiring into the character of this heresy, it will be sufficient for the present purpose to maintain that herein is laid down a principle and herein is a command given which was, without doubt, applicable to all time coming, and to all heresies, errors or deceits which might arise in the midst of those who were believers of the truth.

But there is still an important question for us to ask, and it is this: Why all the anxious solicitude on the part of the apostles for the purity of the truth, manifesting itself in such denunciations of those who were introducing these heresies; John for instance, from whom we have already quoted, even

saying (2 Epis. 10) 'If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine—of which he was speaking—receive him not into your house, neither bid him God-speed: for he that biddeth him God-speed, is partaker of his evil deeds.' And again, the warnings of Paul, who by the spirit foresaw the end of these small beginnings. 'For the time will come,' he says to Timothy, 'when they will not *endure* sound doctrine.' Therefore, he in another place tells him to shun profane babblings and old wives' fables, and strive to be a workman in the scriptures, *rightly dividing* its contents.' Why this we say, and much more which might be quoted, showing how the apostles looked on these things. *Because of its tendency.* As he says further to Timothy, 'it would *increase*—it would *grow* (mark the words) to more ungodliness—it would eat out the truth as a canker—bit by bit its edge would be blunted, its truth modified and pared down, and so adulterated with error, in order to please the lusts or desires of men, that it soon would merge itself into the commonly received sentiments of mankind, and exist as only one festering mass of corruption.

That it has happened thus is evident. And now that in the providence of God, a few have been able to dig out the truth, does the history of the past not afford us a mighty lesson to hold fast to—to contend earnestly for—what we have obtained, to shun with all our heart and soul the slightest defilement from the cup of the abominations of the apostasy.

We have endeavoured to establish this clearly as a basis, in order to show the grounds on which, in the sight of God, we have taken up our position, against those in Union Hall and against all others of similar mind. Coming now closer to the point in hand, let us name a few of the prominent delusions existing among denominations generally:—The Immortality of the Soul—the Doctrine of Eternal Burnings—the Doctrine concerning the Devil—the Pre-existence of Jesus—the Burning of the World, &c.

Now in reference to the command given to the first christians, after that corruptions set in amongst them, to *try* the spirits, and believe them not, if they were found teaching fabulous traditions or heresies of any kind, which command, from the circumstances now existing, is more binding than ever—we maintain that the Union Hall meeting is not faithful. Their attitude to everyone of the delusions named, is directly opposite to that inculcated by the

apostles. Take the first, which for the magnitude of its delusive character, might be called the fountain of error. It was only a little earlier than this time last year, that it was *warmly* debated among them whether or not a man should renounce this doctrine before he embraced the doctrine of Christ, which resulted in several of their number leaving their fellowship. As to the second—eternal torments—it is also a fact that last year there was among them a person whom they had baptised, and whom they had fellowshipped for years, who before his baptism, could never have been questioned as to his views on this matter; and doubtless he would have been in their fellowship yet, had it not been that his position became so notorious by his engaging in public discussion with a Universalist, maintaining that the scriptures taught hell-fire torments—that their *fair* reputation became imperilled and it was only after considerable discussion that he was parted with. These are cases about which there cannot be the slightest doubt; and they have come to light, certainly not by their consent, but through the sheer force of circumstances, principally external to themselves. They, however, indicate a state of things behind—an attitude toward the *vitality* of the truth—which can only require a little time to manifest themselves into a worse state than is yet the case.

The remaining items mentioned as part of the fables existing in the apostacy are not only not discouraged, but are positively believed in more or less by them as scripture truth, which can be abundantly shown did the limits of this letter permit, but which we are quite prepared, if necessary, to prove in detail.

But looked at from another point of view, their position and ours differ at the very outset, that is, in the manner of interpreting scripture, or, in other words, the right division of it. * * *

In speaking upon the point of right interpretation, we would desire before closing this letter, which we sincerely trust may receive your earnest and unprejudiced attention, to mention one other great and important difference between us and Union Hall. We refer to the doctrine of resurrection and eternal judgment. Here I would quote from my first letter. Although you say, from the words of that epistle, that you recognise me as of one faith with yourself, and, as you think, with the Union Hall meeting, yet we are certain that they could not use such language as honestly expressing their minds. I remark,

speaking of our relationship to Christ:—
'We have made ourselves his servants now, and we cannot, if we would, break off that relationship until *after* we have appeared at his judgment-seat to receive the reward due to *faithful* or *unfaithful* servants.' These words contain ideas to which they are thoroughly opposed, and which they denounce as unscriptural and speculative, and as 'human supplementes to the gospel.' They believe and teach that the faithful and unfaithful servants of Jesus Christ do not require to appear together at his judgment-seat to reap that which they have sown, either of the spirit life everlasting, or of the flesh corruption, or as Paul teaches in the 5th chapter of 2nd Corinthians, that 'we must *all* appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that everyone may receive the things in body according to that he hath done, whether good or bad.' They hold that men are judged and rewarded in their graves, that they spring to life *immortal* and glorious, and that there is *no judgment* for the saints beyond the assignment of their degree of glory in the kingdom. Indeed, in this matter, one of their number, who is held in high estimation among them, in writing to one of the brethren, has gone so far as to say that we often speak of the absurdity of the popular idea of sending men to heaven and hell at death, and after a long period of time bringing them before the judge to see if they should be there or not; but, he says, is it not more absurd that a man who is *elect*, *chosen*, by God to the truth in Christ should after this election or choice on the part of the Deity, be tried to see whether he is God's elect or not. So is promulgated the doctrine that once in Christ, ever in Christ; and so we might go on enumerating, but we forbear for the present. We assure you that we are as ready to meet with any in Union Hall as we are to do with you, provided always that their faith is our faith, as we firmly believe that ours is the one faith and hope of the glad tidings. We trust, however, that we will not have written in vain, and that you will be incited to investigate with diligence and with sincerity, not only to put yourself in a right relationship toward ourselves and toward Union Hall, but toward our Master who is in heaven. And we repeat our offer that several of the brethren might see you, in order that with the advantages of conversation these things may be analysed. For truly the issue is a great one: a thing for us to realise.

Waiting your reply, I shall subscribe

myself on behalf of the *ecclesia*, your most affectionate brother in the truth,

ROBERT PATERSON.

EDINBURGH, Sep. 19, 1867.

"Dear Sir,—I received your note, and I beg to inform you that I have no difficulty about the pre-existence of Christ, and the life question; but the other I think was uncalled for; as the one referred to in South Bridge Hall, was led to understand that his views were not held in that meeting, and he withdrew or went away from them. I like to be very cautious about what I say or do now, as I am afraid its turning something like the populars—a quibble about essentials and non-essentials. The brethren in Glasgow are divided, and I question much if they know what they are divided about; and I am inclined to think if the brethren in your own meeting were put to the test, there might be difference of opinion even amongst yourselves.

Yours truly,

[The correspondence concluded with the following from the brethren:]

EDINBURGH, September 29th, 1867.

"My dear Brother,—On behalf of the brethren, I acknowledge receipt of yours of the 10th September. We have waited with anxiety, for your own sake, and for the truth's sake, for your response to our letter of the 28th June; and now that it has come to hand, we have but one feeling as to its contents—sorrow and disappointment. We feel sorry indeed that you should have treated this earnest effort of ours with so much indifference, answering a letter, which we were at the pains to write with the utmost care, with little more than a score of lines of (partly at least) ambiguous meaning; and we feel sadly disappointed that the sanguine estimate of your relative position to the truth, with which this correspondence started has been blown to the winds. Whatever good grounds may have existed in times past, on which the brethren founded their generous aspect of your position, I much fear that the isolation of these years from the society of the brotherhood has lost to you that vitality of the Word, which, in faithfulness, we must boldly say, is necessary to salvation. Yet we still pray, although your letters put us almost in the position of hoping against hope—that you may be yet awakened to a sense of the mighty import of God's salvation; that it

is not to be obtained except by working towards it with fear, with trembling, through much reproach, yea, through tribulation not easily borne.

The particular points in your letter are difficult to meet, because they are no answer to the letter to which they profess to reply. You begin by informing me that you have 'no difficulty' about the pre-existence of Christ and the life question. But by these expressions I am not quite clear as to what you mean. If you mean that you yourself do not believe in the pre-existence of Jesus, and that you are a thorough-going and out-spoken opponent of the immortality of the soul, and all notions of inherent immortality,—why then, that is well. But it was not at all requisite that you should make such a statement concerning yourself, for you must have noticed that all along I have given you credit for being such a person. If, on the other hand, you mean that none of the people in South Bridge believe in the pre-existence of Christ, and that their attitude toward the immortality of the soul, &c., has not been as I have described, you advance no proof for this, and with such a statement I therefore cannot deal.

You say that the person in their fellowship who publicly debated in favour of endless hell-misery 'withdrew, or went away.' But this I told you myself. We are not aware, and we never said, that anyone else in their meeting held the views he advocated, but we quoted his case, among other things, to show that their attitude toward the vitality of the truth, in the matter of witnessing against the apostacy, was equivocal and unfaithful, and we believe and maintain so still.

Had the latter portion of your note been of like nature with the first part, we would have felt justified in writing you for further explanation. But your letter concludes with such an unmistakable indication of your mind on things in general, that we feel this would be comparatively useless; and yet, although a clear *indication* of your mind, the statements are so indefinite that we could not hope to answer them, either to your satisfaction or to our own. 'It's a quibble about essential's and non-essential's,' you say; and from the general tone of your communications, I conclude you *indicate* by this, that nothing should cause division among 'brethren' except a flat denial of the truth of some of such *phrases* as 'the kingdom of God, and the Name of Jesus Christ,' indeed, so long as you keep up

a similarity of appearance in the outside covering, it matters little what the kernel is, seems to be your doctrine. But taking things in your own broad way, can you, looking at all God's dealings with men in the ages that are past, put your finger on any community of his professed servants. In whose midst the principles of corruption have not in very little time wrought and brought forth fruit? The intensity of truth expressed in the words 'a little leaven leavens the whole' has been eminently manifest in all the ways of men since the institution of society in Eden; and it will be so to the end. You need not expect anything else, "Heresies must be, that they who are approved may be made manifest," is Paul's way of it,—and it is ours. Truth and error cannot live together without a struggle for the mastery. It is for us, therefore, seeing the matter is one of contention from beginning to end, not to mourn dejectedly because we cannot dwell in sweet 'unity,' discussing our various 'opinions' but to clothe ourselves daily in the armour of God, take into our hands the two-edged sword of the spirit, and undauntedly fight the battle as good soldiers of the cross.

But while we are at war with every "opinion," and every expounder of "opinion," which, whether directly or indirectly, would subvert the foundations of God's scheme of salvation, we have many differences of opinion in our midst; and in thus answering your remarks on this point, I would say, without putting the meeting to any 'test,' that it would show a very unhealthy state indeed in the absence of any higher guide than the exercise of our reason upon the revealed Word, did variety of view in many things not obtain. But there are things upon which we can have no two opinions, because they embody principles the belief of which is necessary to our salvation; and of these is the substance of our last letter.

Submitting these matters to your meditation, as of no light moment.—I am,

Yours sincerely, ROBERT PATERSON."

This correspondence illustrates the attitude of Dowieism toward the truth: this is an attitude of doubt, indifference, and unfaithfulness. The truth is not upheld in all its parts; and in none of its parts is it earnestly contended for. There is no uncompromising advocacy on the part of the Dowieites against fables triumphant, and the result is that what remains of the truth

in their hands was fast tending to decay.

There are two kinds of unfaithfulness; and we are quite willing to admit that a man might be very contentious for the faith in its doctrinal features, and be very faithless in his "walk and conversation" towards both those within and without, and very unworthy the holy name with which the truth obeyed, invests the mortal perishing sons of Adam. This were a condition of things if possible more odious and lamentable than Dowieism, and one not without practical illustration. Yet, the exigencies of the present moment concentrate attention upon the Dowieistic form of unfaithfulness which, in the garb of gentleness and excellent behaviour, weakens the truth, makes its doctrinal essence a matter of minor moment, and gives it a subordinate place in the thoughts and affections. This unfaithfulness is more dangerous than the other, because it presents itself in a beautiful form which is liable to throw the mind off its guard, and entrap it into a false position. Few would fall in love with doctrinal pugilism; but many are allured into heresy by a saintly disparagement of "doctrine." The danger from the one is, therefore, greater than from the other.

Demanding to specify the particulars in which Dowieism was faithless to the truth, after pointing to their loose attitude on the question of immortality, as illustrated in matter laid before the reader ten months ago, the Editor mentioned that George Dowie believed the devil to be a supernatural being in heaven, having control of death and disease; and that he, and they who were associated with him, denied the judgment of the saints. This was at the first meeting. The brethren were incredulous. At the second meeting, brother Gill, who is the chief supporter of Dowieism in Aberdeen, in the sense of contending for the fellowship of the Dowieites, though holding the truth itself in its purity, produced a letter from George Dowie in answer to one he had written to him, asking him if our allegations were true. The following is the letter:—

DUNDEE, August 22, 1867.

"My dear Brother,—I have received your note and haste to reply. I am very sorry indeed to learn that R. Roberts allows himself to be carried away by the spirit of error so far as to say that I have ever said that Christ will not judge his people. I believe, and have always held and taught for the last fifteen years, that we shall all

stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, where alone will be awarded places and rewards of those who are is. For the same period of time, I have also held and taught that man has no native immortality. I have frequently taught this myself, and never opposed those who did so. If R. Roberts would be honest enough to tax his own memory, he might recollect well enough the most pointed statements I made in his hearing, and before all those he brought with him on that stormy night, of which he gave so garbled a report in the *Ambassador*. He may also remember that it was shown clearly that his faith and mine on that particular point were identical. I have hoped against hope that this recreant brother would pause and bethink himself what account he will be able to give before the judgment-seat of Christ, for the uncalled for, and unmitigated misrepresentations he has made of me and my ideas, and so long as he lives, I shall hope yet.

As to the idea of the devil being in heaven, I enclose all I have ever written, which is perhaps more than I have ever spoken about it. The idea is founded on that passage in Revelations xii, 7-10, &c.

"There shall be war in heaven, bringing to a termination that struggle for the ascendancy, as we may deem it, on the part of the devil, which is now going on in the heavens, resisted by the intercessor for the saints—Jesus the Christ, and finished by victory on the part of the prince of Israel, Michael and his angels."—*Messenger*, April, 1864.

Were I writing on that again, I would avoid the clause "*which is now going on in the heavens;*" because it would not be easy to prove it to another person, and I do not think that the first part of the prophecy has begun to be fulfilled yet. It is *unwise* to give one's own private conclusions too much publicity; but it is *unkind* to judge another's doubtful thoughts.

Your brother in Christ,

GEORGE DOWIE.

Now this letter so far from disproving what we have from time to time alleged, confirms these allegations beyond a doubt. This will be seen by comparing the allegations with the foregoing answers to them.

1.—That both Geo. Dowie and his associates deny the judgment of the saints.

What is meant by this? That they deny that Christ will arraign his people, living and dead, for *life or death*, at his appearing, and teach instead, that only the righteous will appear before him, to receive

honour in varying degree. Is this allegation denied in Geo. Dowie's answer? The very opposite. He defines the operation of the judgment seat to be the "awarding of places and rewards to those who are his." This is exactly what we have attributed to him all along, neither more nor less; viz., that by denying God's purpose to reject and condemn the unfaithful at Christ's appearing, he denies the truth of the judgment, and substitutes a view which invests the advent of Christ with unmingled attraction, and robs it of the awful importance which it possesses in truth.

2.—That Geo. Dowie does not consider a rejection of the immortality of the soul a necessary qualification for immersion.

What is the answer to this? That for 15 years, he has held and taught that man has no native immortality. This is no answer. We have never said that he held or taught the immortality of the soul. What we have said is that he does not, as a matter of principle, exact the repudiation of immortal-soulism, as part and parcel of a scriptural profession of the one faith, and thinks the matter of so little consequence, that in writing an article on the subject, he hesitated to say whether enlightenment on the subject should precede or follow immersion.

3.—That Geo. Dowie believed the devil to be a supernatural being in heaven.

This is answered by an admission that it is so; but the admission is certainly not so gracious as it might have been. It is put as if we had alleged that he spoke and wrote a great deal upon the subject. He says "*I enclose all I have ever written,*" and thus diverts attention from the main point, which is, not how much he has written, *but what he believes*; and there it is before the reader, in his own words, that it is even as we have alleged. We have no interest in alleging it if it were not true; for no greater cause of rejoicing would there be than if Geo. Dowie, and all who are with him, were to change into staunch and thorough-going defenders of the faith, which in words they profess, but which they only faintly understand and advocate.

While dealing with letters, we will add another, written to brother Gill by the Editor, in the beginning of 1864, and which brother Gill has transmitted to us, with a request to reconcile with its contents our present position towards the Dowieites. It is as follows:—

BIRMINGHAM, Jan. 25, 1864.

"Dear brother Gill.—At the request of brother Smith; of Edinburgh, I forward

the enclosed letter from brother Thomas, for perusal.

You will see that the Dr. puts rather a harsh construction upon my indiscriminate list of brethren inserted at the end of the second edition of the *Lectures*. He thinks it was inserted to "neutralise opposition" and "extend the sale of the *Lectures*." This is a great mistake. It was done after considerable hesitancy and deliberation, and with a pure conscience, as in the sight of God, and not with reference to any effect it might produce on any class of brethren. I reasoned with myself thus; "If you omit names, it will be a virtual passing of judgment on those omitted. Are you prepared to excommunicate those who hold errors on subjects not constituting integral elements of the gospel of salvation? No, you are not certain that their faith is compromised or their brotherhood destroyed by an absurd handling of certain erudite portions of the Word of God. True, you may feel uncomfortable with reference to the position that such may hold in the sight of God; but so long as you are united with them on the common basis of "the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ," it would be hazardous in you to cast them off on account of *remote* errors which may not interfere with their brotherhood in Christ, lest perchance you may be discountenancing and turning your back upon the elect of God, whom you may have to recognise with confusion of face at the bar of Christ." In this spirit I decided to insert all the names, leaving God to judge; and I feel sorry that our brother Thomas should have been so far mistaken as to attribute it to sordid and cowardly motives.

With love to all the brethren in Aberdeen,

I remain, your affectionate brother, in

hope of the kingdom and glory of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord,

ROBERT ROBERTS."

The "reconciliation" desired by brother Gill is very easily effected. At the time the foregoing was penned (now nearly four years ago), the position of the Dowieites in relation to the truth was not so manifest as it afterwards became. What was known of it was sufficient to engender the "uncomfortable feeling" referred to, but did not, at that time, appear to justify the resolution to stand apart from them. Afterwards, G. Dowie's belief in the devil in heaven was avowed in the *Messenger*, and sundry other points came to light leading to an altered attitude. Besides the Editor's apprehension of duty in the matter grew with time and reflection. He began to see that repudiating the society of doubtful believers was not subjecting them to judgment, but merely performing an act of self-vindication in relation to the truth, whose interests (as supreme) he eventually saw to require such an attitude toward them. He realised to himself that the responsibility of it lay with those who caused it by their unfaithfulness; and that Christ in judgment would be less likely to censure the adoption of such a course, for his sake, than the continuance of a fellowship which hindered the development of zeal for his name, and repressed the growth of faithful service. Would to God, there were no necessity for such measures, which while tending to health in one direction, undoubtedly generate evil in another. But there is no alternative. The truth must be the gauge in the absence of the King, When he comes, strife will cease, and all our conflicts end in everlasting rest.

(To be continued.)

THE POLITICAL HEAVENS AND THE SIGNS THEREOF.

OCTOBER.

All eyes are turned toward Rome. The "question" of continued Papal supremacy *versus* the aspirations of Italian democracy, is in violent commotion. Garibaldi's insurrectionists have precipitated the question by

invading what remains of the Papal territories, with the avowed object of securing Rome as the capital of Italy, and terminating the "temporal" authority of the Pope. The political forces of Europe have thereby been

stirred to their very centre. Italy, swayed by the Rome-ward impulse of the nation,* secretly connives at the acts of the insurgents, by which it hopes to get Rome, as it before got Naples. France, who has bound herself by the "September Convention," conjointly with Italy, to maintain the rule of the Pope, is angry with the faithlessness of Italy, but checked by the fear of armed Prussia,† confines herself to threats of intervention, which she withdraws as soon as she obtains a decent pretext for so doing. The Pope seeks not France's offered assistance, but in single-handed conflict with the rising forces of the insurrection, relies on a handful of domestic troops, who hitherto have sufficed to keep the insurgent bands in check. He has, however, received official assurance of French protection. Meanwhile, he appeals to the Catholic powers.‡ Herein lies an element of trouble.§ May this not be the inception of the unclean spirit which must be looked for to issue from the mouth of the false prophet,

as the final preliminary to the struggle in which Omnipotence takes part? A hearty response on the part of the Catholic world, backed by the assurance of French support, would encourage "His Holiness" to declare war against his great enemy, "the revolution." This would be the last sign we need look for before the Lord's appearing.

At the present moment all is suspense. France has receded from her threatened intervention, on Italy professing her readiness to keep the insurgents out of the Pontifical territory. No doubt she was glad of a decent pretext for doing so, for last year's war has altered the balance of European politics in a way that greatly reduces the influence of France. The effect of that sharp, short, and decisive conflict between Austria and Prussia (resulting in the prostration of the former, and the unexpected aggrandisement of the latter) begins to be more and more apparent. It has tied the hands of France by creating a rival equal to herself,|| and isolated the

* "The situation of affairs in Italy grows more and more critical. It is out of the power of the Government to oppose an effectual barrier to the strong tide of the national will which rushes on to Rome. That Government must either go with the stream, or be swept away and perish. Rattazzi is driven to the wall and must fight or die. People were asking this evening, 'Will the King stand by him or throw him over?' It is probable that Victor Emmanuel, who has great confidence in the abilities of his present Premier, as well as a strong and affectionate regard for him personally, will uphold him as long as possible. But we may see matters come to such a pass, that Rattazzi will insist on the acceptance of his resignation. It could never suffice to replace things as they were a few weeks ago. The whole Italian nation has taken up this eager and furious cry for Rome. The most moderate papers declare that there is now no retreat, that the die is cast, and the battle must be fought out even against France, if need be."—*Globe*, October 21st.

† "With Prussia in arms on the Rhine, France cannot afford an open rupture with the Italians."—*Standard*, October 17th.

‡ "At present the interest of France is to abstain from violently opposing Italy: for to do so would be to drive her into the arms of Prussia, the latter is ready to receive her: it is keenly watching for the moment in which it may enfold Italy to its heart. What Prussia ardently desires is the breaking out of a serious conflict between France and Italy"—*Globe*, October 18th.

§ "Cardinal Antonelli has addressed a very pressing note on the subject to the Catholic Powers. He boldly accuses the Italian Govern-

ment of complicity with the party of action, and shows the futility of the Convention of September as a guarantee of the independence of the Holy See, affirming that it is in such danger as to call for the immediate intervention of the Catholic world. He demands a guarantee commensurate with the great interests at stake—the sovereignty of the Holy Father and the liberty of the Church, and he concludes with an earnest appeal from His Holiness for the protection of the Powers."—*Pall Mall Gazette*, October 16th.

|| Suppose the seven-hilled city actually in possession of the Italians, King Victor Emmanuel hearing mass at St. Peter's and Pope Pius or his successor, reduced to the condition of a rather swell Archbishop of Canterbury, will there not be heartburnings among the many millions of pious Catholics throughout the world; enough, indeed, to form a new and not unimportant item in future political combinations for a long time to come.—*Star*, October 12th.

|| "The battle of Sadowa," remarks the *Avenir National*, "has had many results which we don't like; but it has at all events, had the excellent effect of rendering any intervention of France in Italy impossible, unless it be meant to kindle a European conflagration. Let the Cabinet of Florence act, and act promptly—it commands the situation."

"In the diplomatic world it is said that Count Bismarck claims for Prussia the right of being heard on the settlement of the Roman question in her quality as a Catholic Power. The Count suggests a Congress at which France, Italy, Spain, and Prussia shall be represented."—*Pall Mall Gazette*, Oct. ober 16th.

Papacy in Europe by driving her military supporter (Austria) almost out of Europe.

The insurrection, meanwhile, hangs fire. The insurgent bands are reported to have evacuated the Roman provinces, and re-entered Italian territory; but whether this is true or false, it is impossible at present to say. Garibaldi, who was arrested at the commencement of the outbreak and sent to Caprera, is said to have effected his escape, and joined the insurgents. If this is the case, the insurrection may be rallying for a spring under his leadership. The extent of the movement may be inferred from the following:—

“The correspondent of the *Liberte*, dating from Rome, October 14th, says that on that day fifty volunteers arrived from France and Belgium; but, he adds, that for everyone recruit coming on the Pope's side, 100 come to the Garibaldians from Naples, Florence, Leghorn, Genoa, Turin, Milan, Bologna, &c. This latter statement is borne out by the Florence correspondent of the same journal, who writes: The great news of the day is the departure for the frontier of the Roman Legion—the Theban battalion—composed almost entirely of Roman exiles. They depart this evening under the command of Major Ghirelli, a brave officer, who leaves the ranks of the regular army to share in the lot of the volunteers under Menotti and Nicotera. These 400 volunteers, amongst whom are Prince de P—, the Marquis S—, and a hundred others of the best families, assembled to day in small groups. I shook hands with some friends amongst them, who pretend not to know what it is all about, but yet who think that, as men of honour, their place is not Florence when fighting is going on at the frontier.

Rome may be said to be completely surrounded, and very shortly the Papal troops will be restricted to the defence of the city. Letters from Rome, printed in the Continental journals, describe it as having all the appearance of a city about to sustain a siege. It is patrolled in every part; all the posts are reinforced, and the troops bivouac at night upon the hills. Arrests continue unceasingly. A letter in the *Debats* of last week says, that as many as 1,200 people have been arrested; the prisons are crowded, and the authorities are at their wit's end to know where to put the people they seize. The young men of the city, nevertheless, contrive to escape and join the insurgents. ‘It is impossible,’ says the correspondent, ‘that such a state of things can last long. The greater part of the Roman youth is in

exile or in prison; business is at a stand-still, provisions are dear, the misery is extreme; and if the agitation in Italy continues, Rome is threatened to be deprived in the winter of the benefit it derives from the presence of foreigners. The Pope seems very calm. On Monday he walked through the Corso on foot. If this was done to test public opinion, the Holy Father must have been little satisfied. Not only was there no sympathetic cry or manifestation whatsoever, but the people hid themselves in passages and shops in order not to be obliged to salute him. It was a very sad spectacle, and I was witness of it.’”

The interest connected with these events arises from the fact that the allotted 1260 years of Papal domination to a certainty run out this year, or next, or some proximate term, and that the termination of the period is marked both in Daniel and John, by the manifestation of Christ, for the purpose of supplanting the Papal imposture by a real pontificate, in which there will be one supreme King and High Priest of mankind, assisted by an order of kings and high priests like himself, righteous, immortal and invincible. It is evident we are on the threshold of this event, but exactly how near or how far off it is impossible to say. It is probable that the insurrection will be kept at bay till the Pope has crowned the edifice of Papal blasphemy by the assumption of individual infallibility at the proposed oecumenical council of 1868. Energised by France and the other Catholic powers, he may succeed for a moment in keeping enemies back, and flaunting an unruffled front in the eyes of the world. So soon, however, as the appointed period of his prevalence has expired (and it hardly seems probable that this can last beyond 1868, if from nothing else than the appearance of things)* we may expect the inrush of the flood that

* “Absorbed in watching the movement which menaces the Pope's temporal power in Italy, some of our readers may possibly have overlooked the blow which is being simultaneously struck at the Pope's ecclesiastical power in Austria. For months past a great agitation has been going on throughout the empire for the repeal of the ‘Holy Concordat’—the famous document by which, in the year

will sweep Papal imposture from the face of the earth. This will probably take the form, in the first instance, of the triumph of the revolution, which will strip the Pope of his temporal sovereignty, and, transferring Rome to the Italian crown, reduce the Pontiff to the simple character of a false prophet, in which character he will aid and abet the civil powers of Europe in their

conflict with the Messiah, who, by that time, will have manifested himself in the world. In due time, Christ will triumph over all, and establish the glory of Jehovah to the ends of the earth. May we live to see it accomplished, and share in the salvation of His Anointed! Amen!

EDITOR.

October 24th, 1867.

1855, the emperor Francis Joseph delivered himself and his people, bound hand and foot, over to Rome. For months past the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Austria has been hurling denunciations at the heads of the repealers, and laying arrogant "memorials" at the foot of the throne. Taking up the popular burden, the newly-constituted Reichsrath or Parliament, has given the subject of repeal grave consideration, both in committee and in public debates. Driven by the events of last year to draw tighter the bonds of union between himself and his people, the Emperor through his Ministry, has wisely refrained from putting any check upon the public fervour in the matter. At last, if we are to believe a Vienna telegram but two days old, His Majesty has determined to leave the question wholly to the Reichsrath, allowing the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Pope in the Austrian dominions to stand or fall by their decision. * * * It is not difficult to foresee the result of the struggle so far as Austria is concerned. The moral effect of this blow upon the Papal power it is not so easy to estimate. Austria was the one link which, in the matter of ecclesiastical

supremacy over foreign nations, bound it to the past. Not another potentate in the world, civilised or savage, permitted this arrogant assumption of sovereignty. And yet it is this very assumption which, even in a greater degree than the temporal power, renders the Pope the legitimate successor to the Hildebrands and the Gregories of the palmy days of the Roman Church. Pius the Ninth, if he were to retire to Malta to-morrow, would still be the spiritual sovereign of a spiritual kingdom, numbering its subjects by hundreds of millions. But it is not that to which he aspires. He wants to be a temporal sovereign as well as a spiritual, and a part ruler of other kingdoms as well as his own. And as his temporal sovereignty slips from under him, the stronger is his desire to retain what hold he already has upon the ecclesiastical sovereignty of territory which is not his. Viewing the facts in this light, the full force of the popular movement in Austria may be seen distinctly, and the effect of the double blow falling at once from the opposite quarters of Italy and Austria estimated with some approach to accuracy."—*Birmingham Daily Post*, Oct. 13.

INTELLIGENCE.

[We make no apology for the length to which intelligence runs this month, feeling assured that all who are thoroughly interested in the truth will read with relish the reports that come from various parts of the world as to its fortunes and progress.—Ed.]

BEITH.—(Scotland.) Brother Gillies, writing October 14th, says, "Through an oversight, I neglected to write to you concerning the immersion of PETER GRAHAM, carrier, who was united to the name of Christ, on the 14th of August last, and meets with the Beith ecclesia."

BIRMINGHAM.—During the month, there have been four additions by immersion, the obedient believers being WILLIAM SHELTON (38), brass worker, formerly Church of England, with Calvinistic views; WILLIAM FIELD (52), timber dealer, formerly connected with a small body known as Christian Brethren, but never able fully to receive orthodox notions; GEORGE FRYER (34), warehouseman, formerly church of England; ELIZABETH FRYER (34), wife of the last named. The first two were brought to the truth in the first instance, through the meetings held by the brethren for the proclamation of the truth; the last two, through overhearing a street conversation in which one of the brethren contended for the faith.—Brother and sister Tomkins have emigrated to the

United States, their destination being Rochester. The brethren took farewell of them on Sunday, October 20th.—The quarterly meeting for the transaction of business (being also the annual meeting) was held on Saturday, October 12th. After tea, the reports presented shewed the following statistics:—**DURING THE QUARTER.**—Number of additions, 7; largest attendance at the table, 65; smallest, 42; average, 53. Largest weekly collection, £2 6s. 2d.; smallest, 19s. 6½d.; average, £1 12s. **DURING THE YEAR.**—Number of additions, 18; total weekly collection, £84 19s. 6½d.; average, £1 13s. Average weekly attendance, 51. Total number of brethren and sisters in fellowship, 105. At the same meeting, a subscription was entered into to introduce an immersion-bath into the hall, of which an estimate of the cost had previously been made by brethren appointed, who now reported: total cost, with apparatus and appurtenances, about, £10; sum subscribed, over £8. The introduction of the bath is to obviate the great inconvenience heretofore experienced in connection with immersions. The use of the public baths being denied (in consequence of a Mormonite abuse some years ago), the brethren have been obliged to use a private bath in a barber's upper room, where they had to contend with the difficulties of a small apartment, a low roof, and a cramped bath. These difficulties now disappear, and meetings for immersion, in future, will be more capable of being turned to profitable account.—During the month, the brethren have seen the advisability of effecting a change in their mode of procedure with regard to business. Heretofore, business has been attended to by the whole body, either on Sunday or Thursday (the latter being the day on which the brethren meet in the evening, for the investigation of the scriptures in a conversational manner.) This has long been felt to be an evil, causing the diversion of the general mind from the matters which ought to be paramount, and giving undue prominence to matters which are purely incidental and subordinate. The evil of this result was more strongly felt as numbers increased. Business was more and more an unwelcome intrusion at the ordinary meetings. It was, therefore, resolved, at a special meeting, held Wednesday, October 16th, that no business, beyond necessary announcements be introduced, at any of the ordinary meetings, and that seven brethren be appointed to transact all the secular business of the ecclesia in conjunction with the secretary and treasurer, subject to the control of the ecclesia in quarterly meeting assembled; a report to be made at every such meeting, when their acts will be confirmed or reversed. The meetings of the managing brethren (held fortnightly) to be open to any brother or sister for suggestion, advice, or argument; but the execu-

tive to be confined to the brethren chosen. Another special meeting was held on the following Wednesday to appoint the brethren in question, and to adopt rules, defining their relation to the ecclesia in matters of detail.—The brethren appointed (chosen by ballot) were T. Davis, C. Meakin, R. Roberts, H. Turner, W. Stevens, C. Rayer, and W. T. P. Townsend.

At one of the meetings referred to, it was resolved that a course of week-night lectures should be commenced. It was believed that a class of hearers would be secured on a week night that would not come within hearing range on Sunday. Besides, the Sunday evening meetings (at which the scriptures are expounded without reference to set subjects) are already attended in a way that leaves little room for improvement; in addition to which, it was felt that the present crisis and controversy within and without the "church," so called, especially in Birmingham, was opportune for a more public testimony. Accordingly, the following announcements have been issued:—

THE PRESENT STATE OF CHRISTENDOM.

Athenæum Hall, Temple Row.

A COURSE OF SIX LECTURES

(Commencing Tuesday, October 22nd,) will be delivered in the above mentioned Hall,

By ROBERT ROBERTS,

For the purpose of shewing that the doctrines of Christendom are not in harmony with the Bible, and that the truth proclaimed by Jesus and his apostles is untaught and unknown in ordinary places of worship.

The Dates and Subjects of the Lectures are as follow:—

Tuesday, October 22nd.—Christianity in the first and nineteenth centuries; the apostles and their predictions; a parallel, a contrast, and a fulfilment.

Tuesday, October 29th.—The connection between prophecy and the primitive gospel; modern preaching lacking in the main element of gospel truth.

Monday, November 4th.—The re-establishment of the ancient theocracy of the Jews under Christ's personal administration, the appointed remedy for the world's afflictions.

Tuesday, November 12th.—The existing state of the world indicative of the approaching close of the present dispensation.

Tuesday, November 19th.—The New Testament doctrine of eternal life subversive of popular views of immortality and a future state.

Tuesday, November 26th.—Personal duty in the present crisis.

Lecture to commence each Evening at 8 o'clock.

NO COLLECTION.

This is only intended as a preliminary course. It was thought wiser to give two or three short courses of lectures than one long one. The two meetings that have taken place were crowded to overflowing.

BRADFORD-ON-AVON.—Mr. J. Spackman writes from this place as follows: "Oct. 1st.—Since you were with us, we have increased our number to sixteen immersed believers. I find, in conversation with Churchmen and Dissenters who have read the *Declaration*, the same result: that they can find no fault with it—they cannot pick a hole in it. They acknowledge that the arguments adduced are in strict union with the Bible. Then how lamentably are they blinded with the traditions they have so ignorantly followed. I think that ere long we shall see our little chapel full of members who will no longer believe in the fallacies and false teaching they have hitherto been accustomed to."

GALASHIELS AND INNERLEITHEN (Scotland).—Brother Dew, writing Sep. 22, says: "Things are very dull with us here now, in this cloudy and dark day; none of the world will come near us. The Galashiels brethren have given up their place of meeting; they think they are justified in doing so because none of the world ever came near them; and for my own part I do not see the utility of spending money in keeping up a place where nobody will come. The money thus spent might be put to more advantage. There are more ways than one of letting our light shine and bearing our testimony to the truth. We profess to be soldiers of Jesus Christ, but we only prove ourselves to be sinecures if we do not find employment in some share of the work. None of us here I believe are qualified to stand up in public to proclaim the truth. But then an army is not all composed of captains and generals: if we as *privates* endure hardness as good soldiers of King Jesus, nothing more is required of us; for he is not an austere, hard task-master, commanding us to make bricks without straw. He that is faithful in little will be promoted to higher honours, when the Captain of our army comes to inspect his troops. Ah, I fear it will fare ill with the fearful, the timid, the faint-hearted, who did not add to their faith courage to face the enemy."

HALIFAX.—Brother Shuttleworth, on the 14th ult., announces three immersions at this place. The particulars supplied are as follow: BENJAMIN LISTER, "separated" from the Wesleyan Reformers; THOMAS TAYLOR,

"come out" from a 30 years' membership with the Baptists; ELIZABETH YOUNG, widow, (sister to brethren Aspin) originally a Campbellite. The first was immersed on the 4th ult., and the two last named, on the 6th. The confession of faith in each case was satisfactory, and the new-borns were gladly received to the fellowship of the brethren, in their patient waiting for Christ."

LEEDS.—Brother A. P. Willis, of Armsley, writing on the 12th ultimo, on behalf of the ecclesia of this place, says "he is cheered to have to inform the faithful in Christ Jesus, of another triumph for the truth. On the 24th of Sep., MISS JANE ASPIN, 23 years of age, formerly a member with the Campbellites and now living with her brother at Bramham, near Tadcaster, Yorkshire, was immersed into Christ upon making the good confession. She is sister to the brethren Aspin of Halifax [and according to brother Shuttleworth, of Halifax, the sixth of the same family now in the faith.—ED.] Her intelligence in the things of the kingdom and name was very encouraging."

LITTLEBURY, ESSEX.—The truth has unexpectedly made its appearance in this quarter. Some weeks ago, an application was received for four copies of the new edition of the *Lectures*. The books having been sent, the following reply was received:—

LITTLEBURY, Sep. 10th, 1867.—DEAR SIR.—I received the *Lectures* all right, and am delighted with them. * * * I intend to send two of them to Australia to my two sons, as a gift. Seeing, as I do, the importance of knowing the truth, I felt it my duty to do so. They are both professing christians; but I find that to be one of the great hindrances to receiving the truth in the love of it. However, I can but feel thankful it was never such to me; for I was first a member of the Church of England about thirty-five years, and continued such for some years; but seeing the Methodists to be, as I thought, a more zealous people, I joined myself to them. I very soon became a local preacher with them; but it happened that about eleven years ago, I heard of another people, who, according to the description I had, were more like the apostles than the Methodists. I, therefore, determined to see them, and undertook the journey, one Sabbath morning, of thirty-seven miles. Rising at two, I walked twenty-three miles to be in time for the rail the remainder of the way, and was quite satisfied that what I heard from them was the truth. Since then, we have been advancing in the knowledge of God and of

His Son Jesus Christ. A few years ago we began to see that man was a mortal and not, as we had formerly believed, an immortal being. A few of us, who could see it, endeavoured to show it to the whole of the brethren, but our efforts were in vain, and to our sorrow, we were requested to draw from them. There was no alternative but to do this or give up what we believed to be the truth. We did, therefore, withdraw, and since that, we have been led to see the kingdom. I was first among them to see this, and wrote them, which set them to look at it, and, having done so, gladly received it. One of them, Mr. Handy, was the brother that sent me the *Lectures* to look at. Thus far, I have given a very brief outline of my history up to the present, and hope to have more correspondence with you at some future time.—I am, dear sir, yours in the truth of the gospel, WILLIAM KING.

LONDON.—Brother David Brown has removed from 12, Cowley Place, Cowley Road, N. Brixton, S., to his present residence, Pennsbury Lawn, Wandsworth Road, S., to which address all future communications may be sent.

NOTTINGHAM.—Brother E. Turney, writing at the end of Sep. last, says: "You will be very glad to hear that the truth is making its way here. I was unexpectedly fetched to see five persons for immersion: two have been Methodists for many years. They are all middle aged and elderly persons. They are poor, but apparently rich in faith; their understanding of the word seems very good, and their zeal ardent. I have been informed that several more are on the point of obedience. The evening audience is increasing, and there seems no doubt that before the winter is over, the Hall will be filled." Brother Phelps, writing Oct. 16, supplies the following particulars of the cases. The first is JOHN WINDLE, who has been for several years acquainted with the truth, but has only lately seen the necessity of the step he has now taken; next, THOMAS TOLLINGTON and his wife, MARY ANN TOLLINGTON, who have been Wesleyan Methodists over ten years; and lastly, THOMAS PARKS and his wife MARY PARKS, who have never belonged to any sect of religion. After studying the truth as it is in Jesus, for about a year, they desired to render the necessary obedience; and after each making an intelligent confession of the faith in the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus the Christ, they were baptised into the one all-saving name, and were added to the ecclesia the following Sunday.

RIPPONDEN.—Brother Frank Cheetham, writing from this place on October 14th, announces that lectures had been given, advertised as follows:—

THE BIBLE versus THE PULPIT.

TWO LECTURES,

As under will be given on Sunday, Oct. 13th, in the

Working Men's Institute, Ripponden,

Morning at 10.30,

"THE PROMISED LAND NOT IN THE SKIES,"

Afternoon at 2-30,

"IMMORTALITY NOT A PRESENT POSSESSION."

Those who attend churches and chapels, and those who do not, are respectfully invited to attend.

Brother Cheetham says "The lectures were to have been delivered by bro. Shuttleworth, of Halifax, but being taken ill on Saturday, he could not come. His place, I am glad to inform you, was supplied by brother Daniel Bairstow, who gave two telling discourses on the subjects. We had also brother Smith, from Halifax, and brothers Rhodes and Mitchel, from Huddersfield. We had very fair gatherings, but like the Longwood stamp, they have but little or no regard for the truth. This is deplorable; one's efforts seemed almost in vain, but we must not give up the work of faith and labour of love; now and then the seed of the kingdom falls into good and honest hearts. We have two that have applied for immersion that are considered fit subjects for it, and two more that are deeply interested."

SWANSEA.—Brother Goldie, writing Oct. 17th, mentions a visit of brother and sister Hayes to that town during the month of September, and states that brother Hayes lectured publicly on two Sunday evenings, at Swansea, and once, on a week night, at Mumbles.

TEWKESBURY.—The truth has made an opening here (a country town of 6,000 inhabitants, not far from Gloucester). A leading tradesman in the place, Mr. W. Osborne, who fills one or two civic offices, and occupies a prominent position among the Independents, has embraced the truth, ultimately, we hope, unto obedience in the putting on of the name of Christ in the way appointed. He was convinced years ago by the writings of Panton Ham, that man has no native immortality, but he did not understand the kingdom or comprehend the truth as a scheme. To this he was introduced conversationally by Bro. Turner, of Birm-

ingham, who makes use of the opportunities thrown in his way by commercial travelling, to sow the good seed. By books lent, &c., he became interested, and bids fair to advance to a state of complete enlightenment. Not content with knowing the truth himself, he desired to give his townsmen an opportunity of learning it, and invited the editor to deliver a course of lectures in that town, undertaking to find a hall and pay expenses. In due course, the editor arranged to spend three days in Tewkesbury for this purpose, and the following announcements were issued by Mr. Osborne:—

'The coming of the Lord draweth nigh.'—
James v, 8.

THREE LECTURES,
ON THE FALSE FAITHS OF CHRISTENDOM,
AND THE TRUE HOPE OF THE GOSPEL,

Will be delivered
BY ROBERT ROBERTS
(Of Birmingham,)

AT THE MUSIC HALL, TEWKESBURY.

Monday, 23rd, Tuesday, 24th, & Wednesday,
25th of September, 1867, at Eight o'clock.

ADMISSION FREE.

"To the Law and to the Testimony; if they
speak not according to this, it is because there
is no light in them."—Isaiah.

And what shall be the sign of thy coming?
Matt. xxiv, 3.

THREE LECTURES
Will be given as under,
BY ROBERT ROBERTS,
(Of Birmingham,)

IN THE MUSIC HALL, TEWKESBURY,
For the purpose of showing the teaching of
Scripture, on

THE SECOND ADVENT,
And the things necessary to be believed to
Salvation.

Monday, September 23rd, 1867,

The Kingdom of God as disclosed in the
prophets, a New Testament gospel proclama-
tion, and an item of saving faith.

Tuesday, September 24th,

The immortality brought to light by Christ,
a different thing from the immortality taught
by Plato, and believed by all the sects and
denominations of Christendom.

Wednesday, September 25th,

The second Coming of Christ the true hope
of the believer and the only cure for the
world's afflictions.

The attendance, which increased with each lecture, was highly encouraging. At the last meeting, about 300 persons, comprising a considerable share of the "respectability" of Tewkesbury, were present. It is needless to say that a feeling of opposition was manifested to the things advanced. This is invariably the first result of a presentation of the truth to orthodox people; and it is by no means a bad sign. It shows that people perceive the tendency of the matter, and are sufficiently in earnest in their religious convictions to be indignant at what they think is opposed to the Bible. Opposition, therefore, to a certain extent indicates the right soil. Mr. Osborne was bold enough to identify himself with the unpopular doctrines by taking the chair at the first and second meetings: Bro. Turner, to whom remotely the holding of the meetings was attributable, filled that position on the last night. With reference to results, Mr. Osborne writes as follows:—

TEWKESBURY, 6th October, 1867,
Sunday evening.

My dear Sir,—Our preachers here in each of the three chapels last Sunday, appeared to take their key note from the chord struck in the preceding week by your lectures. Of course there was no personal reference made. They would not condescend to come down from their dignity to that, but in each, the influence was very traceable. The Independent minister went boldly into the kernel of the matter and gave us a sermon on what *saving faith* was from John iii, 18, "saved by grace through faith, and that not of yourselves but the *gift of God*."

The Wesleyan minister preached from "the things that are seen are temporal but the things which are not seen are eternal." (2 Cor. 4, 18.) which he reversed and represented that things eternal were not seen or to be seen (with the bodily eyes), and warmly denounced earthly schemes of glory, and terrestrial paradises.

The Baptist minister was perhaps more moderate, and though preaching a funeral sermon, made very *delicate reference* to the future state—very little of the *positive* as to the departed spirit—but simply "*as we suppose it to be*" round the throne of glory.

A mark has most certainly been made on the minds of the people, who even now continue to make reference to it. Though they cannot receive it, they speak well of the lecturer, but say he has the Bible in his head instead of his heart.

A local preacher here assigned as his reason for not attending the lectures, that

he was naturally given to doubt, and was now content to abide by the faith he possessed. I thought that if his creed were established on such an uncertain foundation, the sooner he had more *doubts* the better.

This morning (Sunday), we had orthodoxy undiluted from "Christ made perfect *through suffering*," (Heb. ii, 10.)—Not the suffering of death simply, but *life-long* suffering (3 years at least.)

I could receive some part of the elucidations, but it is not a profitable task to have to sift the chaff from the wheat as you go along. I think often I had better stay at home and dig in my own vineyard. I am dear Sir,

Yours truly, W. OSBORNE.

TURRIFF, (Scotland.)—Brother J. Robertson, writing on August 21st, reports the death of sister Mary Milne, of Park Lonmay, who fell asleep on the 7th ult., at the early age of 29, falling a victim to consumption. She was the daughter of brother John Clark, of Balfaton, whose family are now nearly all in the faith. The deceased had only been twelve months in Christ. Her immersion, a year ago, was against the will of her husband, and at the risk of her health. She preferred to obey God than please or preserve flesh and blood. Having seen her duty, she said she must act for herself, whatever the consequences might be. Such decision, lauded by the ignorant as heroism, is only that mature discretion and good sense which characterize all Christ's true servants. The deceased, who died in firm hope of a resurrection from among the dead, was returned to the dust, by mourning friends, on the 12th ultimo.

The gap made by death was more than filled, in an ecclesial point of view, six days after, by the obedience of Mr. and Mrs. GEORGE ALLEN, Middle-third, Old Deer, and Mrs. JANE SCOTT, of Fetterangus, Old Deer, who made the good confession and put on Christ, by immersion, in the presence of about two hundred witnesses, at the side of a neighbouring river. Brother Robertson turned the occasion to public advantage by lecturing to the assembled crowd on the glorious things spoken of the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus anointed. The new-borns were received at the table among a considerable number of brethren and sisters in the afternoon; and in the evening, brother Robertson lectured on "Christ and him crucified." Great hope is entertained of several others, who are giving heed to the word of life.

WESTON SUPER-MARE (Somerset) —Here

the truth is working with some promise of result. Mr. William Newport, a resident, has purchased largely of the works in circulation, and sends them among his neighbours. He writes to say that many are interested. He mentions one case in particular,—that of a gentleman who was qualifying "to go all round the coast as missionary," but who hesitates, "not being satisfied what the gospel is." His friends, who are well-to-do people, are much opposed to the truth which has disturbed his intentions. Mr. Newport expresses a strong wish to see some of the brethren, and expresses the hope that "there will soon be some in the town of Weston-super-Mare, looking for Jesus and waiting for his kingdom."

WHITBY.—CHEERING NEWS.—It has been known from some time, that an agitation on behalf of the truth exists at Whitby, through lectures, in the first instance, by Mr. Charles Dealtry; but the extent of the progress was not known, and the character of the movement was not entirely beyond doubt, from the fact that Mr. Dealtry holds Jesus to have been, *de facto*, the son of Joseph. Both points have been agreeably cleared up through brother Cheetham, of Ripponden, who seems to have had an early acquaintance with the friends at Whitby. Brother Shuttleworth, of Halifax, was invited to lecture. Brother Shuttleworth thus reports the result: "I am happy to say that brother Cheetham and I found the friends at Whitby, brethren, "waiting for the kingdom of God and looking for the mercy of God unto eternal life." True, I found them entertaining an error respecting the sonship of the Christ, (holding that he was the son of Joseph) but being of a teachable disposition, it was speedily relinquished for the truth on my "preaching Christ that he is the *Son of God*,"—Acts 9-20. (Were they re-immersed? No baptism can be worth anything that is based upon a rejection of Christ's divine sonship.—ΕΠΙΤΟΚ.) The error referred to was based upon an impression that the accounts of Christ's nativity were spurious. Spurious or genuine, however, (and I had no reason to doubt the latter,) I shewed that they but stated a fact absolutely necessary to the explication of many otherwise inexplicable testimony. Amongst others, I addressed the pithy query put by Jesus to the Pharisees, who apparently held a similar idea.—See Matthew xxii, 41 to 46. The zeal of the Whitby friends for

the dissemination of the truth, took the following shape, while we were their welcomed guests; viz., Landing there about 8 p.m., on Saturday last, arrangements were made during the evening for a campaign next day (Sunday), the front of the harbour being decided upon for the morning, and the Temperance Hall secured for the evening. The following Lectures were advertised by the Town Crier, viz., "The Gospel of the Coming Kingdom of God, and the Gospel of Life, Incorruptibility and Resurrection." This had the desired effect: a numerous and attentive audience was realised at both places. The filling of the Hall in the evening shewed us that considerable interest had been created, the result, probably of a discussion which had been commenced in the morning, between the lecturer and an Independent Minister, which was also continued at the close of each succeeding open-air lecture. On Tuesday, I lectured in the evening at Whitby again, to a still larger audience, on the "Day of Judgment."—our "Independent" opponent resuming the offensive at the close. On the following evening, the brethren again repaired to the front of the harbour without previous advertisement, and were greeted by a vast concourse of people, perhaps the largest I ever addressed. The subject dwelt upon was one which arose out of the previous night's debate, viz., "The Testimony of the Four Evangelists to the Coming and the Kingdom of Christ, and an identification with the Hope of Israel, as expressed through Moses and the Prophets."

The brethren are sanguine of much good resulting, not excepting our reverend opponent himself, who, like the audience, was not a little impressed with the competency of the truth to cast down high imaginations and things which oppose themselves to the knowledge of God.

The brethren number somewhere nigh a dozen, with those who are immediately interested, and who ere long, I trust, will give themselves to the Lord in the prescribed way. In good hands, they are susceptible of considerable development in the knowledge of the diversified bearings of the truth. They have as yet only one meeting, viz., for breaking of bread, on Sunday. Of course, in the week, they get together often in a brotherly way. I suggested another meeting on the Sunday and one in mid-week for their mutual edification in the scriptures.

A subsequent visit by sister Shuttleworth

has developed in some a desire for re-immersion.

CHINA.

HONG KONG.—One, J. Lilley, writing from this place for himself and brethren, on the 27th July last, says "In this far-off heathen land, I and a brother of mine by chance saw your *Twelve Lectures*, and they were the means of our being led to search the scriptures. I am glad to say that the way that was so dark before, has now become light. We had often before wondered whether so many millions in the land of China were doomed to suffer the everlasting pains of hell. But when we came to search the scriptures, to see whether things in your lectures were so, we saw at a glance that they would perish without law. We have a hard fight among those who believe that the soul is immortal. We have sent for your *Lectures*. I suppose they can be had from any book store. The one I have is only borrowed. We hope we may be able to press on. There is no liberty here. There are missionaries, and a few Chinese people profess to be Christians, but we may truly say that gross darkness prevails."

HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA.

Sister Hume, writing Sep. 12th, says, "A few in this place have decided on the side of truth. *Anastasis* and your articles on the resurrection have done much to enlarge and strengthen their faith. On the other hand, those who deny that the saints are to appear before the tribunal of Christ at his appearing, and say that their judgment is now, have no sympathy with the Doctor or yourself, nor do I think that such will ever come to a scriptural understanding, because they do not appear to have the qualification of good and honest hearts, so it is labour thrown away to try to reason with them. The hardness and obduracy they manifest causes bitterness of heart to the humble and contrite. What trials our dear and beloved brother Dr. Thomas has passed through in this respect! But the word of the Deity, I doubt not, supports him under every discouragement."

UNITED STATES.

JEFFERSONVILLE, INDIANA. — Brother R. H. Gresham, writing July 17th, reports the existence at this place of an ecclesia, numbering sixteen brethren and sisters. He speaks of it as a recent formation. He says "Our little band here have just emerged (some six or eight months ago) from an association of unbelievers, [Campbellites, we presume, Ed.] and, doubtless, there are many scattered up and down the

country, and in the English provinces, in the same position that we were, to whom we should like to say something, if we could but get their ears, but we suppose they are not readers of the *Ambassador*. I have known brother Thomas, personally, for twenty-four years, and I ought to have been far advanced in the truth years ago. Sixteen persons now compose our ecclesia; eleven of them live here (in Jeffersonville); two of them, thirty miles distant; two 150 miles distant, and one nearly 300 miles distant." Brother Gresham encloses a correspondence with a brother J. K. Spear, of Sweetwater, Ill., consisting chiefly of letters commendatory and encouraging from the ecclesia at Jeffersonville, to the brother in question, under the circumstances stated in the next paragraph.

SWEETWATER, Ill.—There has been a division in a Campbellite congregation at Sweetwater, caused by the introduction of the truth, through the instrumentality of J. K. Spear. Twenty-eight have embraced the truth, and formed themselves into an ecclesia in connection with brother Spear. Brother Spear makes an attack on Campbelldom generally, and to neutralise his operations, sundry damaging statements are circulated by his Campbellite adversaries, to his detriment. The brethren at Jeffersonville, themselves (former Campbellites, and, therefore, entertaining a natural sympathy with brother Spear, whose sufferings in this particular they understand so well, knowing the tactics of the Campbellites) write to him to encourage him to persevere against all misrepresentation. Brother Spear in replying, says: "The war here

against the truth is getting more and more severe, and I fear there be some of the twenty-eight with me who will not withstand the fiery darts of the enemy. Pray for them, that their faith fail not in the struggle through which we are passing."

TO AMERICAN SUBSCRIBERS.—Will American subscribers, intending to renew their subscriptions for next year, please notify brother Donaldson, 242, Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich., on the receipt of this number, and accompany the order with the required remittance.

N.B.—By a recent alteration in the postal law, the entire postage of the *Ambassador* will have in future to be prepaid, so that subscribers will not be asked to pay the usual two cents to the postman on delivery. For this exemption, however, they will have to pay in the shape of increased remittance to the British side of the water. The subscription, instead of being 2 dollars per annum, will stand at 2 dollars 35 cents., allowing for exchange at 140.

By the time this gets into the hands of subscribers, brother Donaldson will have received a supply of *Declarations*, and the new edition of *Twelve Lectures*.

Canadian subscribers will please take note of the same fact with regard to brother Coombe, 104, Yonge-street, Toronto, and brother W. H. Hacking, of the *Marturion*, Listowell.

NOTES.

Brother Jardine will resume his articles in refutation of Trinitarianism next month.

Dr. E.—will find his surplus subscription invested (with assistance) in four extra pages issued with the present number.

We had commenced writing "Answers to Correspondents" when informed by the printer that space was exceeded. We promise for next month.

Brother Mullholland, Glasgow, on behalf of himself and those associated with him, sends 20s. for the brother and sister appealed for a short time since, observing "Our being misunderstood and misrepresented by men with whom we are at one on the important question, "What is the Truth?" shall not discourage us from doing, as far as in us lies, what God requires of us, both with regard to the

enlightening of our fellow creatures, and also rendering a helping hand to any of our brethren who are suffering." This is the right spirit.

THE ADVERTISING SCHEME.—Towards this, we have during the month received, £2 8s., in sums of 10s., 3s., 10s., 10s., and 5s.. The total sum received since the suggestion was first mooted is £7 15s. 5d.; promises amount to 7s.1d. per month for six months. The whole will be transferred to the hands of brother Andrew, of London, who will proceed forthwith with a monthly advertising according to discretion. For the satisfaction of contributors, vouchers from the papers advertised in, will be lodged from time to time with the Editor.

THE AMBASSADOR

Of the Coming Age.

“A wicked Messenger falleth into mischief, but a faithful Ambassador is health.”—PROV. xiii, 17.

No. 42.

DECEMBER, 1867.

Vol. IV.

THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF JUDGMENT.

BY J. J. ANDREW, LONDON.

(Continued from page 264.)

JESUS CHRIST bears the character of a judge towards his disciples only while they are in the position of *candidates for immortality*. As soon as they have obtained eternal life, he ceases to be a judge to them, because they have then become like himself, partakers of the divine nature, and can neither sin, suffer, nor die; they are then his brethren, not in name, but in reality—sons of God, and join theirs with Christ—and, consequently, entitled to share with him whatever he enjoys or possesses. He is to them King of kings and Lord of lords, not a Judge. He judged them when he decided that they were worthy of eternal life; but any positions of honour which he may give to them after that has taken place, will be in his character of their Elder Brother, or the Captain of their salvation.

Among the objections brought against the divine truth, that an account of each individual's career is to be given at the judgment-seat of Christ, is one which ought never to be uttered by those who profess to believe in the bible as a revelation from God to man. It is said that it will be impossible, from the length of time it will occupy, for each person who is to be judged, to give an account of his deeds, in this life, at the day of judgment. This apparent difficulty is not based upon any scripture testimony whatever, and might, therefore, be dismissed as totally irrelevant to an impartial examination of the subject in hand. But as it appears to be founded on an erroneous idea, we would just observe, that although the bible speaks of “the day of judgment,” there is no reason to suppose that this “day” is limited to twenty-four hours.

The "day of salvation" is a phrase comprehending several hundred years, the number of which cannot be precisely defined until it comes to an end; and we may, therefore, conclude that the day of judgment represents an indefinite period of time also. The Bible nowhere reveals what length of time the judgment of Christ's household will occupy, but we may be quite sure that it will not be conducted in a hurry, for God almost invariably accomplishes his work in a gradual manner. Seeing that He has revealed, through the mouths of His prophets and apostles, that everyone of the disciples of Christ must report their conduct to him, nothing more ought to be required to convince all who believe in the power of God to carry out whatever he has predicted, that this will be duly performed. How it is to be done, and what length of time it will occupy, are details with which we have nothing to do. Sufficient is it for us to know the fact, and then believe it. God has always found ways and means of carrying out His designs hitherto, and he, doubtless, will do the same in this case. His thoughts are not as our thoughts, neither are His ways our ways.

Resurrection of two classes. It is contended by many that the resurrection at the second advent comprises only one class—the righteous; but we think the scripture testimony already produced is quite sufficient to disprove this theory. Not only have we ascertained that all "the quick and the dead" (who have been amenable to God's law)—both just and unjust—will be judged by Jesus Christ at his appearing and his kingdom, but we have also seen that they are all to stand before his judgment-seat to render an account of their probationary career, before approval or condemnation. To do this, they must be raised from the dead; so that these two facts are alone sufficient to prove that the resurrection at the second advent comprises two classes—the righteous and the wicked.

But as this important truth is abundantly confirmed and illustrated in many other parts of scripture, we will adduce, more explicit testimony respecting it. Let us take, first of all, the statement of Daniel:—"At that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people * * * * And many of them that sleep * in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."—Dan. xii, 1, 2. It will

* The frequency with which the death-state is compared to a "sleep" is not without its significance, and as all the types, parables, and similes, are valuable in affording corroborative evidence of the various truths of scripture, this instance should not be overlooked. In ordinary life it is customary to clothe ourselves every morning *after* awaking from our nightly sleep. In the same way, we may conclude, will it be with those "who sleep in the dust of the earth," and are to "awake to everlasting life" on the morning of the resurrection. They will awake to the same kind of life as they had before going to sleep, and those who are approved will afterward be "clothed in white raiment" (Rev. iii, 5) which will endure everlastingly. If they were thus clothed before awaking, the illustration would be considerably marr'd, because it would be contrary to the natural order of things. Those who "awake to everlasting shame and contempt" will not be clothed in this manner, but on the contrary will be left naked, that the shame of their nakedness may appear. Regarding the remainder of the dead, it is recorded that "they shall sleep a perpetual sleep, and not wake." (Jer. 51-57.)

be admitted by most persons that Michael is intended to represent Jesus Christ, because he is the only one to whom has been assigned the honor of being the great prince of the Jewish nation. When he "stands up," it will be for the purpose of "restoring the kingdom to Israel." Consequently this passage refers to his second appearing, when he comes to restore the Jews to their own land. "At that time," says Daniel, there shall be a "time of great trouble," and "many that sleep shall awake." But what do they awake for? Is it that they may enjoy the blessings of immortality? This is the case with a portion of them, for "some," says Daniel "shall awake to everlasting life." But what about the other portion not comprehended in this class? They are included in the "some" which, Daniel says, "shall awake to shame and everlasting contempt." Here then are two classes distinctly spoken of as being raised from the dead at the second advent. Daniel first says that "many shall awake" from their deathly sleep, and then he divides them into two classes, and shows that the one are the righteous and the other the wicked. If therefore the wicked do not rise from the dead at the second advent, neither will the righteous be raised.

A parallel passage to this is to be found in John v, 28, where we read that Jesus said "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which *all that are in the grave shall hear his voice*, and shall come forth; *they that have done good* unto the resurrection of life, *and they that have done evil* unto the resurrection of damnation." The "all" here mentioned, are, of course, not all mankind, but only that portion amenable to the judgment—those who have become responsible to God by a knowledge of His law or truth. Some of them will have been sufficiently obedient to entitle them to be called righteous; and, of these, Jesus says "They that have done good (shall come forth) unto the resurrection of life." But there will be others who have been disobedient, and, therefore, deserving of punishment; of these, Jesus says "They that have done evil (shall come forth) unto the resurrection of damnation." Thus we see there are two classes comprised in this prediction about the resurrection. It is true that the particular time for its occurrence is not stated, but from other parts of scripture, we know that a resurrection is to take place at the second advent; and as Jesus excludes from his discourses and prophecies all reference to post-millennial matters, we may reasonably conclude that it is the pre-millennial resurrection to which he refers. And when taken in conjunction with his description of the judgment already examined—which he expressly applies to the time when he comes in his glory—there can be no doubt that he alludes to the resurrection at his appearing and kingdom. This being so, how can this plain passage be reconciled with the theory which places the resurrection of the righteous at the beginning of the millennium, and the resurrection of the wicked at the end? Jesus first says, that a certain portion of mankind shall come out of their graves, and then, like Daniel, he proceeds to define their destiny; one part are to be brought into existence "unto the resurrection of life," and the other "unto the

resurrection of damnation." A more clear and definite mode of stating that two classes will be raised at the same time could scarcely be devised.

If further testimony be required from the mouth of Jesus, we cannot do better than refer to his description of the dividing of the sheep and the goats. There can be no doubt that this takes place previous to the millennium, because the sheep are invited to enter the kingdom of the age to come, and the wicked are condemned to partake of the punishment preceding that age. There is nothing to lead us to suppose that any great space of time—such as a thousand years—intervenes between the approval of the one and the punishment of the other; but, on the contrary, their respective destinies are summarized in one sentence: "*These (the wicked) shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.*"—(Matt. xxv, 46.) *

Turning to the parables of Jesus, we find the same truth repeatedly inculcated by him. This we have already seen to be the case in the parable of the nobleman and the pounds or talents, where the unprofitable servant is brought before his master at the same time as the two worthy ones; and, respecting him, the nobleman said to those standing by "*Cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.*"—(Matt. xxv, 30.) The nobleman's absence has now been prolonged such a length of time, that it is absolutely necessary, for this parable to be fulfilled, that *the unprofitable servants shall be raised from the dead at the second advent*, for the purpose of being brought before Jesus Christ—the figurative nobleman—at the same time as the profitable ones.

In the preceding chapter of Matthew an important lesson is given to the disciples of Jesus—that of steadfastly watching for the coming of their Lord—in which the effects of vigilance in one servant, and carelessness in another, are clearly pointed out. "Of the one, Jesus says "*Blessed is that servant whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing. Verily I say unto you, that he shall make him ruler over all his goods.*"—(Matt. xxiv, 46, 47.) But of the other, he says "*If that evil servant shall say in his heart, my lord delayeth his coming * * * * * the Lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of, and shall cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion with the hypocrites; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.*"—(verse 48-51.) The sentence pronounced upon this slothful servant is worded almost precisely the same as that against the unprofitable servant; and it shows, that at the second advent of the Master of God's household,

* It has been said that in the description of the judgment in the 25th chapter of Matthew, there is no mention of a resurrection, and that, as a consequence, there is no proof that the events depicted in it are connected with, or must be preceded by, the resurrection. To such we would say How can the dead "sheep" and "goats" appear before the judgment-seat unless they are raised from the death-state? Although no resurrection is mentioned, it is evidently implied. Indeed it affords quite as much proof that its fulfilment necessitates a previous resurrection, as does the divine statement recorded by Moses and quoted by Jesus, in his argument with the Sadducees—"I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob."

punishment will be inflicted on those servants who have slumbered or are slumbering when He comes. In order that this may be done, those who have died must be raised from the dead, and the living must be brought before the judgment-seat.

In the parable of the tares, we have a representation of the mixed condition of believers of the gospel of the kingdom. "The wheat," we are told, "are the children of the kingdom,"—that is, those believers who walk worthy of their high calling, and receive an abundant entrance into the kingdom prepared for those who love and obey God. "The tares," we are told, "are the children of the wicked one,"—a phrase which comprises, not only unbelieving adversaries, but also all believers who are not faithful to their master; for Jesus says "He that is not with me is against me"—(Matt. xii, 30.) Respecting these two opposite kinds of children, it is said "Let both grow together until the harvest: and in the time of harvest, I will say to the reapers, gather ye together *first the tares*, and bind them in bundles to *burn them*, but gather the wheat into my barn."—(Matt. xiii, 30.)

In the interpretation which follows, we further read "As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this world (age). The son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and *them which do iniquity*; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth."—Verse 40 to 42. Here again we have the punishment of wicked children represented as occurring at the same time as the bestowal of blessings on the good children,—who, being the wheat, must first be separated from the tares before they can be gathered into the barn. This parable is sometimes interpreted as referring to the destruction of Jerusalem; but even if it have a primary application to that event, we think that its ultimate fulfilment does not take place until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled; because: 1st.—It is called "the time of harvest," and we know that those who will be saved in the present and past dispensations are the *first fruits of the harvest*.—(Jas. i, 18; Rev. xiv, 4). 2nd.—The description of the punishment to be inflicted on the wicked children is immediately followed by this statement: "*Then shall the righteous shine forth* as the sun in the kingdom of their Father."—(Verse 43.) This is parallel to the verse in Daniel: "They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament" (Dan. xii, 3), and, from the position which it occupies in the interpretation of the parable of the wheat and tares, we may conclude that the burning of the tares *immediately precedes* the glories of the millennial age.

Of the same import also is the parable of the fishes: "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a net that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind; which, when it was full, they drew to shore, and set down and gathered the good into vessels, but *cast the bad away*. So shall it be at the end of the world (age); the angels shall come forth and *sever the wicked* from among the just, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth."—(Matt. xiii, 47-50.) Interpreting the fish gathered into the net as meaning all who believe and obey the gospel of the kingdom, it is not difficult to see that the

casting away of the bad fish is the punishment of the unrighteous believers, and that the packing of the good fish into vessels is the entrance of the righteous believers into the kingdom. Both take place at the same time, not one thousand years apart.

The parable of the marriage feast is the next one deserving attention. The kingdom of heaven is here likened to a wedding, and the first guests invited, are the Jews. But there were not sufficient of them accepted the invitation. Therefore, the Gentiles were invited to come in: and this continued until "the wedding was furnished with guests."—(Matt. xxii, 1-10.) When, however, the king came in to see the guests, he observed one who had not a wedding garment on, whereupon he said "Friend, how camest thou in hither, not having a wedding garment? And he was speechless. Then said the king to the servants, *Bind him hand and foot, and take him away, and cast him into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.*"—(verses 11-13.)

When Jesus Christ appears again, it will be for the purpose of effecting the marriage of the Lamb with the church; but before it can be accomplished, it will be necessary for that church to be purified by extracting from it all who are not worthy to participate in the marriage tie; and all who are thus extracted will, it appears, be punished immediately.

In this separation of the worthy from the unworthy guests, we see an illustration of the psalmist's statement: "The ungodly shall not stand in the judgment, *nor sinners in the congregation of the righteous.*"—(Psalm i, 5.)

The same truth is also conveyed in the discourse of Christ on the vine. "I am the vine," he says, "ye are the branches," when addressing his disciples. "If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned."—(John xv, 5, 6.) An unfruitful branch becomes withered as soon as it ceases to bring forth fruit, but it continues a broken branch until the husbandman trims the vine at the day of judgment. All branches which have become withered or broken will then be given to his messengers, to be cast into the fire to be burned, where there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. This will leave the vine in possession of fruitful branches only, and these will disseminate the fruits of the spirit among the nations, until all the earth be filled with the knowledge of the glory of God.

Paul likens the church of Christ to a temple or building (1 Cor. iii, 9), the foundation of which is "the apostles and prophets."—(Eph. ii, 20.) In the erection of this building, all who are in the Christ are workmen—a term which may comprise *both good and bad labourers*. Paul exhorts Timothy to be an industrious and skilful one: "Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth."—(2 Tim. ii, 15.) He also warns the Corinthians to be careful how they exercise their abilities in building; for "If any man build upon this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble, every man's work shall be made

manifest, for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire, and *the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is.*"—(1 Cor. iii, 11, 12). Now what is the lesson we learn from this? The members of Christ's church are workmen engaged in building a temple, some of whom use gold, silver, and precious stones, while others use wood, hay, and stubble. When their Master comes, he will subject the temple to a fiery process, which will test every man's work, burning up the perishable materials—the wood, hay, and stubble—but leaving the indestructible portion, composed of gold, silver, and precious stones. The building is then purified, and fit for the habitation of the Holy Spirit.

(To be continued.)

TRINITARIANISM AND THE TRUTH,

CONSIDERED IN RELATION TO THE FIRST THREE VERSES OF JOHN'S GOSPEL.

THE "PRE-EXISTENCE" OF JESUS CHRIST—HIS BEING THE WORD MADE FLESH.

(Continuation of "The Bible as a Law of Life and Immortality," from page 222.)

HAVING in our former papers traced the history of Jesus Christ, and explained the interest which attracted the devout and righteous, far and near, to visit the little babe, so meantly cradled, we will now consider what more the scriptures say concerning him, and what Trinitarians say. In all that we have touched on, from his cradle to his grave, we have discovered nothing to elevate his nature above that of man. He was born of a woman. He was not born of the Spirit until he was raised from the dead. He was only begotten or generated by the Spirit; his mother was simply made pregnant by the Spirit; she received seed by the Spirit, and this seed must have been human seed, miraculously formed—seed, afresh created by the same creative power which formed man at the beginning. This we cannot prove *a priori*, but *a posteriori* it cannot be refuted. The nature of the seed is proved by the nature of the fruit. We cannot reason from the seed to the fruit, as we are not directly informed of the nature of the seed with which Mary was impregnated; but we can reason from the fruit to the seed, from the effect to the cause. And, inasmuch as all we can learn of Jesus clearly proves him to have been simply a man, he could not have been human had the seed from which he sprung not been human. Being created afresh, however, it was necessarily pure—free from the contamination of an hereditary depravity. Yet, pure as this was, it was but as the purity of Adam's flesh before he sinned, the "very good" with which he, Adam, was characterized, when new from the hands of his Creator. Yet, pure as this was, aye, immaculate, it was still human; and withal, it does not necessitate the conclusion as the natural consequence thereof, that Jesus' flesh and blood were, therefore, immaculate. His body

was formed in the womb by his mother's blood, and, as she was of sin's flesh, necessarily, in his formation, he became contaminated with her degenerated blood—his blood one with hers. Had she been immaculate, necessarily he would have been immaculate too, but as she was of the seed of fallen Adam, of Adam's depraved fleshly nature, she could not have been immaculate. No matter, therefore, however pure the seed was, with which she was impregnated, the fruit thereof was of her own flesh and blood, and, necessarily, depraved likewise. The best seed will not produce its natural fruit if it is not carefully planted and as carefully tended. In the vegetable world there is a true analogy. Soil, atmosphere, and an adapted care, are all necessary to be considered in the proper cultivation of fruits, flowers, plants, and trees, from the best seed. There must not only be the best seed, but an adapted culture to the nature of the seed to produce the best results. Plant the best seed in the worst soil for it, and it will either die or become deteriorated in its growth; or, plant it in the best soil, and do not tend it in its growth, and it will fail to produce its proper fruit; or even take indifferent seed, and carefully plant and tend it, and its value will be increased. So it is in the human economy: seed, soil, and cultivation, or seed, blood, and education, are three necessary things among others to be considered in the study of man, as related to the various differences which exist between man and man throughout the world, in savage, civilized, and christianized life. To the seed and blood are due the idiosyncrasies of every man; but the great leveller, as well as elevator, is education. The seed is nothing, and the flesh and blood are nothing, comparatively so, without it. Commit to ignorance and bad example, the most promising child, and he will fail to fulfil the natural expectations of his birth and parentage. Provide another, the opposite of this, with what is necessary to cultivate his abilities, and repress his propensities, and he will attain merit. There is the blood of the negro, and the blood of the white man; the blood of one nation and the blood of another; the blood of the king and the blood of the commoner; the blood of the patrician and the blood of the peasant, each with its peculiarities, and in the hereditary tendency of these peculiarities we see that the seed from each has its peculiarities likewise. These, along with climate, create the distinctions which diversify men into nations, tribes, kindreds, and stamp every individual man with his particular or natural bias. Hereditary virtues, hereditary diseases, and hereditary propensities are all varieties of the same thing. The common saying "it runs in the blood" expresses the general recognition of the fact, and though at first sight one might suppose from this, that the origin of man must have had several heads, that there must have been more Adams than one, and hence as many bloods, yet in reality the very contrary is proved, inasmuch as the scriptures reveal both the cause and the cure, and show the effects of the one to be the very opposite of the other. The cause is sin or disobedience: the cure, obedience or righteousness. The effect of the one is to divide man from man, the effect of the other is to unite man to man. Hence in the tendency of sin to create hatreds, and divide man from man, it in the developing itself with the increase of population, and the spreading itself with the spreading of man over the face of the earth into

every climate, created the diversities of bloods and the diversities of nations, the diversities of rank and the diversities of families : so, in the tendency of obedience to unite man to man, it in the provoking of that love which knows no man after the flesh, will by a like process, destroy all nationalities* and remove all distinctions of race and blood from off the face of the earth. The cure indicates the disease as much as the disease indicates the cure. By the spreading of the knowledge of God throughout the world, the moral aspirations of man will be assimilated, and by this assimilation of moral effort, the physical organization of man will be assimilated. And just as sin in its various manifestations runs in the blood, so will obedience. For as there is no moral force without its physical, so there is no physical force without its moral, in so far at least as the works and organization of man are concerned. Nature and experience teach this, but the scriptures teach it more fully. The force of sin is manifested in the evils around us ; the force of truth, in the good around us. Adam represents moral weakness and physical force ; Jesus represents physical weakness and moral force. The first has culminated in the corruption of both, the second will culminate in life and vigour to both. After this the flesh earthly, will be destroyed, but the moral will be corporealized in heavenly substance, and remain eternal as at the beginning, when all the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy. It behoves us therefore in the consideration of the nature and character of Jesus Christ to mark the relationship in which he, while in the flesh, stood to these things. Being a man like other men, he had his own particular bias, or peculiarity, from every other man, there being in all the world over, no two men alike in either speech or thought, action or feature. And as these diversities are tracable to conception and birth, to the separate distinctive peculiarities of both the father and the mother, there is nothing very singular in Jesus having exhibited a peculiarity in keeping with the fresh created human seed from whence he sprung, and the blood by which he was formed in the womb. The purity of the first, had induced the susceptibility he so early manifested, of receiving good ; the contaminated nature of the other, had created the temptations to which at any time he was subjected ; as for example, in the temptation in the Wilderness, a part of that temptation is just what might be naturally expected to rise before the eyes of a man, in such poor circumstances as he was, in whose veins circulated the blood of royalty. He was of the house and lineage of David, and as this ancestor of his was a great king, and Solomon, another ancestor of his, was a greater king still, it was but natural the temptation should run in his blood to be a king also, and excel them both, and the much more natural too seeing he had the necessary talents and power to do it. What man is there who does not pride himself upon the greatness of his ancestors, if he has any ? and who does not also strive to vie with them if he has the ability ? And what is this but the natural desire of his peculiar blood, the idiosyncrasy of his being, and the carnality of his mind ? And had Jesus nothing else to sustain him against this temptation, save the susceptibility he had from the purity of the seed from whence he sprung, of receiving good, he would have contended against it in vain. For though the seed, through i₁₈

* There will be names of nations, but all nations will be confederate under one nation—the Jews.

purity, was susceptible of receiving good, it was incapable of infusing it, and the blood of Mary, so far from improving it, corrupted it. His physical man, therefore, in place of being a help to him, was, in fact, his enemy. But then again, from this antagonism, came good, for where there is no antagonism, there can be no virtue. How then came the virtue, seeing his flesh profited him nothing? To say that his flesh was immaculate is to say that his flesh was the cause of his goodness, that he profited from it, inasmuch as it prompted him to no evil; inasmuch as he was holy, harmless, and undefiled; because he could not have been otherwise, inasmuch as his body in being created so, it was impossible for him to be anything else. What lesson in all the world could have been derived from this? If his flesh was pure, it could not have been purer than Adam's was before the fall, otherwise it could not have been of human flesh at all, for Adam was made "very good." But what profit did Adam derive from the "very goodness" of his flesh? Had the flesh been incapable of prompting Adam to desire, he, of course, would have had no fleshly desire to meet or refuse, but the consequences of his transgression show, that it was not only capable of prompting him, but that it was also pure while so capable, for it was not before the transgression it became depraved, but after it. All the desires of the flesh are not necessarily sinful. Those only are sinful which from the nature of the blood dispose the person whose blood it is, to pursue the instincts of his particular blood, such as to fight for his country, glory in his rank, and despise the man of another colour, shade, or race, or rebel against a king whose throne he *feels* he has a right to. These are necessarily sinful, but nevertheless, a man does not commit sin, in their so prompting him, if he fights against them. But there are other desires of the flesh such as to eat, drink, and such like, which are related to sin, when the person whose flesh it is, is drawn away by them to commit an act of disobedience. Hence, there was nothing sinful in *seeing* "the tree to be good for food, and pleasant to the eyes." This was natural to the senses of a pure fleshly nature, not sinful. It was the being drawn away by these promptings of the flesh to eat of it, in opposition to God's will, that created the sin, and when once the sin was committed, the flesh became defiled, not by the food it ate, but by the action of a disordered function, the moral, on all the other functions of the body, as every function has its physical organ. The whole flesh therefore became defiled, leprosy-like, by the touch of sin on one part, and thence degenerated into desires, properly lusts, not at first natural to it. The moral faculty of Adam to constrain the flesh then became impotent, and hence from this, he and his posterity fell to being its slaves. Its lusts became his master, and hence its own corruption and destruction. Properly restrained it would have remained "good" until the Almighty pleased to change it, but in thus becoming defiled, it became ready for the burning. Now, in place of Jesus being of pure flesh, such as Adam was before he sinned—and as we have already said, had he been even of such flesh, he nevertheless would have been human, and had he been of a superior flesh he could not have been human at all—in place of Jesus being of the flesh identical with Adam's before the fall, he was of the flesh of Adam after the fall, he was formed of Adam's sinful flesh, and therefore from the

flesh point of view was in circumstances less able to resist temptation than Adam was. Adam in regard to temptation had therefore this advantage over Jesus Christ—a physical advantage. Adam had not the lusts of a depraved nature to overcome, but on the other hand Jesus had this advantage over Adam—he had an educational advantage. The physical advantage with Adam simply lay in the no obstacle the flesh presented to his obeying, but being ignorant of sin and its results, he could not reason with himself as Jesus was taught to reason. His flesh and blood were pure, but his education was imperfect. He had not the experience of a long past history of man to reflect on as Jesus had. He did not know good from evil.—(Gen iii, 5, 22.) What goodness he had was purely instinctive. It was but the natural result of the happy organization of his being. It was not a character derived from moral culture. His character only began when he was put under restriction. This restriction did not necessarily mar his happiness, for had he never transgressed he would have continued in the enjoyment of the natural harmony of his being. His sinning however brought a blight upon his whole system, his moral and intellectual faculties fell from the sphere in which they had moved; and from being a man, the lord of creation, he became much more like the animals around him, a prey to disease, mutual destruction, and death. And inasmuch as all this, is the antithesis of happiness, and inasmuch as happiness is the fruit of health; we here see how Adam, in sinning,

“Brought death into the world, with all its woes,”

and how Jesus in obeying has brought life. By the very same portal in man through which sin entered into the world, so is it cast out. “As by the disobedience of one all are made sinners so by the obedience of another all are made righteous.” And as this portal in man, through which disease and death entered at first, is that through which it still enters, or now, rather, rushes and surges, there is no difference in the principle of sin’s action on the whole system of man now, from what it was in the beginning. The health now, is still more marred; the life now is still more shortened, upon the very same principle they were so at the commencement. So much has the moral of man got to do with the intellectual and physical, that it cannot be infringed

without mischief to both. The picture which the apostle gives of the world’s declension, and of the Jews’ in particular, in Rom. i, 18, to the end illustrates this, and explains the mystery of the fall. Hence, as the antidote to this cannot be a physical or intellectual remedy—however important these may be in the alleviation and cure of many of the diseases incidental to man—but a moral remedy, it shows the kind of education on which Jesus’ wisdom was built, and the reason of these scripture maxims “man shall not live by bread alone but by every word which proceedeth out of the mouth of God,—the fear of the Lord, and the departing from evil bringeth health to the navel and narrow to the bones, His words are LIFE to them who find them and HEALTH to all their flesh.” It shows the wisdom of it all, inasmuch as it directs the attention not to the ramifications of sin, but to the origin of it, and applies the remedy to its very entrance. The obedience of Jesus Christ labors to bring back the moral nature to its normal condition, that through its restoration, the intellectual and physical may be rearranged on the same principle. They were at first disarranged, by the disorder and injury of it, which Adam created by his disobedience. The means, therefore, which the scriptures in these maxims prescribe to restore man to a state of happiness, indicate the flesh or physical of man as impotent to effect any good. And hence it is, that no art, no science, no political reform, ever did any good, or ever will, in the way of elevating man above his present condition of sin and sorrow, until the knowledge of God covers the earth, and enters as food into the moral nature. If the flesh had been the first cause of sin, it would have been now the seat of it, and in place of a moral remedy, there would have been a physical remedy, but in place of being the seat of sin, it is only the soil through which it ramifies like a weed, and grows luxuriantly powerful and destructive. The first cause of sin lay not with the flesh, but with the moral faculty, and this not from any imperfection in the moral organ itself, as if it could not have been exercised to resist the temptation, but from the want of that knowledge of good and evil, by which Adam would have been on the watch. The moral organ had, doubtless, been equal to the exigency, but Adam’s ignorance prevented him using it. Still,

though the flesh was thus no cause of sin, it was no positive advantage to Adam to keep him from sinning. It only did not prompt him to, or make him sin, as it, unfortunately, now does. It did not throw any obstacle in the way of his obeying, as it presently does. It but prompted a very natural desire, not an unnatural one, and he could have satisfied it otherwise than he did. Adam had been created perfect in his organization, but not in knowledge, wisdom, and understanding. These he had to acquire by experience—by the force of external objects on his senses. In the acquisition of these, he had but to exercise his faculties. His instincts were pure, his aspirations holy. His body had to be exercised, his intellect had to be used, and so also his moral faculty. The external world and the garden he was placed in, served the purpose of educing the power of both the first, but not the last. It required a law apart from physical nature, to exercise the last. Without this law, he would have had no moral character, and had such a law not been made, it would have shewn he had no moral faculty. But having this faculty, it was necessary to make the law, in order to exercise the faculty and educe a moral character. Now, in his exercise of his physical and intellectual faculties, there is no more reason to believe that he exercised, or could have exercised, or that he had fully realized the capacity, or understood, or measured the powers of his physical and intellectual organs, without an education, than that he had understood, or realized the powers of his moral, without a moral education. The evidence goes to show that though perfect and "very good" in his organization, he was nevertheless awaiting in a true experience of all his faculties, inasmuch as he was placed in circumstances to give them exercise. There is every reason to believe, therefore, that he had failed frequently both physically, and intellectually, to perform and understand many things he had desired. These failures however, in place of injuring him would teach and develop him. His experience would add to him knowledge, and this knowledge would add to him power. His physical and intellectual faculties in place of being diminished by those failures would be increased, in as far as his reasoning powers would come to his aid. The laws of the natural world would daily be revealed to his observation

—their manifestations in the appearance and working of things around him would teach him. But in the moral element of his being, the law that was made to give exercise to his moral faculty, was altogether apart from anything he could observe or reason of; and inasmuch as he himself could not find out any means of acquiring knowledge, wisdom, and understanding of moral law such as he could of the laws of nature; and inasmuch as the recuperative powers of the moral nature do not depend on anything that can affect the senses of man, such as can excite the recuperative powers of the physical and intellectual natures; any failure that he might make morally, would be, as far as he himself was concerned, a blow without the capability of a reaction, and hence an injury without a cure. Therefore, like as a child ignorant of the nature of fire, and attracted by the glare of a burning light, will in the innocence of his play, catch at it, and get burned, pained, and seriously wounded; so, Adam in his ignorance of good and evil, in his ignorance of happiness and misery, in his ignorance of death and life, as each can only be known by contrast—in his ignorance of the cause of the one and of the cause of the other, in his ignorance of the nature of obedience, and of the nature of disobedience, in being naturally attracted by the appearance of the forbidden fruit, rendered conspicuous by its being forbidden, partook of it without any intelligent perception of the meaning of God's words, and his eyes were opened. In ignorance he sinned, without knowledge he had no light to guide him, he was morally blind, and physically so too in so far as the moral aspect of things was concerned, for he looked on the nature around him through a different light after he sinned, from that through which he had looked at it before—but this ignorance in his circumstances was no sin, it was but the natural circumstances of his being at the time, and hence was no obstacle in the way of his gaining knowledge by some other means nevertheless; still, as ignorance is no plea against the consequences of a broken law, whether in nature or religion, whether of those laws which regulate our physical system or of those which regulate our moral, he was like the child which the fire made to suffer without excuse, the penalty of his disobedience. And if it may be suggested here, that the sin did not justify the penalty, it may be as well to suggest

likewise, that God must be unjust too in suffering an innocent child to be burned. It is but the nature of God's laws, to the inflexibility of whose workings is due the security and success of everything subject to those actionary and reactionary forces by which compensation can be had on every side. Hence, as that disobedience led to the revelation of a moral law by which a restoration might be effected, the consequences to Adam and his posterity, in the punishment he received, were compensated by the consequences which an obedience to that law would effect morally as seen in the case of Jesus Christ. And as Adam was doubtless, a much wiser man, though not so happy a man after the fall as before it, we here see the play which his experience and knowledge of good and evil would give to his moral faculty. His experience of the consequences of disobedience would naturally lead him to exercise a more careful attention to the word of God than he had done previously, and hence secure in his belief of the promise made to him, a greater blessing, than the one he lost through his inexperience and ignorance. Still, whatever obedience he might manage in view of that promise would never be perfect obedience such as he could have managed or did manage before he disobeyed. The obedience he could have managed or did manage before he disobeyed was purely an obedience in harmony with his being, and hence a perfect obedience in such agreement with his circumstances, as never would have marred the working of his organization, or frustrated its powers. But after his fall, no such harmony could exist again. The flesh would always remain an enemy and a stumbling block, to the last. And the reason is obvious. The flesh in its physical and intellectual manifestations, was in the beginning wholly under the control of the moral faculty, and obeyed its behests, and so long as the moral faculty continued perfect in its own sphere, the physical and intellectual would continue in obedience to it: but when its action became perverted by disobedience

to that which on the other hand was superior to it, the control it had of the others ceased, the fleshly instincts became loose and the reason erratic. The same principle of action and reaction exists still. According as the moral faculty is educated or uneducated, so are the others useful or destructive, harmless or dangerous. Now, as the moral faculty is as much a result of organization, as the physical and intellectual are, it is not difficult to perceive how in the action of sinning—a moral action—a physical evil would arise. In the beginning it had been the natural function of the moral organ to obey, but in disobeying this action was perverted, and the physical force of the organ reversed. This reversion introduced disorder into the whole system, for as a wound in any part of the body creates suffering in all its parts, so would the disorder of one organ disarrange all the others. But as we have already said, the cause of this lay not with the organ, but with the want of knowledge of a certain kind, such as would have added power to the organ, and enabled Adam to resist the temptation, for if Adam had had similar resources by which to exercise his moral organ, as he had to exercise his physical and intellectual, he would not have failed. In this therefore we see that God had designed man much more for a moral nature than a physical or intellectual, for Adam's failure resulted in the destruction of the flesh, and the knowledge gained by it was of infinitely more value than from what would have resulted, had he not failed. Had he not failed the moral faculty would have continued the regulator of his instincts, and hence the preserver of his flesh; but it in itself would never have been developed to attain the power which was manifested in Jesus Christ. It would have only served his flesh, but in his sinning the flesh became its enemy, and hence that which was best calculated to educe its power, and add to it strength in accordance with the nourishment it received from the word of God.

(To be continued.)

THE AMBASSADOR.—The *Ambassador* will continue at the present price for another year at least, Parliament not having yet arrived at a definite conclusion on the Bankruptcy Bill. The present number has eight extra pages in consequence of the pressure of matter.

SUNDAY MORNING AT THE CHRISTADELPHIAN SYNAGOGUE,
BIRMINGHAM.—No. 1.

From Phonetic Notes by brother JOHN BUTLER.

THE sentiment of the words we have just been singing is strikingly reflected in the opening statement of the chapter which has just been read—"Let brotherly love continue;" and it would be a profitable thing for us to dwell upon it and realise it, and to let it prevail. There can be nothing more certain than that the sentiment of love, which is here referred to, is at the very bottom of the whole scheme of the truth in which we rejoice; there can be nothing more certain than that the very object of the truth is to manifest God's love to us, and to develop God's love in us; there can be nothing more certain than that the truth in its ultimate and eternal development, as we might say, will present the very highest form of this impulse of love; and there can be nothing more certain, either, than that those who are not carried along by this prevailing impulse—which originates the truth, and which we may also say is the essence of the truth—will be left behind. Those who are not of love are not of God. John distinctly says that God is love, and that those who are of God walk in love. And he says "He that sayeth he loveth God and hateth his brother, is a liar, and deceiveth himself." Such a case as this we can conceive to be possible, where a person may know the truth and may console himself with the idea, which so far is legitimate, that knowing the truth and having been immersed, he is a child of God; and yet who, notwithstanding his legal status in the matter, is personally destitute of the principle in which it has its origin, which is here expressed by the word "Love." We have the distinct assurance of John, of Paul, of Jesus, and of all who in fact have spoken in the name of God, that such individuals are spiritual abortions—out of harmony with the system with which they are connected—excrescences upon it, as it were, which will in due time be cut away. Such unfruitful branches will be lopped off. Jesus says "Every branch in me that beareth not good fruit shall be taken away." Now if we only look this sentiment in the face, we shall see it to be a very attractive one, and capable of affording the highest

happiness—a sentiment which when once it begins to control our mental being, will, without much difficulty, hold the sway. If we only reflect for a moment what the object of existence is, we shall then see that the Scriptures, in presenting the fact that God is love, and that love is the highest object of being, is presenting us with something, both the most sensible and attractive that can possibly be considered. People live to be happy; as soon as persons cease to be happy, they cease to have any object in life. We see this practically illustrated in the case of the suicide. He has lost every sort of happiness, and the consequence is, that having no object in existence, he deprives himself of it. If that be true (and it is true,) what we have to think about is, the fact that love is the highest source of happiness, whether existing in our own bosoms, or manifested by others toward us. In fact, the longer we live, and the more we study, the more we shall find that the deepest sources of happiness—happiness that will be genuine and enduring—are only to be found in connection with the things of God; for God has associated the highest blessedness with the things which pertain to Himself—with those actions of the mind which he desires. There is no blessedness apart from these. Love is the highest and the strongest. There is no sentiment capable of giving a man or woman more power for enduring, or for accomplishing an object, or of being really happy, than this one of love. There is nothing can equal the pure delight that springs from the love of another. I do not now mean the love that exists between the sexes; though that might be referred to as an illustration, since it is chosen to represent the relation that exists between Jesus and the church. I refer to friendship in its purest and most disinterested form; the pleasure it gives surpasses all the gratifications in which men ordinarily indulge. Unfortunately, we are in a state of society in which the selfish instincts rule, and we very rarely get an opportunity of realising this love. We have endless opportunities of kindness, but few for real,

spontaneous, unchecked love. There are two kinds of love; and one is more enjoyable and easy to accomplish than the other. To love a person who is lovely, is delightful and costs no effort. This is perhaps the most perfect form of love, the form which exists in the complete body of Christ prospectively contemplated. When the shattered fragments of that body, (at present mostly hid in the dust,) are united, and the community of the righteous made perfect by resurrection and judgment, love will prevail over all. All will love, for all will be lovely. Christ will have blown away all the chaff, rejected every unworthy person, and there will remain only those who are truly distinguished by their love to God, to Christ, and to each other. The second form of love, is the one which Jesus refers to when he says "Love your enemies; do good to them that hate you." That love requires a distinct effort. It cannot develop itself in a selfish bosom. It is an impulse created from within; and not from without, like the other. Its cultivation helps to assimilate us to the supreme source of love, and tends to amalgamate and improve inferior elements. In an ecclesia, while there are those who by the power of the truth are made lovely, there are those who, by reason of weakness, are destitute of power to attract. To these, this love makes advances in kindly words and deeds. We have loved God because he first loved us. The same principle acts between man and man, but at the same time we must expect failures. In some bosoms, manifested love will have no power to enkindle a reciprocal flame, because the truth does not dwell deeply. A great many pass current among us who will be rejected. We must remember that few will be chosen; only those will be accepted who are the jewels; the precious stones of the sanctuary, transparent to the rays of the truth, and yielding a beautiful refraction of them in the beautiful tints of individual excellence. A person who is selfish is an opaque and unpolished stone. He is not of God. "God is love," and it is only in proportion as we remember this, that we shall become capable of reflecting this quality. We must remember the whole of the truth, and not a part only. We must not leave out the love. This is our danger. Christadelphians are not likely to leave out anything else. They see from the Bible that God is angry with the wicked; that corrupt and sinful human nature is nothing in His sight; that Jesus will be manifested to

destroy the sinners of mankind, and that there is no salvation except in God's appointed way. They see the necessity of placing themselves in opposition to the corruption around them, and are forced into a continual attitude of defence and attack. Therefore we are not liable to forget our duty in these things. But we are liable to forget that God is love, and that the whole truth is but the exemplification and expression of it. Even God's judgments have their origin in love; for the reason he destroys, is, that those principles upon which he has been pleased to establish the harmony of the universe, may be preserved intact. If God were to allow the compromise of His authority, allowing life to continue in rebellion, there would speedily be developed a state of things which would quickly approximate to the hell of popular imagination. It must not be forgotten that every manifestation of the divine character, and every form of the divine law, are connected in their roots, if we could only trace them downwards, with this primitive impulse of love, benevolence and kindness. This principle must therefore prevail amongst those who are God's. Jesus said "Love one another; by this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another." Love is unquestionably the first characteristic of the divine family. We may sometimes feel distressed at our want of ability to love many that profess the truth; but there is this consolation given by John, that it is no evidence of a wrong disposition in ourselves. It is quite evident that he contemplated the possibility of a man failing to realise this sentiment of love in certain directions, and he gives an answer to the question, which we might be prompted in such circumstances to put to ourselves: how do we know that we are such as love those who are of God? In the 5th chapter of his first letter, verse 2, he says "By THIS we know that we love the children of God, *when we love God and keep his commandments.*" Now a person that really loves God, and whose inmost delight is in obeying His commandments, may rest assured that he or she is a person who will love the children of God when they are brought into contact with them. This is a sure apostolic test, and one that stands to common sense, as all true things do. There are many, and always have been, who get into the circle of the professing brethren of Christ who are not lovers of God, nor doers of his commandments, but who are under the power of the

flesh continually; and evince it in all their sayings and doings. To such, we may be kind, but love is out of the question. On the other hand, it is impossible for those in the flesh to love those in the spirit; they are sure to misunderstand and dislike them, because of the dissimilarity of taste and motive. There is a continual opposition arising between them. It is the old antagonism which Paul takes notice of in Gal. iv, 29. We must not be discouraged by the fact that we do not realise the perfect condition of love in the present state. It is a great mistake to look for it because it is part of the divine arrangement, that those who are false shall mingle with those who are true, and there never can be a perfect amalgamation between the two elements. The one acts as a means of discipline upon the other.

Yet we are not to discriminate in the matter. We are not to judge. When men walk in external conformity to the laws of Christ's ways, we must leave the rest. We take cognizance of these general facts simply to fortify the mind against the discouragement that some may instantly feel in connection with the imperfections or the disagements of the present. It is a mistake to be discouraged or disappointed in the matter. This is a time of trial—we must not look for perfection. All duties must be performed; all truth must be remembered. In nothing let us be terrified or diverted from the way of God. "God is love," and we are a family of love, though the full manifestation of this will not be witnessed till the age to come.

Sunday, October 27th, 1867.

WHO WAS THE FATHER OF JESUS CHRIST ?

LETTER FROM MR. DEALTRY.

Dear Sir,—“In the *Ambassador* of this month, you refer to me. Under the head of ‘Whitby, cheering news,’ you say ‘Mr. Dealtry holds Jesus to have been *de facto* the son of Joseph.’ You then inform us ‘that Mr. Shuttleworth paid a visit to that town, and found there certain believers in the kingdom of God entertaining an error respecting the sonship of the Christ, holding that he was the son of Joseph, and that under his teaching it was speedily relinquished for the truth.’ You remark ‘no baptism can be worth anything that is based upon a rejection of Christ’s divine sonship’—an unscriptural phrase by the way. Now, I trust, that as you have introduced this subject in connection with me, you will allow this to appear in your next issue. *No baptism would be worth anything that is not based upon the belief that Jesus is the Christ—the son of the living God.* I hold that Jesus is the son of Joseph by *natural* descent, and the son of God by his anointing and resurrection from the dead. The Whitby brethren were immersed on this confession, as regards the nature of Jesus. You say that is heresy. Well, let us see; all the Jews considered Jesus as the son of Joseph, and the evangelists so far from contradicting

the opinion, appear to have encouraged it, and to have believed it themselves. In proof of this, see the following passages, Matt. xiii, 54; Mark vi, 3; Luke iv, 22. ‘Is not this *Joseph’s* son?’ mark the answer of our Lord in verses 23 and 24. This is most assuredly an acknowledgment by Jesus himself that he is the son of Joseph, but that, nevertheless, he is the Messiah, and should be received as such in other countries, although they, *on this account*,—among *his own kin and in his own house*—might reject him. I might give other quotations, but conceive these quite sufficient to establish the point that the Jews in general, and the evangelists in particular, believed Jesus to be the son of Joseph, and upon an equality with his brethren in all respects until his baptism by John. For it is to be remembered that the evangelists wrote their gospels thirty years after these events took place, and for the use of *christians*. If, therefore, at the time of writing they knew that Jesus was *not* the son of Joseph, it is utterly incredible that they should have suffered this imputation to pass without even a single observation, and thus give their full sanction to the opinion. If Jesus were not the son of Joseph, I ask what propriety or consistency

can there be in an appellation which is perpetually recurring throughout the New Testament—the Son of Man. Would the same appellation be given to Adam? I call your attention to Luke iii, 23. Observe, *en passant*, that this genealogy, as well as that in Matthew, is the genealogy of Jesus through *Joseph*, and that if Joseph were not the father of Jesus, it is not the genealogy of Jesus. The assertion of Luke is positive that he was *really* the son of Joseph. I presume it will be granted that Luke, when he wrote his gospel, knew whether Jesus was the son of Joseph or not. He certainly knew that he was *supposed* to be the son of Joseph, and always passed as such. If, then, he had intended to contradict this, he would have said ‘*not* being what he was supposed to be—the son of Joseph;’ and, in this case, his continuation of the *genealogy of Joseph* would have been perfectly absurd. On the other hand, you will recollect that Luke composed his gospel for the Gentiles, that he states that several spurious gospels had then begun to be circulated, and that, probably, about this time, these miraculous circumstances (contained in some of these pretended gospels), began to gain some credit. Luke knowing this, very naturally introduces the passage which completely contradicts that opinion, stating that Jesus actually was what he was supposed to be—the son of Joseph. In the original, the language more strongly affirms that Jesus was the son of Joseph, than is to be inferred from our translation. The prophecies in the Old Testament gave every reason to suppose that the Messiah would be, *in all respects*, similar to other human beings. He was to be ‘of the race of David,’ ‘from the loins of David,’ a blood relation. ‘a prophet like unto Moses.’ I would here observe, with reference to the genealogies, that the copies vary much in the order of the names; and the Cambridge manuscript contains the same genealogy in Luke as in Matthew. If you deny that Joseph was the father of Jesus, how can you prove *his descent from David*? You cannot produce evidence—clear, undoubted evidence—that Mary, his mother was descended from David. But if you could do so, be it observed, *Jewish kings did not inherit from the female*. The probability is that Mary was a Nazarene. With the exception of the first sixteen verses, (which furnish us with the pedigree of Jesus through Joseph,) the first two chapters of the gospel by Matthew are a gross fabrication. The same may be said of the first two chapters in Luke’s

gospel, saving the proem, or first four verses. Perhaps there is nothing that was ever written in all past ages, which has since met with so public and general a profession of belief, which is so ill *attested*, as the miraculous conception and nativity of Jesus Christ. Epiphanius says ‘that the Ebionites, or Nazarenes, held that Christ was the son of Joseph.’ *Trenæus* testifies that *the Jewish Christians* denied the pre-existence and divinity as well as the miraculous conception. The Jews possessed by far the best opportunities of knowing what were the real doctrines and instructions of Jesus and his apostles, and these Jewish believers regarded their master as the son of Joseph. It is granted that these Christians utterly disbelieved in the story of the miraculous conception, and sternly held that the Christ Jesus was begotten and born like any other child, and yet they are never censured by the apostles for so doing. It is marvellous that (supposing your view is correct), no mention is made of it, no allusion to it in any other part of the New Testament. How do you account for Mark neglecting to record a fact so extraordinary? It is a commonly received opinion that Mark had seen the gospel of Matthew before he wrote his own, and that his may be considered an abridgment of Matthew’s. If this were the case, how shall we account for the omission of the narrative contained in the first two chapters? I can conceive of only three suppositions. Either Mark did not *believe* the narrative, or he thought it of *no importance*, or his copy of Matthew’s gospel did not contain it. The last appears to me the most probable reason for the silence. The first two chapters of Luke’s gospel were wanting in the copies used by Marcion in the second century. I again repeat if the account of the miraculous conception of Jesus be true, he could not be the offspring of David and of Abraham from whom it was predicted, and by the Jews expected, that the Messiah should descend. Mr. Shuttleworth says ‘amongst others, I addressed the pithy query put by Jesus to the Pharisees, who apparently held a similar idea, see Matt. xxii, 41 to 46.’ This, he concludes, proves that he is right and I am wrong. Now let us look at the question. It will be granted that the Pharisees gave a scriptural reply to the first question in 42nd verse. ‘They say unto him the son of David.’ They made no answer to the second question, in verse 45. ‘If David then call him Lord, how is he his son?’ neither did Jesus offer any explanation.

The scriptures, however, afford us the solution of this apparent difficulty. Attention must be given to what is said in verses 43 and 44: 'How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying Jehovah said unto my Lord, &c.' If then David call him Lord, how is he his son? That is David's *LORD SON*? Jesus became David's son by *natural* descent through *Joseph*, and his *Lord Son* through suffering death, resurrection, immortalization, and the will of his divine Father, who made him 'both *Lord* and Christ,' see Acts ii. vses. 30 to 36. He THEN became *second Adam*—the head of a new family. Those who hold the common opinion about the origin and meaning of the word Adam, will tell you that Adam means 'red earth,' and that the name was applied to the first man, because God made him out of the ground. The word is derived from a root which signifies to resemble, to be like; and, therefore, Adam denotes *similitude*, or *resemblance*. 'The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last (or second) Adam a life-giving spirit.' We have no introduction to Jesus until we meet him at his baptism by John. Then expired the 69 weeks, or 483 years of Daniel. Up to that moment no one knew that he was to be the Christ. 'But when the fulness of the time was come (483 years.) God sent to the Jews his son, (constituted his son by the anointing,) *born* of a woman.' 'The phrase 'born of a woman,' bears no allusion to the supposed miraculous conception. It is a common Jewish phrase to express a proper human being; see Matt. xi, 11; Job xiv, 1, and many other passages. *Born* is a much more sensible and correct translation in this verse than *made*. The verb is rendered *born* in Matt. xi, 11. Why should it be differently translated in Gal. iv, 4? In conclusion, let me say that it is a source of deep regret to me to differ from you all on this question. I hold every other doctrine in common with yourselves. I am satisfied, however, that I am right, and will leave in confidence the decision to Jesus himself.'—I remain, dear Sir, yours sincerely,

CHARLES DEALTRY.

November 8th.

REPLY TO MR. DEALTRY'S LETTER.

The readers of the *Ambassador* will reciprocate the expression of "deep regret" with which Mr. Dealtry closes the foregoing

communication. It is indeed to be lamented that so able an advocate of so great a part of the truth, as Mr. Dealtry, should be at issue with them on so vital a question as the nature of Jesus; and that they should be compelled on that account to deprive themselves of his co-operation and fellowship. His enlightenment would be a cause of great joy. On the other hand, the doctrine he advocates is, in our view, a perilous subversion of the doctrine of Christ—the triumph of which would be fatal to the work of the truth now going on. For both reasons, we shall endeavour to refute the various arguments by which Mr. Dealtry seeks to fortify his position.

We point in the first place to the lameness of his definition of Christ's divine sonship—a phrase which, notwithstanding its unscripturalness as a matter of words, represents a scriptural idea, viz., that Christ was the Son of God, in whatever sense this may be understood. He says that Jesus was "the Son of God by his anointing and resurrection from the dead." The fallacy of this is apparent, from the fact that the sonship of Christ was proclaimed *while he was yet in the flesh*.—(Matthew iii, 17; Luke ix, 35; John i, 49; John iii, 16; v, 19, 23; vi, 69; x, 36.). He was the Son of God before he suffered.—(Heb. v, 8.) Therefore in determining the sense in which he sustained this character, we must exclude his resurrection from consideration. His sonship was a fact before he died and rose again. This being so, we must confine our attention to "the days of his flesh," (Heb. iii), in seeking to know what constituted his sonship. Hedged, in this enquiry, within the four walls, as it were, of Christ's mortal life, in what does Mr. Dealtry allege Christ's sonship to have consisted? His *anointing*. Mr. Dealtry does not indicate the authority upon which the anointing of the spirit is to be considered synonymous with sonship. We doubt if he would allege that such authority exists. Saul was "the Lord's anointed;" (1 Sam. xxiv, 1,) but not a son; David also had been anointed, both with oil and spirit; but he is nowhere styled the Son of God. Jesus was anointed; but he was the Son of God *in addition to this*. That Jesus is the Christ, (anointed) and that Christ is the Son of God, are two separate propositions.—(John ii, 22; v, 5.) The prophets were moved by the same spirit which dwelt superabundantly upon Jesus; but he was a son, while they were not; witness the distinction observed in Hebrews i, 1: that "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners, hath spoken unto the fathers *by the prophets*, hath in these last days spoken unto us *by A SON*." God spoke in both cases, and by the same spirit, but the channel of utterance was different; in the one case, it was the mouth of selected sons of Adam, in the other, it was a begotten Son of God. What made him Son of God? Mr. Dealtry says the possession of spirit; but this cannot be:

for the prophets had the spirit as well as he. "The spirit of Christ was in them."—(1 Pet. i, 11.) According to Mr. Dealtry's theory, they were all sons of God, for all had the same spirit: and if so, where was the distinction indicated by Paul in the words quoted? a distinction emphatically observed in Christ's parable of the vineyard: "And when the time of the fruit drew near, he sent *his servants* to the husbandmen, that they might receive the fruit of the vineyard.

* * * Last of all he sent unto them HIS SON, saying they will reverence MY SON."—(Matt. xxi, 34, 37.) Let this be read in view of the fact that the prophets were mere men selected and inspired by the spirit, while Jesus was preternaturally begotten of a virgin, by the power of the Holy Spirit; and the distinction is highly intelligible and immensely interesting. Introduce Mr. Dealtry's theory, and it is without meaning.

Mr. Dealtry relies on the fact that the Jews regarded Jesus as the natural son of Joseph. This is rather against his theory than for it; for Jesus repudiated the views entertained of him by the Jews, and stigmatised them as fleshly. His words are "I know whence I came and whither I go; but ye cannot tell whence I come and whither I go. YE JUDGE AFTER THE FLESH * * *

* Ye are from beneath, I am from above. Ye are of this world, I am not of this world."—(John viii, 14, 15, 23.) If Christ was the natural son of Joseph, no signification can be attached to these words that would not also apply to all the prophets and apostles; and then Jesus sinks to a level with them, instead of occupying that prominence indicated in the words "To him give all the prophets witness."—(Acts x, 43) "Christ the end of the law for righteousness."—(Rom. x, 4.) Not only so, but the language addressed to the Pharisees would be strained, unnatural, unsuitable, and extravagant in the last degree, if it merely meant that his teaching (by the spirit upon him), was superior to theirs. He says "I proceeded forth and came from God, neither came I of myself, but He sent me. *Why do ye not understand my speech?*"—(John viii, 43.) This appeal to the meaning of his words plainly intimates that they had reference to his individual origin. They could by no law of language have any other significance. Of course the Pharisees could not understand them; because, judging after the flesh, they believed Jesus to be a mere man—the natural son of Joseph; but in view of the fact that his paternity was direct from heaven, without the intervention of man, we are enabled to see great point in them. They mean—that is he meant them to mean—that he was the Son of God as distinct from men, whose paternity was of the flesh. They accused him of blasphemy, for this assumption. "For a good work," said they, "we

stone thee not; but for blasphemy, and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God." [The Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the Sabbath, but SAID ALSO THAT GOD WAS HIS FATHER, *making himself equal to God.*—John v, 18.] Jesus answered them "Say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest, because I said I am THE SON OF GOD."—(John x, 33, 36.) What a weak and scarcely detectable element of meaning there is in these statements, on Mr. Dealtry's theory; in fact it may well be asked if they have any meaning whatever. And to this question there could but be one answer, that if Mr. Dealtry's theory is to be received, John's "gospel" must be rejected. The two are utterly irreconcilable. But take the New Testament account as it stands, and these statements instantly fall into the category of intelligible utterances. We have, then, a rational explanation of the reason why Jesus, in the days of his flesh, assumed the title of Son of God, which, in Mr. Dealtry's theory, is entirely wanting. According to Luke, the angel Gabriel said to Mary, the mother of Jesus, before his conception, in answer to her question "How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?" "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; THEREFORE also that holy thing that shall be born of thee shall be called *Son of God.*"—(Luke i, 35.) This is a very satisfactory explanation of the whole matter; but Mr. Dealtry unfortunately thinks it spurious. The value of his reasons we shall presently see.

His next position is that "the evangelists, so far from contradicting this (the Jews') opinion, appear to have encouraged it, and to have believed it themselves." The proof of this is alleged to be in Matt. xiii, 5, 4; Mark vi, 3, and Luke iv, 22; but we submit that these references give no countenance whatever to Mr. Dealtry's suggestion. They merely reflect, in an historical way, the impression that prevailed among the *unbelieving Jews*. The nature and value of this impression we have already seen. It is true the evangelists do not correct it; but then it must be remembered, that it was not their province, as narrators of Christ's life, to do so. They never step aside from the narrative to discuss the errors of the people. They simply record facts, and in doing this, they were bound to make known that in the surprise created by the wisdom and the works of Christ, the people who rejected him, exclaimed, "Is not ^{he} the carpenter's son?" If we are to say ^{that} because they did this, without contradicting the view therein expressed, they endorsed it, we must conclude that they believed Jesus to be a demonologist, operating under the auspices of Beelzebub; for they record that the Jews said "He hath a devil, and is mad, * * * he casteth out devils by

Beelzebub, the prince of demons ;" and they add nothing to confute the declaration ! But in truth, it was their duty to put these things on record without comment. We have to judge from other sources whether the popular impressions (always loose and inaccurate) were the truth. Against these impressions, we have to put Christ's declaration that the Jews judged after the flesh, and did not believe; and the fact that the confession of enlightened believers was "*Thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel.*"—(John i, 49.) Mr. Dealtry draws his conclusion from the impression of the mob; we prefer to seek light at the hands of Christ's actual adherents and companions, who understood and believed him, which those to whom Mr. Dealtry's references relate, did not.

Mr. Dealtry thinks it "utterly incredible" that the evangelists "should have suffered the imputation (of Christ's paternity to Joseph) to pass without contradiction," if that imputation were false. If the evangelists had been writers of controversial works, standing on a level with the opponents of their doctrines, this observation might have some weight; but this was not the case. We extract truth by argument; and argument for, admits of argument against; and procures for an adverse conclusion the same recognition and attention which we bestow upon that we believe to be the truth. There is no umpire but that of reason. Hence all are on a level, and take each other's views into account. But it was different with the New Testament writers. They had authority on their side. Theirs was not a system elucidated by reason as against rival systems standing on the same foundation. It was truth infallible, divinely revealed. Hence they did not stoop to the discussion of popular errors, as we do, who have no authority but the testimony of the written word to fall back upon. They stood in dignity and strength upon the pedestal of certain, unquestionable truth. They recorded the impressions of the people on certain points, without saying anything about the truth or untruth of them, for the simple reason that the truth of the matter, they elsewhere, in the words of Christ, and the narrative of his birth, lay down in clear and positive form.

As to Christ being styled Son of Man, we see in that title an intimation of the fact that he was not of the nature of angels (Heb. ii, 16), but of real human stock—son of man, though Son of God. This is explained by the fact that though the inception of his being was due to divine impulse, his nature was elaborated from the substance of Mary, as much so as any child is from its mother; but if the meaning of it be that Joseph was his father, how is he the Son of God? This point has already been brought out. Mr. D. asks if Adam could have been styled "son of man?" Certainly not, because there was no antecedent man-nature from which to evolve

him. But what is he called? SON OF GOD. (Luke iii, 38.) This point tells destructively against Mr. Dealtry's purpose. Adam is styled son of God because he was the direct product of creative power, as distinct from human pro-creation. With this fact in view, we have scriptural light shed on Christ's title as Son of God. His being called Son of Man as well, is due to the intervention of human instrumentality by Mary, his mother.

Mr. Dealtry next calls attention to the genealogies of Luke and Matthew, affirming that they each give the descent of Jesus through the line of Joseph; but that this is a mistake is evident at a glance. A comparison of the two is all that is necessary to show that they are two separate lines. They coincide from Abraham to David; but here there is a complete divergence. One line (that of Joseph) proceeds through Solomon and the Kings of Judah, his successors; and the other (that of Mary) through Nathan the prophet, into a collateral branch of the royal family. The two lines once more unite in the family of Salathiel, in the days of the Babylonish captivity; but in the days of his grandson they again separate, and do not again approximate till the espousal of Mary and Joseph, with whom all genealogical traces of the line of David terminate. These facts will be apparent to anyone who will take the trouble to compare the two genealogies. But Mr. Dealtry may say, this does not get rid of the fact that Joseph is the terminus of both lines, as set out in the genealogies under consideration. Query, is this a fact? An inspection of the genealogies will show it is not; although superficially it appears to be so. As regards Matthew's genealogy, there is no obscurity. It brings the line from Abraham to Jacob, father of Joseph, (an interval of 42 generations,) and concludes with the words "And Jacob begat Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ." This, then, is the line of Joseph beyond doubt; but does this favour Mr. Dealtry's view that Joseph was the father of Jesus? The very opposite. It does not say "and Joseph begat Jesus." It ought to have done so, on Mr. Dealtry's hypothesis. But as soon as it reaches Joseph, it breaks away from the style of phraseology by which the descent of the line is previously traced. It introduces Joseph, not as the father of Jesus, but as "*the husband of Mary;*" and isolates Joseph from all connection with Christ's paternity, by declaring that of Mary was Jesus born, and that Joseph was merely her husband. This shows the object of this genealogy, and suggests an answer to the question "Why was this line given if Joseph were not the father of Jesus?" As the husband of Mary, Joseph was legally one with Mary. The two were made "one flesh" by marriage. Hence, in a legal point of view, Jesus was the son of Joseph by being the son of Mary, and through

Mary inherited the lineage and rights and titles of Joseph. Had any other than a son of David been the husband of Mary, it would have interfered with the legal and blood-relationship of Jesus to David. Jesus would not in all respects have been the son of David. In fact his relationship would have been obstructed by the legal power of the husband over the wife. It was as necessary that the husband of Mary should be a son of David as it was that Mary should be a descendant of David; for if it had not been so, Christ's legal rights under the covenant made with David would have been destroyed. But by both father and mother being "of the house and lineage of David," the natural and legal proprieties and necessities of the case were preserved, in spite of the marvel of Christ's supernatural begetting. Hence, the genealogy of Matthew is of the utmost value in showing that Joseph was descended from David.

Luke's genealogy is a little more obscure, but not a whit less fatal to Mr. Dealtry's theory. Luke begins at the opposite end from Matthew. He traces the line backward while Matthew does it forward. He begins with Jesus at the time of his baptism by John, and says "Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age, being (*as was supposed*) the son of Joseph." Now, why does Luke employ the word "supposed?" If, as Mr. Dealtry hints, Luke believed Jesus to be the natural son of Joseph, why does he not say so in the simple, unequivocal style observed in all the other cases, instead of introducing a word which suggests doubt and mystery? Who "supposed" he was the son of Joseph? and why was it a subject of "supposition." Does not the existence of a "supposition" show that a contrary idea had been asserted, viz., that Jesus was *not* the son of Joseph in a natural sense, but Son of God? Does it not show that there was a diversity of opinion existing at the time of Luke's writing? Supposition only comes into play where uncertainty exists; but according to Mr. Dealtry, there was no uncertainty; "For," says he, "all the Jews believed and knew Jesus to be the Son of God, and the evangelists did not contradict it." Yet, according to Luke, "supposition" was active at the time of Christ's baptism, on the subject of his paternity. This "supposition" could not be as to *which* man was his father, for his supposed father was well known, and all his family; as is proved in the passages quoted by Mr. Dealtry. The supposition could therefore only relate to the question of human *versus* divine paternity; and the popular view of the question, Luke treats as a *supposition*, in the sense of an idle and wrong supposition. Luke's words prove that to his (Luke's) private information, Jesus was *not* the son of Joseph in a natural sense; for in penning this public record of his genealogy, in which he is bound to admit the legal relation of Jesus to Joseph, he inserts

a parenthesis which fences off the popular idea of his being the natural son of Joseph. It is as much as to say "The common idea was, that he was the real son of Joseph; but the truth is, this is a fallacy, a popular delusion; for though the legal son of Joseph, he was the product of creative power, through Mary, the wife of Joseph." This is the effect of Luke's parenthesis. On no other principle can the occurrence of such a parenthesis be rationally accounted for.

There is another, and if possible, more conclusive view of the matter. A glance at the original word would suggest that Luke's parenthesis is wrongly marked in the common version; and that it really includes the whole supposition alluded to. Luke's words literally translated, would read "And he (Jesus) was beginning about thirty years of age, being (as was supposed, a son of Joseph) of Heli." The words "which was the son," that precede "of Heli," in the common version, are not in the original. Their introduction changes the significance of the verse. It makes it allege that Joseph was the son of Heli (Mary's father), whereas he was the son of Jacob; and it destroys the connection between Jesus and Heli, which it is evidently Luke's intention to point out. Paraphrasing Luke's words, so as to express their evident significance, they would read "Jesus was at this time about thirty, and the general supposition was that he was the natural son of Joseph, but he was, in reality, genealogically of Heli." Genealogy being only reckoned by males, Heli, Mary's father, would be put for Mary in stating his natural extraction. This harmonises all the apparent difficulties in the case, and destroys the proof which Mr. Dealtry thinks he sees in Luke's genealogy, for his lamentable conclusion on the subject of Christ's origin. Luke's genealogy is not the genealogy of Joseph, but of Heli, Mary's father, and Joseph's father-in-law. If Mr. D. demur to this, let him reconcile it with Matthew's genealogy, which is undoubtedly that of Joseph. If Luke give the genealogy of Joseph, Matthew does not; for the lines are different. Mr. Dealtry alleges them both to be that of Joseph. How can this be, when they are different? He must reject one on his own hypothesis, for two conflicting pedigrees cannot be right. But there is no necessity for rejecting either. One is the genealogy of Mary, and the other of Joseph; and both are essential to show that, notwithstanding the departure from the natural order of things in Christ's begetting, Jesus is still the son of David, and heir to his throne.

Luke does not state that "several spurious gospels had then begun to be circulated." He simply observes that many had attempted a narrative of the facts of Christ's life, and that he, having authentic and personal knowledge of the whole matter, had been induced to put forth his account. It is probable that the "gospels" in circulation

were feeble, and it might be, in some particulars inaccurate; but surely it is a tremendous liberty to take in the discussion of a subject of such momentous importance as this to suggest, as Mr. Dealtry does, without the shadow of proof, that the miraculous conception of Jesus was a feature in these current gospels which Luke wrote to correct! We must deny him the aid of this suggestion in attempting to explain Luke's parenthesis. To make use of it would be to beg the question with a vengeance. We submit as a much better and more reasonable explanation, the one we have suggested.

"The prophecies in the Old Testament," which Mr. Dealtry briefly summons to his aid, are dead against him, when brought a little more close than he brings them. It is true they represent the Messiah as a prophet like unto Moses, a son of David, a man of sorrows, and so on, but these are in no way incompatible with the fact that the method by which he was constituted a man and a son of David, was by supernatural begetting, constituting him son of God as well as son of David. But how shall Mr. Dealtry reconcile with his theory, the prediction of Isaiah: "The Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold A VIRGIN shall conceive and bring forth a son, and call his name Emmanuel." Will Mr. Dealtry join another class in the egregious folly of saying that "a virgin" should be translated "a young woman?" Lest it may be so, we ask what there would be in the nature of sign or wonder in a young woman conceiving? Is it such a rare and extraordinary event for a young woman to conceive, that its occurrence would be "a sign?" As well might it have been written "Behold, a young man shall marry a young woman." Conception by a virgin is a marvel and a sign; conception by a young woman an everyday occurrence. Again, if Mr. Dealtry will have it "young woman" instead of "virgin," where is the young woman that has born *Emmanuel*? Perhaps he will say, Mary; but how is Jesus, if the natural son of Joseph and Mary, *Emmanuel*—GOD WITH US? If Jesus was a mere man, he was not "God with us." If he were God with us by simply having the spirit, then all the prophets and apostles were "God with us," and there was no meaning at all in Christ being called *Emmanuel*.

But while discussing the suggestion that "virgin" may be changed to young woman, we are bound to affirm its utter inadmissibility from a philological point of view. The word (ALMAH) translated "virgin" in the passage quoted from Isaiah, is never translated "young woman," and never used in any sense other than that of an unmarried female. This may be seen by reference to the only places of its occurrence, which are Gen. xxiv, 43; Ex. ii, 8; Ps. lxxviii, 25; Prov. xxx, 19; Cant. i, 3; vi, 8; Isaiah vii, 14. The word most frequently used for

virgin, (*bethoolah*), Gen. xxiv, 16, is not the one used in Is. vii, 14. The word translated "young woman" (*nagara*)—Ruth iv, 12, is most frequently rendered "maiden" and "damsel," and it is probably this fact that has suggested the attempt to get rid of Is. vii, 14, as a proof of Christ's miraculous conception, by the assertion that young woman (married or unmarried) is interchangeable with the "virgin" of the passage in question. The suggestion is entirely false. The word means a young virgin female in the absolute sense; and we can only eliminate this idea from the passage by deleting ALMAH the word, and substituting *nagara*; and even then, the unscrupulous critic who would dare upon such a liberty, would not be much assisted in his designs, for even the substituted word would more naturally bear the construction of 'virgin' than 'young woman.'

There are other Old Testament statements to prove the miraculous conception, but there is no present space to enter upon them. We have cited one strong enough to establish a powerful presumption in favour of the explicit narratives of Matthew and Luke, and to pave the way for their favourable consideration. Mr. Dealtry asserts these to be spurious additions to the original. This is, of course, essential to his argument, but lays a terrible onus upon him, for the records themselves being *prima facie* evidence of their genuineness, he cannot displace them without reasons of the most unimpeachable kind. It is not sufficient in such a matter to establish a plausible case. The reasons against must be more than equal to the reasons for; they must be crushingly preponderating, for if it is only a case of equal probability, there is room for the attacked theory to be correct, and in that case, general considerations must be allowed to turn the scale. Now, the arguments of Mr. Dealtry are not of this character; they are precisely of an opposite character. They are vastly inferior to those which establish the genuineness of the assailed narratives, while the general considerations, as we shall see, are all on the side of the doctrine which Mr. Dealtry denies.

In the first place, he is bound to recognise the existence of a belief in the miraculous conception in the first century. This fact destroys the nature of any non-belief which he may be able to show to have existed, so far as such non-belief might be construed unfavourably to the miraculous conception; because the argument he would apply on one side would be equally forcible on the other. If the non-belief of men living at the time, is presumptively against the doctrine, on the ground that they may be supposed to have had opportunities of ascertaining the truth of the matter, the belief of other men living at the same time and with the same opportunities is of equal weight on the other side; nay, it is of much more weight, for one "yes," on a matter of fact, is worth a

thousand "noes." "Yes," implies a reason and evidence; "no" only indicates the absence of reason and ignorance of evidence. A thousand men ignorant of a thing and unable to appreciate the evidences of it, may say they don't believe it; but is their negative of any value against the positive assertion and arguments of those who are privy to it? Twenty men may come into a court and say of a prisoner "We don't believe he is guilty," but the evidence of three men who have witnessed the fact of his guilt, will blow their opinions to the wind, and bring the jury to a verdict. Now the fact that any number in the first century believed in the miraculous conception (which Mr. Dealtry is bound to admit), destroys the value of every adverse expression of opinion which he might be able to quote. Belief is always of more value *prima facie* as a matter of evidence than non-belief, for belief is the result of a *cause*, whereas non-belief is the natural vacuity of a mind not informed. Ergo, the existence of the belief in the miraculous conception, argues the existence of a positive reason for it.

Mr. Dealtry thinks the apostles fail to censure the non-belief in the miraculous conception. This is a great mistake. There is nothing more characteristic of John's epistles than the assertion of the divine sonship of Christ, as against those who denied it, by asserting he was the son of Joseph. He says "Believe not every spirit; try the spirits whether they are of God; because MANY FALSE PROPHETS ARE GONE OUT INTO THE WORLD."—(John iv, 1.) Of these "false prophets," he says "*They went out from us but they were not of us.*" (ii, 19.) John therefore recognises the existence of error in his time. It will not do to quote the opinion of these false prophets as evidence in favour of their opinions. He says "We are of God; *he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us. Hereby we know the spirit of truth and the spirit of error.*"—(iv, 6.) Now, on the subject of Christ's sonship, he says "We have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world. *Whoever shall confess that JESUS IS THE SON OF GOD, God dwelleth in him, and he in God.*"—(14, 15.) Those who alleged he was the Son of Joseph would come under the implied condemnation of this passage. Every declaration that Christ is the Son of God (and they are numerous throughout the whole New Testament) is a condemnation of those who asserted he was the son of Joseph. Mr. Dealtry is, therefore, under an entire misapprehension in saying that the New Testament writers fail to condemn the theory that was afloat.

Mr. Dealtry next argues upon the omission of Mark to notice the miraculous conception. Will he seriously contend that this is evidence of its untruthfulness, in the face of

the fact that other explanations (at least *equally reasonable*) are possible in the case? Will he act more unwisely in this than in other matters? Will he not admit that every partial fact is susceptible of a variety of explanations, and that the universal rule is to adopt that which is dictated by collateral evidence? As a wise and candid man, he will not say 'No' to these questions. He would be among the first to laugh at the man who should contend that because Her Majesty speaks of the "Prince of Wales," without mentioning that he is her son, therefore, she is not his mother. Silence in such a matter never proves anything one way or the other. Yet Mr. Dealtry urges Mark's silence as a disproof of the miraculous conception. If this is good logic, it would prove that Christ was not born at all, for Mark never mentions the fact, but commences his narrative with the active ministry of Christ. The same argument applied to Matthew, would disprove the ascension, for Matthew does not mention it. Mr. Dealtry has really suggested the explanation. Mark's narrative was written at a later date than that of Matthew, and with Matthew's narrative in his possession, it did not occur to him to repeat the preliminary facts detailed so minutely by Matthew. Mark restricts himself to the "beginning of the gospel" (Mark i, 1), and was, therefore, precluded by the scope of his narrative from going back to the birth of Christ.

Mr. Dealtry's reliance on the omission of the account of the miraculous conception in some early copies of Luke and Matthew, is equally unavailing. For a few early copies without these chapters, a great number have them; and the question to be decided is, were the chapters in question fraudulently excluded from the few copies, or fraudulently introduced into the many? As a question of probability, no sane man would hesitate to pronounce upon it. There is no moral doubt that the fraud was practised in the few copies. In the production of these, the assertors of Christ's purely human birth would purposely omit the chapters that stood in their way. It is much easier to imagine this to have been the case than to suppose that during the lives of the apostles, so glaring an imposture should be so extensively and successfully perpetrated as the addition of two whole chapters to the two principal gospel narratives received in every church.

Then, as against Mr. Dealtry's hypothesis, we have to place the internal evidence of genuineness presented by the chapters in question. They are of a piece with the books of which they form an accredited part. The successful perpetration of such an imposition would have been a literary impossibility. The patch would have been visible.

Upon what slender and inadequate grounds

does Mr. Dealtry rest his objection to these portions of the sacred record, which received, place the subject in dispute for ever at rest. We sincerely hope he may see his way out of the unfortunate position he has taken. The denial of Christ's miraculous conception is

more serious than it may at first sight appear. We have exhausted space in dealing with the literary aspect of the question. A few words in a future number, on the doctrinal bearing of the matter, will be a necessary sequel.

EDITOR.

TOUR IN SCOTLAND.

The journey from Aberdeen lay about forty miles to the north, extending to the Buchan district, which is in the northern part of the shire. Here, through the instrumentality of Brother James Robertson, the truth has taken root in sundry scattered villages, laying hold of one here and another there, belonging to the class which it everywhere finds out, that namely, in which there are not "many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble," but many of the poor of this world, rich (as they may be and are called to be) in faith. These, to the number of twenty-one souls, constituting about two-thirds of the entire number in these northern parts, assembled from the various points of the compass, and met at Fetterangus, (an agricultural village, of several hundred inhabitants), under the hospitable roof of brother and sister Kerr. Here tea was spread, in primitive style, in a barn to the rear of the house, to which the only light admitted, came from the open door, there being no windows. The surrounding were rude, but the occasion was interesting. It was truly encouraging to think that in these quiet and unlettered parts, where, a few years ago, the truth was unknown, there should now be so many to whom it was sufficiently interesting to bring them together, on a very wet day, (for the rain fell persistently and heavily all day) from widely-sundered parts of an extensive district, to meet a stranger, who had nothing of interest to present to them, apart from the glorious faith, which is so distasteful to the mere religious sentimentalists of the age, so offensive to the moralists and "scientific" sceptics of the learned world, so unintelligible to the ignorant, and so utterly unpopular with all sections of the community. After some agreeable fraternization in the barn, for two hours and a half, the meeting adjourned to the "hall," in which it had

been arranged for a public (advertised) lecture to be given. The "hall" consisted of one of the single-storeyed low thatch-roofed cottages (of which the village is composed), with its inside taken out, and the interior filled with benches. Such as it was, it was the place in which the public of Fetterangus are wont, on such occasions, to assemble, and, therefore, the highest elevation from which the light could be exhibited to them. From this point of view, the meeting was equal to the largest adventure that could be attempted anywhere in the truth's interest, and, therefore, commanded the utmost pains that a low roof, dismal light, and fatigue of an immediately previous meeting and a long walk through miry roads in the rain, would allow. The lecture (subject: the Kingdom of God in relation to the gospel) was interrupted with questions put by an astute whilom clerical student, whom we were told the overpressure of brain-work had driven back to the mallet and plumb-line. His questions, which related to immortal-soulism and the death-state, were attended to at the moment, and the lecture assumed the form of a somewhat spirited colloquy, which, probably, was more interesting to the audience (numbering about fifty) than an unbroken discourse. The questioner was essentially a quibbler (and a sharp one too) and had come with the avowed purpose of frustrating the effort made for the truth, if he could. He was supported in this object by a considerable number of his acquaintance, who, finding themselves thwarted in argument, honoured the occasion, when they got out of doors, with a few rounds of hooting and groaning, and a few rowdy thumps on the doors and windows of the place.—From Fetterangus the Editor proceeded early next morning to Cumminestone (nine miles off) where brother and sister Reid uphold a lonely light amid surrounding darkness. From

this, the journey lay by road to Turriff, a town of two thousand inhabitants, six miles farther west. Here there is an ecclesia of eight souls. It has been larger than it is at present, but has, at one time and another, been reduced by removals to other parts, and, in one or two cases, by separation through "roots of bitterness." Those at present forming it seem united in the love of the truth, striving together for the faith of the gospel. Let all who name the name of Christ avoid the very appearance of evil, that love among themselves and the truth's progress may be unchecked. "Without rebuke," "a good report among those that are without," are necessary conditions of success. The breath of calumny is a blight upon the delicate operations of the spirit among men, and our policy ought to be to thwart it by "giving none occasion" for its malicious activity. Sometimes this policy fails through the obliquity of circumstances, and the ingenuity and corruptness of the propensity in some to think evil, to which even the purest course appears unclean, and by which, of course, an accidental appearance of evil is greedily pounced upon and greatly magnified. In this case, we can only endure the wrong and live it down. "What can't be cured must be endured." With clean hands, there is no ultimate disadvantage in having to submit to this infliction.—(1 Pet. ii, 19.) The discipline is wholesome. If there is fault, patience is the best virtue we can cultivate. Brother Robertson has learnt the wisdom of these reflections. Misfortune has laid the foundation of misrepresentation. Evil has been imagined and alleged where only a wrong shape of circumstances existed. Imposed upon by evil doers, he has been implicated in their errors, which he did not see in time to wash his hands of them. In this way detrimental reports have spread. These, for the sake of the truth with which brother Robertson is identified, the Editor felt it his duty to enquire into, and found them without any foundation so far as brother Robertson's probity is concerned. We mention this on account of his relation to those who have seen fit to assist him in his operations on behalf of the truth. That assistance, so far as the interests of the truth are concerned, is deserved; for brother Robertson's labours are untiring, and have been successful in these agricultural parts in awakening an interest in the

truth where it did not before exist. It matters not that the circulation of printed books is an effective part of the instrumentality he employs. The initiative has been with him. It is not the man who makes a weapon, but he who uses it, that is most to be credited with the results of its application. Both rejoice together. His lectures, wherever an opportunity presents itself (and he is one of those that make opportunities), induce that preliminary agitation which makes subsequent appliances useful. The results hitherto have been good. Several are rejoicing in the knowledge and comfort of the truth who, but for these labours, would have been in darkness. We remind the brethren how these labours are prosecuted, by quoting the following from the *Ambassador* for December, 1866. "He earns his livelihood by sedentary manual labour, but for many years has been unable, from the state of his health, to apply himself continuously to his employment; and is under the necessity of availing himself of change of air and occupation. This change he seeks in connection with efforts for the truth. As he says: 'I often go away, and hold meetings, when I am not fit for my work, and come home all right again.' In the prosecution of these efforts, brother Robertson has been beholden to the kindness of friends. His pecuniary resources have not been such as to allow of his absence from work without assistance. Some in certain parts have paid his rent, and contributed in various other ways to keep him in the field of occasional exertions." This state of things continues, and the time of the year has now arrived when friends of the truth are invited, if they think well, to renew the assistance rendered last year, so that operations may be kept active in the northern corner of the kingdom, and men and women thereby added to the company of those, who, at this late age have been privileged to attain to apostolic truth revived.

Two well-attended lectures in a room adjoining the Town Hall, Turriff, concluded the visit to these parts, and the scene of operations was then transferred to Glasgow. Here a change has taken place for the better, within the last eighteen months. There is now a meeting established on the basis of no compromise with the fables of the apostacy. This is an enormous gain to the cause of the truth, inasmuch as it affords a basis of operations in a vast population, which

was otherwise without much opportunity of attaining to the truth in a genuine form. True, the ecclesia is small, numbering only thirteen souls, but this is a nucleus sufficiently large to lead to greater things, if the thirteen surrender themselves as the Lord's property to do the Lord's work. This work is varied and often effectively performed by humble and limited instrumentality. What is wanted is a clear understanding, a hearty appreciation, a decided policy, a disinterested determination to serve God, exalt the honour of Christ, and save men—irrespective of discouragement or opposition. These can only be acquired by the constant reading of the word, by which we imbibe the spirit of the ancients, who were approved. When acquired, they will lead to a calm unquenchable pertinacity in the performance of those things that are possible, in the truth's service. Possibilities are determined by circumstances and capacity. Impossibilities will never be exacted by the supreme Judge. What will be looked for, and what must be cultivated, is the diligent accomplishment of *that which is within our power*. It may be a very little, but let us do it continually, and with a good conscience, as in the sight and service of God, and we shall be accepted.

The ecclesia had arranged for the delivery of five lectures in their ordinary place of meeting, a place capable (if memory serves aright) of holding 200 people. The effort being an experiment, they deemed it prudent to begin on a small scale. The result was highly encouraging. All the meetings were well attended, one or two being inconveniently crowded. Several cases of permanent interest have since been reported. The truth has thus made a new and auspicious start in Glasgow, the future results of which rest with the brethren. To their hands, in Glasgow, the trust is committed. If they band themselves firmly in faithfulness to the truth, doctrinally and practically, they will preserve a pure centre, which will assimilate to its own purity, the elements it may draw into itself from the surrounding population. In view of the past history of the truth in Glasgow, there is much need they should do this. By such a course only

(unflinchingly pursued) may they hope to replace the weak and abortive state of things heretofore presented to view, with a strong and mature development of the gospel, in a race of hearty men and women set for its defence. If they make themselves warm, they will make others who may join them warm. We all ought to be decidedly *warm*—even hot—not lukewarm, for such are nauseating to Christ. The truth demands warmth—even to the degree of zeal that will eat us up, and where it is realised in its own truthfulness and grandeur, it will engender this state of mind in relation to itself; for all men are warmly interested in that which intimately affects themselves when they understand and believe it. It is only when men dimly perceive or weakly believe the truth that they are dull and indifferent about it. It is not a question of race or temperament, except in a very small degree. Let the small band of brethren in Glasgow (delivered from the trammels of past associations) take the matter earnestly in hand, setting in motion every agency within their reach for the object in view, and they will draw to themselves the sympathy and ready co-operation and assistance of every earnest friend of Christ, and redeem Glasgow from the cloud which has hitherto obscured it from view. The truth first; friendship and fellowship next, and a living sacrifice to God ever after.

A flying visit to Wishaw and Beith disclosed nothing specially worth recording. In Beith, the truth has a never-failing friend in brother Gillies, whose steady unostentatious exertions are slowly telling in the conviction and obedience of one and another. In Wishaw, there have been misfortunes and hindrances, but the truth seems to hold its own among a small company. Better days might be, and may be. Let those concerned see to it. Much depends on them. Let it be said of them at the end, "They have done what they could."

May the Sun of Righteousness soon arise and dispel the shades of darkness that everywhere intercept the light of heaven, and doom the millions to misery and death! Amen.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

THE STANDING STILL OF THE SUN AND MOON, IN THE DAYS OF JOSHUA. ASTRONOMICAL BEARING OF THE EVENT.

A correspondent (brother C. G. Aspin, People's Park, Halifax,) asks "Do you consider that the words uttered by Joshua: 'Sun, stand thou still—and thou, moon' &c., can be legitimately used to upset the whole Newtonian system of Astronomy?" This question he himself answers so conclusively, that we cannot do better than use his own words. "It is assumed by some that Joshua's words are inconsistent with the theory that the earth goes round the sun; but I do not think the reasoning upon which this conclusion is founded, is correct or consistent with general example in other portions of scripture. If you will permit me, I will state my reasoning on Joshua, which is as follows. I do not see any reason to attach an inspiration of spirit to Joshua's words in the abstract, more than to "old shoes and clouted," or "the cloak which I left at Troas," &c. A prolongation of daylight was the thing wanted in order to complete the execution of divine vengeance; and so the wish, and the extraordinary faith in the divine interposition to produce the effect desired, were each an inspiration; but the language or form of expression was Joshua's own, and uttered in accordance with his own apprehension, and the apprehension of those in whose hearing he uttered it. I think this in no way derogatory to the dignity and authority of the scriptures. On the other hand, it would have been highly incongruous had any other form of speech been employed. It would have sounded strangely in the ears of Israel, if Joshua had said 'Earth, cease to move on thine axis!' They heard what was in accordance with their ideas; and at the same time the effect produced (which was the main thing), was precisely that which would have been caused by an interruption of the earth's revolution. And no untruth was told. We speak even now according to appearances. We say 'the sun rises,' or 'the sun has set,' and truly so; though strictly speaking, the expressions are out of harmony with the real philosophy of the thing."

Our correspondent hits the mark as it appears to us. Our forms of speech are invariably derived from the aspect of things, and not from the essence. Analytical phrases would be cumbersome and unpleasant. We are finite and superficial, and our language accommodates itself to the surface. We say "a fine day:" we don't say "a favourable

concurrence of the elementary forces during the exposure of this side of the planet to the sun." So when we wish to express a good condition of health, we do so in words that briefly deal with the surface only; we don't say "the various organs constituting the body are in a sound and active state, and performing their functions with freedom and alacrity, resulting in a liberal flow of the nervous fluid, and the consequent enjoyment of the several functions which derive their energy from that source." Any approach to this sort of minuteness is pedantic and borish in the highest degree. The mind is quick in its operations, and cannot bear to linger over a simple and common idea in this laborious way. It didn't matter in what language Joshua expressed his wish so that the result desired was understood. Had he said anything else than what he said, it would not have been generally understood. Besides, being ignorant of astronomy, he could not have expressed his wish in any other words. For all practical purposes, the sun moves from east to west; and in common conversation (say when men are out a-field), it is said to move, despite our knowledge that actually it is a fixture. If a prolongation of the day is wanted, what more common out-of-doors than to say "I wish the sun would stop a bit." If this is the case among ourselves, with a correct knowledge, need we be surprised at Joshua's words, which only reflect the impressions of sense, and the desire for a practical result which required a continuance of light? To suppose they are intended to express the relation of the heavenly bodies, is to be guilty of an absurdity of which even the fool-hardy sceptic ought to be ashamed. "Then do you suppose," says he, "that the earth was actually arrested in its diurnal motion?" It may have been, but it was not necessary that it should. This was not what Joshua desired. He wanted a continuation of light, which he expressed by the synonym of the sun and moon standing still. Now this could be done without the disturbance of the vast revolutions of the starry framework, which the suspension of the earth's motion would have caused. Light is refractive. Under divine power, the rays of both sun and moon could be broken at a gradually-increasing angle, in such a way as to give the appearance of motionless sun and moon, while the earth was actually accomplishing its usual revolution. Is anything too hard for God?

"BORN AGAIN."

P.M.—("As many as received him, to them gave he power 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 man, but of God.—John i, 12, 13.) You think water had nothing to do with the birth here referred to, but a moment's reflection will show that this conclusion is a short-sighted and a groundless one. The phrase "born of God," determines nothing. Of itself, it reveals, nothing of the process by which the result is accomplished. This we have to learn from other testimony, and it may be learned. The inception of a man's divine sonship is caused by the truth presented to his mind. This is evident from the fact that the method adopted for the creation of sons is the *preaching of the gospel* which, Paul says, is the power employed of God in the salvation of man.—(Rom. i, 16.) When the truth of the gospel is received, the believer is begotten. His divine relationship has commenced; but it is evident that unless this begettal advance to the stage of birth, the result is abortive. Now, Jesus connects water with the birth, (John iii, 4), and baptism with the belief of the gospel. (Mark xvi, 16.) Hence, it is a divine arrangement for a believer to be immersed in water for the purpose of being fully born into the divine family. A man may scorn the idea of water having to do with such a result, but he cannot deny it, if he believe the New Testament.—(Acts x, 47; viii, 36; Heb. x, 22; 1 Peter iii, 20, 21.) This birth of water, however, may very naturally, as a matter of speech, be ascribed to the "word" leading to it, because water immersion would do nothing for an ignorant person. Baptism is "a washing of water by the word."—(Eph. v. 26.) The word is the inceptive and creative power; immersion but the external act, by which it has legal efficacy. Hence Peter speaks as follows of those who had believed and had been immersed:—"Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever * * * and this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you."—(1 Peter i, 23.) Now, if believers can be said to be born by the word of God, surely with more appropriateness still, they can be said to be "born of God," for this covers the whole ground. But it would be quite a wresting of the word to our own destruction to say that because certain are said to be born of God, they were not baptised. Is one part of the word of God against another? Surely not. All must agree. To be "born of God," which is but a general form of speech requiring the light of specific information before it can be understood, is to believe the truth, and be immersed into Christ. Those mentioned by John in the passage in question had been the subjects of this double process, for all that received Christ were baptised. Christ himself set the example by being baptised of John. All Christ's are born of God in this way. This is a birth, "not of blood, nor of

the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man." Human appointment has nothing to do with it. It is entirely divine. From a natural point of view, it is foolishness. It is a part of the system of "base things and things which are not," which God has chosen to accomplish his ends in relation to the human family "that no flesh should glory in his sight."—(1 Cor. i, 28, 29.)

But it remains to be said that it is doubtful if John i, 13, refers to the class mentioned in the verse immediately preceding. On this point, we quote the following from the *Diaglott*: "Griesbach notes a different reading of this verse. Instead of *hoi egenetheesan*, he has *hos egenethee*; the singular pronoun and verb for the plural, which would make the passage read 'who was not begotten of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God,' thus referring it directly to the physical generation of the Messiah by the spirit of God, rather than to the moral regeneration of believers." This would get rid of your difficulty very summarily. There is no difficulty either way, but there would be less appearance of difficulty if the improved reading be adopted, and it certainly harmonises better with the context than the usual reading.

THE MEANING OF "PERISH" IN SCRIPTURE.

This is to be determined by lexicography and scriptural usage. Applying the first, we find that so far as the Hebrew scriptures are concerned, there are several original words translated by the English word "perish," and all appear to have substantially the same meaning. 1. *Avad*: "Ye shall *perish* among the heathen."—(Lev. xxvi, 38.) "When shall he die and his name *perish*, (Ps. xli, 5); "The king shall *perish* from Gaza."—(Zech. ix, 5.) "Came up in a night, and *perished* in a night."—(Jonah iv, 10.) The same word is also rendered *destroy* and *fail*.—(Ezek. xxvi, 17; xii, 22.) 2. *Gavag*: "That man *perisheth* not alone."—(Jos. xxii, 20.) "All flesh shall *perish* together."—(Job. xxxiv, 15.) This word is most frequently translated *die*, and *give up the ghost*.—(Gen. vi, 17; xxxv, 29.) 3. *Naphal*: "and many of them *perish*."—(Ex. xix, 21.) This is almost the only case in which this word is translated *perish*. In about 400 other instances it is rendered "fallen." 4. *Saphak*: "He shall descend into the battle and *perish*."—(1 Sam. xxvi, 10.) "I shall now *perish*."—(1 Sam. xxvii, 1.) This word is also rendered *consume* and *destroy*.

As regards the New Testament, the original word will be found to have the same meaning. *Appolumi* is the one most frequently used, and this finds illustration in the following passages: "Lord save us, we *perish*."—(Matt. viii, 25.) "They that take the sword shall *perish* with the sword."—

(Matt. xxvi, 52.) "The bottles shall perish."—(Luke v, 37.) "Meat which perisheth,"—(John vi, 27.) "Whereby the world that then was being overflowed with water *perished*."—(2 Peter iii, 6.) There are seven other words translated *perish*, but they are of very rare occurrence, and the meaning is the same, as will be seen by consulting the only passages in which they occur, which are as follow:—(Matt. viii, 32; Acts viii, 20; Acts xiii, 41; 2 Co. iv, 16; Col. ii, 22; Heb. xi, 31; 2 Pet. ii, 12.) To perish is to lapse into destruction. In relation to man, which is no doubt the aspect of the case our correspondent has in view, to perish is to be destroyed, in the sense of utter annihilation. This may be seen by consulting a Concordance. The popular sense of the word is a theological fiction. There is no such thing known to scripture, as perishing and still continuing in existence.

THE KINGSHIP OF CHRIST.

It is true Christ was rejected in his claims as King of Israel; but it is very far from being true that he "laid aside his title" in consequence of that rejection. The very opposite of this is indicated in the language of the 2nd Psalm: "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision. Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure. YET have I set my king on my holy hill of Zion." When God (by Jesus,) has spoken in wrath, and vexed in his displeasure, the adversaries of Jesus, which he has not done yet in the way he predicted—(Isaiah lxiii, 3-6; Zeph. iii, 8; Joel iii, 2; Zech. xiv, 16; Rev. xix, 15.) Jesus will be installed, in the throne of David, as king of Israel, and ruler of the whole earth.—(Is. xxiv, 23; Jer. xxiii, 25; Micah iv, 2-8; v, 2-4; Zech. xiv, 9.) At the same time, it is perfectly true that "God's salvation," by Christ's rejection, "has received a wider circle (than Israel,) viz., the whole earth;" Yet this was no accident; it was part of the plan fore-ordained and made known to the prophets, that Christ should become the salvation of Jehovah to the ends of the earth. In fact this was the principal feature of the promise to Abraham, that in his seed all families of the earth should be blessed. But are we to say that because Christ's operations are to bear upon the whole earth, therefore they are not to have their centre in the Holy Land? that because he is to rule all nations, therefore he won't be king of the Jews? that because the Gentiles are admitted to the privilege of Israel's commonwealth, therefore Israel's commonwealth is abolished? By no means. No one truth destroys another. We must find a place for every feature.

You are right in saying that Jesus is not king of "the church." Christ's brethren are his associates, not his subjects; his

particular friends, not his servile attendants. There is no confusion between Israel and "the church." The nation subject to Messiah's rule, when established at his return, is contemporary Israel after the flesh, spiritually renovated. "The church" is the total of those who shall be counted worthy of immortalisation and association with him, in the government of the whole world. The two are as distinct as the nation of Israel of old and the tribe of Levi, to whom pertained the priesthood.

THE DURATION OF AIONIAN (ETERNAL) LIFE.

We should not, as a mere matter of words, know whether *aionian* (translated "eternal") life were endless or otherwise, unless informed. The information we have, dispels all doubt. "They cannot die *any more*."—(Luke xx, 36.) "There shall be *no more death*."—(Rev. xxi, 4) "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death."—(1 Cor. xv, 26.) Therefore the life of the *aion* to come, (adjectively described as *aionian*) is endless, and constitutes immortality—deathlessness. There would be no immortality if *aionian* life came to an end. *Aionian* punishment, on the other hand, is terminable, and ends in destruction—second death; for indeed the very punishment of that *aion*, is "destruction from the presence of the Lord."—(2 Thess. i, 9.) The upshot of sin is death. "The wicked shall perish, but the meek shall inherit the earth."—(Psalm xxxvii, 20, 22.)

THE PROPRIETORSHIP OF THE HUMAN SPIRIT.

The spirit of a man is truly his own spirit while he exists; but there is a higher sense in which it is not his, but the Almighty's, "in whose hand is the soul (life) of everything, and the breath of all mankind."—(Job xii, 10). "In whose hand thy breath is, and whose are all thy ways."—(Dan. v, 23.) "In Him we live and move, and have our being."—(Acts xvii, 28.) It is in opposition to immortal-soulism that we quote these passages, and have alleged the human spirit to be God's property, and not man's. This theory [which is of pagan origin,] represents the spirit as the entity, the person, the man, and the body as something possessed. The scriptures on the other hand speak of the spirit as a thing possessed by the body, which is the man. "The spirit of God is in my nostrils."—(Job xxvii, 3.) "He formeth the spirit of man within him."—(Zec. xii, 1.) "Receive my spirit." All of which phraseology, be it observed, is scripturally applicable to the brute creation. This is the strong point of the argument. Orthodoxy claims the statements quoted as proofs of

immortal-soulism; but if the claim is good, it proves that animals have immortal souls; for of them we read "they (men and beasts) have one breath." (spirit: the same word)—(Ecol. iii, 19). "In all their nostrils (fowl, cattle, beast, creeping thing, and every man) is the breath of life."—(Gen. vii, 22). "Thou takest away their (the beasts') breath (spirit: the same word): they die."—(Psalm civ, 29).

Neither men nor beasts have, nor are, immortal souls. They are ephemeral forms of life, organised from the dust, and sustained in being by the great spirit which proceeds from the Father of all creation, and fills the universe. There will, in due time, be imperishable forms of life on the earth. Immortality has been brought to light by Jesus Christ through the gospel, (2 Tim. i, 10.) and all who believe, and to the very end obey in all things the gospel, will be raised from the dust, and receive the glorious gift by spirit effused upon them.

"SPIRITS OF JUST MEN MADE PERFECT."

This is one of several things to which Paul alleges the Hebrews had "come."—(Heb. xii, 22.) The Hebrews had not "come" to any of them in the literal sense. They had come to them in the sense in which they had "not come unto the mount that might be touched and burned with fire, &c." (ver. 18); that is, in the relative sense. The faith they embraced in Christ had no relation to the literal Sinai, at which Moses received the law, but had relation to the Mount Zion and Jerusalem of the heavenly order of things on earth, to come, when "the Lord of Hosts shall reign in Mount Zion and Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously."—(Isaiah xxiv, 23.) Most of the things enumerated, have their place in that time to which at present we are only related by faith. "The spirits of just men made perfect," is one of the things. To perceive the meaning of it, we must keep in mind that it is introduced with the others, *in contrast to what obtained under the law of Moses*. With this in view, we get at a ready solution. Paul says in an earlier part of this same epistle, (chap. vii, 19), "The law made nothing perfect." It accomplished nothing effectually for those who served it. It did not procure the remission of sins unto life eternal. A righteousness capable of elevating the sinner above the operation of the established law of death, was impossible under it. Righteousness could not come by the law.—(Gal. iii, 21.) Paul distinctly says "If righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain."—(Gal. ii, 21.) The law could not make just men perfect in their spiritual relations: "Under it were offered both gifts and sacrifices that could not make him that did the service PERFECT, as pertaining to the conscience."—

(Heb. ix, 9.) If perfection could have come by the law, we should have had no dispensation through Christ. "If the first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second."—(Heb. viii, 7.) But the first was entirely faulty, as a means of healing the breach between man and his Maker. It was never designed to accomplish this object. It was a purely provisional arrangement of things to pave the way for the real work.—(Gal. iii, 24.) It only typified the real work which is now in progress. It contained no arrangement by which the law of God might be upheld in the death of Adam's race and yet the goodness of God made effective in resurrection and eternal life—nothing by which He could be "just and yet the justifier of those who" were under condemnation.—(Rom. iii, 26.) It pointed allegorically to the way in which this was to be done; and that was Christ, who is the substance and end of the whole matter. Under the new covenant, *the spirits of just men are made perfect*, whether they lived under the law of Moses, (in faith) or live now, or are yet to live. Christ's sacrificial and mediatorial work, (which is the basis of the new covenant,) removes the weight of the law of sin and death, from which none of the just men of ancient times could deliver themselves by their own righteousness.—(Rom. viii, 1, 3.) "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works, to serve the living God? And for this cause, he is the mediator of the new testament (or covenant), that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament (or covenant), they who are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance."—(Heb. ix, 14, 15.)

To this glorious arrangement, the Hebrews who were formerly in a legal sense, under the "mount that might be touched," had "come" by the faith of Christ; and the hope of realising the substance of it, in the glory, honour, and immortality of the kingdom, was the anchor on which their minds rested.

Should you object to all this, and say that "the spirits of just men made perfect," were the immortal souls or the righteous in heaven, you get into fog and difficulty inextricable. In what sense were the Hebrews come to the glorified immortal souls of the righteous? And if in any sense, were their just forefathers under the law, not equally "come" to the same thing, seeing at their death they went to glory, and are now "safe in the promised land?" And what contrast in that case between the spiritual destiny of men under the law, and those under the gospel? And if just men were made perfect at that time, what is the meaning of Paul's statement, "They without us, SHALL NOT BE MADE PERFECT; (Heb. xi, 40.) and of

John, concerning the sounding of the seventh angel, "The time of thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldst give REWARD to thy servants, the prophets, and to them that fear Thy name, both small and great."—(Rev. xi, 18.)

"THE SPIRITS IN PRISON."

This is a mere synonym for the men now in *hades*, or the death state, of which you may be satisfied by carefully reading the context. "By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient when once the long-suffering of God waited in THE DAYS OF NOAH, while the ark was a preparing.—(1 Pet. iii, 19, 20.) Now who were disobedient in the days of Noah? The men who were contemporary with him. Hence "spirits" and "men" are in this case equivalent. What was the condition of those men at the time of Peter's writing? They were dead and in their graves, and gone to nothing. Hence "prison" is interchangeable with grave, of which we have illustration in Isaiah xxiv, 2; Zech. ix, 11, 12. The grave is certainly a prison of the most effective description; there is no escape from it, and dead men wasted to nothing in it, may, with a retrospective glance at their having once lived, be well described as "spirits." When were these disobedient men preached to by the spirit? The answer is, "in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing." The spirit preached through Noah, who is styled "a preacher of righteousness."—(2 Pet. ii, 5.) This was "the spirit of Christ which was in the prophets," (1 Pet. i, 2), and in Noah amongst the rest. The anointing spirit, of which Jesus of Nazareth was the complete

embodiment, (being God manifest in the flesh), was common to all the servants, messengers and prophets of ancient times. Hence, the spirit which quickened Jesus in his resurrection, and developed a saving name through him, was the same power, influence, or agency that operated through Noah in proclaiming a salvation which Peter says was a figure of that to be achieved through Christ.—(2 Peter vi, 21.) If it be asked why Peter should suddenly diverge from Christ to Noah, the context would suggest that he did so to show the parallel between the two dispensations, thus: There was preaching in Noah's time, and preaching in the apostles' time; disobedience in both; salvation in both; by water in both.

If you contend that Peter means that Christ in a disembodied state, went to hell during the three days he was in the grave, and preached the gospel to the immortal souls of those who were drowned at the flood, you involve yourself in strange difficulties. Christ did not go himself, observe; he went *by the spirit*, and preached, &c. Why by the spirit? Did he inspire some devil in hell to preach the gospel? and why was the preaching confined to the souls drowned at the deluge, when, according to the theory in question, hell had received countless millions of souls since the flood, all as wicked, and all as much in need of the supposed privilege? But in truth, these difficulties are perfectly gratuitous. There is no hell, no disembodied state, no immortal souls. These are myths of paganism. The truth of the matter we have endeavoured to set forth.

Your other questions anon. Forbear with the delay that has taken place, which you seem to regard unfavourably. Remember that these exertions are put forth amid labour and travail, and are not the pastime of leisure.

THE POLITICAL HEAVENS AND THE SIGNS THEREOF.

NOVEMBER.

EVENTS have justified the anticipation of last month. The revolutionary movement upon Rome is checked. Its mission is accomplished in tabling the Roman question on the political council board of Europe, and imposing upon the unwilling powers the necessity of discussing and coming to a decision upon it. The development of the situation is the work of the frog-spirit, whose activity and potency has been the great sign of the times for the last fifteen years. The facts of the moment are

familiar to the ordinary newspaper reader. Garibaldi's expedition, connived at by the Italian government, brought France on the scene in defence of the September Convention. By the aid of French troops, Garibaldi was defeated, and France found herself once more with Rome on her hands, to the undisguised displeasure of a large section of the French nation, the "liberal" element of which reprobates the maintenance of the "temporal power" by French bayonets. The Emperor

between two fires,—[his Roman Catholic subjects, on the one hand, who desire the protection of the Papal territories, and the democracy on the other, who hate the Papacy with a perfect hatred, and wish the Italians to be left to mind their own affairs,]—has contrived a Conference to get out of the difficulty. Afraid, in the critical state of his dynasty, to undertake the responsibility of either one course or the other, he calls upon Europe to decide for him what is to be done. At the date of writing [Nov. 28], the invitations to the conference have for the most part been accepted, and it seems likely it will be held. What they can make of the subject as a practical question, it is difficult to conceive. A more hopeless piece of diplomacy it is, perhaps, impossible to conceive, than the attempt to peacefully reconcile the burning desire of the Italians to have Rome for their capital, with the dogged obstinacy of an infallible Pope's claims to "the patrimony of St. Peter." Likely enough, it will end in widening the breach that already divides the parties to the dispute,—a breach that amounts to a gulf impassable; and in precipitating Europe into a war about the Pope, for and against, initiated probably by a declaration from "His Holiness," which will be the political parallel to the apocalyptic unclean-spirit from the mouth of the false prophet.

The nature of the crisis will be learnt from the following newspaper scraps:—

"The most conflicting rumours are current in regard to the Congress on the Roman Question. But one point seems to us manifest. What the Emperor of the French desires is an impossibility. He desires to withdraw his troops from Rome, and yet to keep the temporal power as safe as if they were still there. He can only hope to do this by getting the other European powers to unite in guaranteeing the temporal power of the Pope, and in binding Italy not to attack it. What Powers will give such a guarantee? Not England, certainly. On the other hand, should the Emperor be willing to withdraw from Rome without any such guarantee on the part of the Pope,—well, then he can do so, without asking leave of anybody. Or, finally, if he wishes to get an excuse for leaving the Pope to shift for himself, it is hardly consonant with the dignity of the other Powers to assemble in Congress for such a purpose. France went to Rome of her own accord; Napoleon expelled Austria in order that, for his own glory, he might

become the Pope's sole protector. If he is tired of that position now, that is his own affair."—*Globe*, November 18.

The *Italie* of Florence has the following:—

"The information which we receive leads to the belief that the Conference relative to the affairs of Rome encounters many difficulties, and will probably never meet. The circular of General Menabrea has clearly defined the Roman Question. Henceforth the fact is evident that the temporal power and the kingdom of Italy cannot co-exist. Means have been found to restrain the revolutionary elements which wished to force a sudden and violent solution; but the nature itself of things cannot be changed."

"The event of the day is the Italian note respecting the Roman question; it is plain and straightforward in tone, and it may be considered as summarily disposing of the French plan for settling the 'Roman Question.' General Menabrea says, as clearly as it is possible, that the temporal power of the Pope and the Italian Kingdom cannot co-exist—and that Italy will be a prey to all the dissolving influences of revolution, so long as this cause of disturbance continues to endure. The matter may therefore be said to have arrived at a dead-lock. Italy will only negotiate on the basis of the destruction of the temporal power, and that basis the French Cabinet will not admit."—*Standard*, November 15.

The *London Review* declares that the existence of such a volcano as the Roman Question in the centre of Europe threatens more thrones than one; and the Emperor Napoleon, with the discredit of his recent failures on his head—with the rise of a spirit of discontent among certain classes of Frenchmen [indicated, among other things, by the recent disturbances in Paris]—cannot afford to leave open any door for the entry of discord and revolution. The Italian disturbances of 1847 led to the great French uprising of 1848; and although, as we showed on a recent occasion, the condition of Europe now is far better than it was twenty years ago, inflammable materials are not wanting, which might burst into a desperate blaze, if subjected to too much friction, or left to ferment among themselves with the close and smothered heat of an artificial compression."

The *Spectator* says:—

"The European house is filled with gunpowder, and rifles must be discharged amidst it. One unlucky shot, and the world will be on fire, and it is the interest alike of Pio Nono and Garibaldi, of the High Priest of the Catholic Church and the High Priest of the Revolution, that the shot should be fired. If Garibaldi is shot what will hold Italy? and how keep him from getting shot if he believes his death advantageous to the world? Remember—we are ashamed to

write words apparently so superstitious, but our habitual readers at least will understand them—that 'luck' has deserted Louis Napoleon; that the current of events, that current which is the expression and result at once of his own mistakes and others' successes, has for two years set in steadily against him; that if an accident can mar his plans, the broad probability is the accident will occur. It is useless, and worse, to predict, but it is impossible to avoid a fear that if the worst comes to the worst, if Rome cannot be saved without war on Italy, Napoleon, old conspirator, old gamester, old Carbonaro, who loves Italy, detests the Papacy, and understands France, who has been arming for twelve months, and who, in supreme moments, can stake all, will leave Rome and Italy to themselves, announce to his people that Bismarck's hand is on his throat, and hazard dynasty, country, and Europe on one terrible throw for the Rhine. There is no question, if Prussia really has interfered, that France would respond, and it is not when he is calling the nation to arms, that Napoleon need embarrass himself about priests, or will care to leave behind him a hostile population in Paris. He may win still in Italy, for the Papacy may give way; but he also may not, and if he does not, then we half believe the hour so long predicted will have arrived at last, and France and Germany will settle once for all which is to lead the world."

The party of action, which is by no means resigned to its defeat, is preparing for a decisive blow. It is no longer satisfied with mere demonstrations. It may not succeed, but such is its plan. The manoeuvres of the Mazzinian party at Milan and Pavia are a source of concern, and measures are adopted to prevent an outbreak. Garibaldi's hymn is demanded in all the theatres.—*Express*, Nov. 21.

The working men's societies of Italy have published a protest against the arrest of Garibaldi; the general has sent them the following letter in reply:—

"Varignano, Nov. 8. My friends, my warmest and most sincere thanks for your words. Remember, however, that it is not in the direction of Varignano you ought to turn your looks and thoughts, but toward Rome. Remind our friends and the whole Italian people of this. Yours ever, GARIBALDI."—*Globe*, Nov. 18.

The *Italia* of Naples publishes the following news:—

"The military magazines of Capua and Genoa have been furnished with everything necessary for an eventual defence of these places. For the last three days men have been engaged repairing all the exterior works. The deposits of powder have been augmented, and a large quantity of projectiles have been sent from Naples. The fitting out of the

navy is being vigorously pushed forward. All the ships in this port have been armed except the Castelfidardo.

"Some persons," says the *Italie* of Florence, "are very much preoccupied by the formation of the army, the command of which has been conferred on General Cialdini. That force is not got ready with any idea of aggression; but, considering the present state of Europe, Italy quite naturally prepares to defend her interests should unforeseen events occur."

The *Platea* of Milan publishes the following:—

"We are in a position to announce that the Ministry of War has given orders to arm the Quadrilateral and store it with provisions. Instructions have been given at Piacenza and Bologna to prepare to send forty-pounder guns, supplies, and ammunition."

The *Corriere Italiano* of Florence says that very shortly 60,000 breech-loading muskets will be issued to the Italian army.

The peace of Europe in several quarters rests upon an unstable basis. And, whatever may be said to the contrary, we do not believe that a secure basis of tranquillity will be reached until a great war has removed the most serious of the existing difficulties. The Pope and the Sultan are the two unfortunate centres of commotion. The difficulty occasioned by the former is felt at present throughout all Western Europe. The embarrassments of the Sultan demand the attention alike of the East and West.—*Globe*.

THE EASTERN QUESTION.

Turkey nears the doom foreshadowed for her in Rev. xvi. The political Euphrates is fast drying up. The last month has witnessed a great acceleration in the process by which Moslem power is evaporating from Europe. The negotiations arising out of the insurrection in Crete have ended disastrously for 'the sublime Porte.' It will be remembered, an armistice was agreed upon for the discussion of Cretan grievances. In this discussion, the ambassadors of the various European powers took part. These pressed upon Turkey certain recommendations as to the government of Crete, which Turkey did not think fit to accept, and in consequence of this, Russia, Prussia, France and Italy joined in a 'collective note' withdrawing the 'moral support' of the powers from her, and leaving her to struggle with the consequences of her refusal to act on their advice.

The following comments of the press place

the political bearing of this proceeding in a clear light:—

“Two of the States, which now join with Russia in a declaration which is really SENTENCE OF DEATH ON THE OTTOMAN POWER, were allied in the Crimean War to defend Turkey at all cost against Muscovite aggression. France and Italy are now combining with Russia against Turkey. France and Italy were then allied with England to defend Turkey against Russia. Russia has played her cards well. * * * Those who take the trouble to read the short, sharp, and effective manifesto just addressed to Turkey, will, we think, admit that we do not exaggerate or misunderstand its import. The manifesto takes the form of a joint declaration addressed to Turkey by Russia, France, Prussia and Italy. It informs Turkey in curt terms, that she has rejected all the advice given her in regard to Crete; that she has done nothing really to improve the condition of things; that it is no use talking to her any more, and that, therefore, the Powers ‘discharge themselves from responsibility by leaving the Porte to the possible consequences of its acts.’ The circular concludes with the significant intimation that ‘the Cabinets, after having vainly endeavoured to enlighten the Porte, feel it to be their duty to declare that henceforward it will seek in vain for their moral support in the midst of any embarrassments which may be created for Turkey by her lack of deference to their counsels.’ This is emphatic; but this is not all. The Russian Government introduce this declaration by a circular of their own, in which Prince Gortschakoff announces that ‘the Imperial Cabinet will be always prepared to take part in any European concerted action, having for its object the solution of those difficulties.’ The *Courrier Russe*, of St. Petersburg, observes that “at the first glance over these documents, one must see that the Eastern Question has entered a new phase.’ So it has truly. ‘It is not yet war,’ says the *Courrier Russe*, ‘at least we hope so; but it is evidently the deliverance and enfranchisement of the Greeks in a very near future.’ * * * England has taken no part in the declaration addressed to Turkey, and neither has Austria; but it is perfectly obvious that neither can dream of taking action against it. Indeed, one of the journals which approves of the alliance dwells complacently on the fact that it really matters little whether England likes it or not, seeing that France, Prussia, and Russia combined are strong enough to be absolute dictators in the transaction. In no case, however, would England think of interfering. We are all alike weary of protecting Turkey. Even a Tory Cabinet could not think of any further risks on her behalf; and certainly Lord Stanley is individually as little likely as any man living to approve of such a course.

Turkey has made her bed, and she must lie on it. The declaration already issued will doubtless be followed up by other and more precise demands. The Turkish Government will probably be ‘recommended,’ or ‘invited,’ to yield up Crete, and allow her to be annexed to Greece, whose sovereign is now allied, by more bonds than one, to the reigning house of Russia. And then begins, like the breaking of the ice on the Neva, the great *debocte* of the Turkish Empire. Turkey has had her day—and made base and cruel use of it. Humanity, freedom, civilization, will alike have reason to rejoice whenever the hour of her fall is sounded.”—*Morning Star*, Nov. 8.

The Sultan has now an opportunity of ascertaining the political gains derivable, or likely to be derived, from his recent pilgrimage to the West. Within the last ten days, a document of serious import has been placed in his hands. It takes the unusual form of a ‘declaration,’ or we may perhaps say of an anathema or excommunicatory bull, and its object is to inform him that, for his many and various sins, particularly in the matter of Crete, certain august sovereigns, who do justly and love mercy, are resolved to cut him off from their communion, and leave him to the fate of the wicked. The sovereigns who hereupon shake off the dust of their feet for a testimony against this exemplary offender are those of Russia, Prussia, France, and Italy. Of course, they have no right to tell him that, for the obstinacy he has displayed, they will break up his house, confiscate his effects, and cut off his head; but they threaten him with consequences hardly less terrible. The Turkish Empire resembles a drunken or paralytic man, who is only kept bolt upright by five or six warm-hearted friends standing up all round him and close to him, so close that he can hardly move his limbs or draw his breath. The proximity is inconvenient, but here is the difficulty—if they move away, he will tumble into the gutter. This is just what they threaten to do. In diplomatic jargon, they declare that “they will leave the Sublime Porte to the consequences of this refusal, and withdraw from Turkey all their moral support.” There is a grim humour in addressing such language to anything Sublime, but from the sublime to the ridiculous there is but a step, and perhaps to the tragical but a step.

Looking through the self-denying terms in which it is conveyed, the meaning of this threat is that the four Powers who are parties to it will, from this moment, and to the utmost of their ability, considerations of decency being included, act in a hostile sense toward Turkey. They will not at present send their armies and fleets to Constantinople, but they will view with composure any difficulties in which Turkey may find herself entangled, they will do all they can to

augment those difficulties, and they will omit no opportunity of hindering and thwarting Turkey in her endeavours to get clear of them. If any other Power ventures to afford Turkey the slightest aid, they will regard such aid as an act of intervention which will set them free for more decisive proceedings. As only two great Powers have refrained from joining in this threat, it is easy to imagine from what quarter intervention on behalf of Turkey is deemed possible. Great Britain and Austria have alone refrained. Their concurrence was no doubt asked, but it was refused, and the other four agreed to go on without them. There is thus, blended with the threat to Turkey, a special warning to ourselves. If we sent a fleet into Turkish waters on any such mission as that which took it there fourteen years ago, four combined fleets would be on the spot to bear us company, but as opponents, perhaps as belligerents, certainly not as allies. The four potentates need be under no apprehensions. We have had enough of Turkey. We are not going to fight to keep any portion of the Greek race in vassalage. We have certain interests in the East which we shall do our best to ensure, but they will probably be unassailed. The gate-keeper of the Red Sea would not be less friendly to us as an independent sovereign than he is as the satrap of the Sultan.—*Manchester Examiner and Times, Nov. 9.*

Another aspect of the Eastern Question is ably outlined in the following remarks from the *Globe*, of October 9 :

"No one affirms that there is the least likelihood—there is not even a possibility—of Russia conquering India. But there is not only a likelihood, but in our opinion an absolute certainty, that she will soon make use of her power to disquiet our Indian dominion, and to find occupation for our Anglo-Indian army. This is one of the great objects which she has had in view in so rapidly pushing forward her conquests in Central Asia. Ever since she was beaten in the Crimean War, Russia has ceaselessly and vigorously been projecting her power Eastward. Why ?

No sooner was the Crimean war at an end than, almost without stopping to take breath after the struggle, Russia directed her whole spare forces against the tribes of the Caucasus. During the Crimean war, she had felt the difficulty of carrying on operations to the south of the Caucasus when by far the larger portion of the mountainous peninsula remained in the hands of hostile tribes. Hence, the first thing Russia did after the Peace of Paris, was thoroughly to subjugate the Caucasus,—transplanting or driving out the greater portion of the inhabitants, and taking firm and full possession of the country by military settlements and a chain of forts.

That mountain-barrier to the southward progress of Russia is now levelled. To use the phrase of Louis XIV in regard to the Pyrenees, "The Caucasus is no more." The gateway leading into Asia Minor and Persia is now in the hands of Russia. The door is open: she can pass through as soon as she is ready to do so.

Russia has now got within range of India, and that is exactly what she wants. Her position there is like that of an attacking force which is not strong enough to storm the enemy's position, nor cares to do so, but which gets its long-range artillery into play, and sends out skirmishing and attacking parties to fully occupy the enemy's attention. Both her subjugation of the Caucasus and her advance up the Oxus are measures of preparation which Russia means to turn to good account whenever the Eastern Question is re-opened. By drawing or forcing Persia into an alliance with her, she will secure an advance by that Power upon Herat, the key of Afghanistan; while at the same time she will intrigue with the Afghan chiefs, and, if unopposed, will march a well-equipped regiment or two across the Bamean Pass upon Cabool, to co-operate with the chiefs who are willing to support her.

The influence of such events upon our Indian empire would be most serious. The mere fact that a Russian regiment had crossed the Hindoo-Koosh and taken up a position at Cabool, would produce a moral effect throughout India a thousand times greater than would be justified by the military importance of the event. The natives would say "Here is Russia come hundreds of miles over deserts and mountains, and openly dares to beard England at our gates!" The plain fact is, we could not for a moment remain inactive in such circumstances. We could not afford to allow a single Russian regiment to cross the Hindoo-Koosh: and to prevent it we should have to occupy Cabool. We could not allow a Persian army simultaneously to seize Herat, without a forward movement on our part up through the Bolan Pass to Quetta, or perhaps even to Candahar. In fact, whenever the aggressive movements of Russia and Persia begin, as diversions to engage our Indian army, and cripple our strength for opposing Russia in Europe, our Indian Government will be forced to abandon its policy of inaction, and will have to occupy Cabool and Quetta in order to have full command of the passes which lead up from our frontier into Afghanistan. The line of the Indus is one of the most defensible in the world; but merely to hold it and allow an enemy to occupy the Khyber and Bolan Passes would be to submit to a state of blockade,—leaving the power of the initiative wholly to the enemy.

We shall not only be compelled to do this, but, to all appearance, it will be at no

distant date. Russia is firmly resolved to make another and still more determined attack upon Turkey. She is busily preaching Pan Slavism, and intriguing with the Slavonian populations both of Austria and Turkey, in the hope that they will co-operate with her. She only waits for an opportunity. And a war in Central Europe would serve her purpose. No one can tell how near we may be to a great crisis in Europe: and we sincerely trust that our Abyssinian expedition may promptly accomplish its object, so that

England may have her hands free to meet the difficulties of a re-opening of the Eastern Question. The Abyssinian expedition has been undertaken by the Government most reluctantly: it is a legacy of embarrassment left to them by their predecessors. There is no escape from it. At the same time it will be by no means disagreeable to Russia to see England engaging her forces at a point almost equally distant from Afghanistan in the east and Constantinople in the west.

INTELLIGENCE.

PROPOSED VISIT OF DR. THOMAS TO BRITAIN.

It having come to the knowledge of the friends of the truth in Birmingham, that it will not be impracticable for Dr. Thomas to visit this country in the course of next year, they have decided to ask the friends of the truth generally throughout the country to join with them in sending an invitation to that veteran expounder of the divine oracles, and in the raising of money to meet his travelling expenses, including railway fares, to places visited in this country. The general object of the invitation would be to promote the cause of the truth, by lectures in all places in which a door of utterance might present itself. It is probable that at the present crisis, his lectures would secure the ear of the public, as there is a general uneasiness in reference to passing events, which disposes the people to listen to anything likely to throw light on them. This disposition would be likely to have a special manifestation in connection with a visit from the Dr., as his name is pretty widely known in connection with prophetic views of current events. In any case, the cause of the truth would receive a great impetus throughout the country. The faith of the brotherhood would be strengthened, and enlightened, and the ignorant promoted. With this in view, we invite a response to the proposal now made. Communications to the Editor.

BIRMINGHAM.—We have to record the following items of intelligence for the last month: WILLIAM FIELD, (28,) formerly neutral, son of one of the brethren, has been immersed and added to the ecclesia.—Brother Townsend and sister Deakin have been united in marriage.—A three months' sojourn by brother and sister Hayes was terminated on Wednesday, Nov. 27, by a farewell tea meeting, at which brother Hayes gave an interesting account of his travels in relation to the truth. There was a large gathering. Brother Hayward, of Mumbles, has come to reside in Birmingham. The week night lectures have been highly successful; and the attendance all that could be desired. A second course is advertised: subjects as follow:

Tuesday, December 3rd.—The heaven and hell of popular belief founded on fiction, and a misunderstanding of scriptural terms.

Tuesday, December 10th.—The second appearing of Christ in person, to judge his people, and take the reins of universal government, the only hope presented in the scriptures.

Tuesday, December 17th.—THE GOOD TIME COMING, or the state of things among the nations when the kingdom of God is established.

Monday, December 23rd.—CHRISTMAS: a few words on the origin, its significance, its lesson, and its prophetic import.

[The interval between these dates will (God willing), be spent at Whitby, Scarborough and Swansea.]

Tuesday, January 14th.—The future history of Jerusalem as the metropolis of the Messiah's kingdom, involving another temple, and the restoration of sacrifices.

Tuesday Jan. 21st.—The COVENANTS OF PROMISE (Eph. ii, 12); or the good things promised to Abraham and David realised in the restoration of the kingdom again to Israel, and the blessing of all nations under the reign of Christ.

EDINBURGH.—MRS. HUGHES, lately among the adherents of George Dowie in Edinburgh, has been added to the ecclesia. She was formerly a member of the New York ecclesia; and coming to England in ignorance of a division prevailing, she became a member of the Dowieite meeting; but, however, after a considerable time, she came to see their false position in relation to the truth, and renounced their fellowship. She was received to fellowship on October 27th.—Brother and sister Lamb, of Pathhead, a few miles distant from Edinburgh, have come to reside in the city, and will prove a welcome addition to the ecclesia.—The public witnessing for the truth by the brethren, in the form of lectures, was resumed, on the Sunday above-mentioned. The speaker was brother Paterson, whose subject was "A Recent Jewish Conversion." He reviewed the case of a Jew—the nephew of a rabbi—who came to this country from Holland, and coming in contact with some of the clergy, studied with them what they termed the "Christology" of the Old Testament, and thus became a convert to Gentilism, vulgarly called Christianity. The lecturer examined in detail the "Christology" of the Old Testament, and showed how thoroughly it was opposed to the creeds of the churches of which he had become an adherent; "thus selling the little of his birthright which remained for a mess of Gentile pottage." The second address was by brother Ellis, who spoke on "What shall the Messiah do when he comes?" The attendance on the first two occasions was much the same, as was also that at the third lecture, which was delivered by brother C. Smith, the subject being the "Kingdom of God." But the fourth of the lectures commanded a much larger audience than its predecessors. Its subject was "Future Punishment: Hell," and was delivered by brother Paterson. The audience was very attentive; and a good number of the *Declarations* were sold at the close; and a copy of the *Lectures*. On Sunday last (November 23), brother Ellis lectured on "Gehenna." The good attendance of the previous Sunday was maintained, and the brethren are in hopes of fruitful results.

FROME.—Mr. J. Hawkins writes to say that there is no sympathy with the views of Panton Ham, on the death of Christ, among the friends of the truth in this town. The announcement will gratify the readers of the *Ambassador*, who will be glad to learn more in due course.

GALASHIELS.—Brother W. Milne writes "We have lost our brother Richard Pearson, through error concerning resurrection and judgment imported from Glasgow, that hot-bed of sedition concerning the truth."

GLASGOW.—Bro. Clark reports several additions to the ecclesia. The first is MARGARET CRAIG, who at the early age of 16, after acquaintance with the truth for considerable time, gives herself up to God, in immersion, as a living sacrifice. Her mother and eldest sister, who had formerly been in connection with one of the nondescript meetings professing the truth in Glasgow, were, on their own application, after a careful and satisfactory examination, also received into the ecclesia. On Sunday, October 13, the wife of brother McINTYRE put on the Lord Jesus in the appointed way, and was added to the ecclesia. Several interested strangers are in attendance. Christadelphian meeting place, 280, George Street, Glasgow.

HALIFAX.—Bro. Shuttleworth announces two immersions, viz., MARY BLACKBURN, sister to brother Cheatham, of Ripponden, and MRS. HOYLE. Both reside in Norland, a place about equi-distant from Halifax and Ripponden, between which they will probably divide their future attendance.

LEEDS.—Brethren Dixon and Willis each write in words of thanksgiving, to announce the immersion of JAMES NAYLOR, a young man from York, of whom the following particulars are communicated:—He picked up a copy of the *Discussion* from a friend's table some time ago, and having taken it home to read, his interest was aroused, and he wrote for the *Twelve Lectures*, advertised on the back. The perusal of this, and subsequent research, completed his conviction of the truth, and he wrote to Birmingham to ascertain the nearest community of Christadelphians to York. This was Leeds, and there he went, and gratified the brethren by an unusual exhibition of intelligence in the things pertaining to the great salvation revealed. His immersion was the desired and natural sequel. He had been a Universalist, and latterly a church of England "professor."

LONDON.—Brother J. J. Andrew, writing November 12, announces the immersion of his brother Arthur on the previous Sunday. It is permitted us to hope this may be a useful accession to the cause of the truth in England.

NOTTINGHAM.—Brother Phelps, writing November 20, announces an addition to the ecclesia in Nottingham, through the marriage of brother E. Turney, on October 8, to Susanna Longmate, who having made the good confession, put on the Lord Jesus by immersion sometime previously. The number of the ecclesia is now 31.

ROTHES, (Scotland).—Mr. W. Coutts, M.D. of this place, having attained to a comprehension and belief of the truth through works that fell in his way and were then sought after by him, writes to say that a few individuals in the same place are gradually finding their way to a comprehension of the truth, and that he desires to be made acquainted with the constitution and conduct of an ecclesia, as it seems probable the duty of establishing one will devolve upon him. The desired information has been supplied.

TRANENT.—It may be interesting to the readers of the *Ambassador* to know that at this place—a small mining district about 10 miles from Edinburgh—there exists a company of faithful brethren, to the number of eighteen. They have been in existence as a meeting for a good number of years, and have had many trials in their endeavours to be faithful to the truth, chiefly owing to the pressure brought to bear on the locality by Dowieism from Edinburgh. They have, however, thoroughly thrown off this influence, having by personal contact—the best of all tests—proved Dowieite pretensions to be false. Their faithfulness has resulted—as has been the case from the time of the apostles to this day—in the formation of another community recognising Dowie fellowship. One or two, who had been formerly with them, formed the nucleus of this second assembly. Aided by several of the most prominent members of the Union Hall community, they took advantage of a revival agitation going on, gave open-air lectures, &c., on life in Christ, his personal reign on earth, and baptism as the “proper mode” of confessing their belief in him. They have thus gathered together a large number, whose bond of fellowship consists in the profession, and very superficial knowledge of the things mentioned above, while holding, in common with their teachers, many of the most absurd and

apostate doctrines of the world’s *Christianity*. One of their number, Catherine Hogg, daughter of brother Hogg (of Tranent), coming to see that she had confessed merely to a form of words, without their true knowledge, and that her immersion was not a sign or seal of an intelligent faith—abandoned their fellowship, and put on the name of the Anointed One, with that intelligence which constitutes its only significance. She was added to the brethren on the 5th of October. She resides in Edinburgh, and enjoys the fellowship of the brethren there.

Brother Andrew Blackhall, who was immersed into the one faith, at Tranent, on the 14th of July last, divides his fellowship between the Edinburgh and Tranent ecclesias. He resides in Edinburgh. The brethren in Tranent, principally through the intelligence and zeal of brother R. Strathearn, are very active in spreading the truth. They have addresses every Sunday evening, in the meeting-place, and have been assisted in their endeavours by brethren Ellis and Smith, of Edinburgh. Brother Ellis spoke on Sunday, November 9th, to large audiences, on “The Future Inheritance of the Saints,” in the afternoon; and “The Signs of the Times, in Relation to France, Italy and Rome,” in the evening. Brother Strathearn spoke the next Sunday evening, on “The Resurrection of the Dead;” and next Sunday again, brother C. Smith lectured on “My Kingdom is not of this World.” On both occasions, large audiences attended. On this latter day, there was a social meeting in the afternoon, which about fourteen of the Edinburgh ecclesia attended; and the time was spent in the profitable examination of “Positive and Negative Aspects of the Faith.”

TURRIFF.—Brother Robertson writes October 20th.—“On the 8th and 15th of September, I delivered two lectures on ‘the Coming of the Lord in relation to the One Faith and the One Hope,’ as a sequel to the two delivered by you when here. On the 28th, JAMES FERGUSON, weaver, (formerly belonging to the established church,) 70, Low Street, Pitlago, and Mrs. HEPBURN, from the same place, (formerly among the Baptists,) came here, a distance of 12 miles, to obey the truth. On the 29th they were baptized into the name of the Lord.”

SWANSEA.—Brethren Evans and Goldie separately announce two additions to the

ecclesia here; one being MRS. LANGRAVE, who, with her husband, has attended the meetings for some time, but has preceded him in the obedience of the truth, he, however, being expected shortly to follow. The other is the case of BENJAMIN BENNETT, who is described as "a young man of promising abilities, who has had some practice in public speaking." Bro. Goldie announces the re-immersion of his wife.

AUSTRALIA.

SYDNEY.—Brother Rooke writes on the 21st of August, to say that during the last twelve months, the progress of the truth in Sydney has not been specially encouraging. He is, however, able to report two additions to the small ecclesia existing in that place, viz: GEORGE GARDNER, and his wife, JANE GARDNER, natives of Scotland; both formerly Campbellites. They were immersed on the 11th of August last. He says they were surprised, after professing Christ for so many years, to find they had been ignorant all the while of its first principles, and groping in perfect blindness.

UNITED STATES.

JEFFERSONVILLE.—The following is a continuation of the Intelligence which appeared last month. It was held over for want of space:—

"The brethren in Jeffersonville issue the following certification of brother Spear's standing and character, to neutralise the defamatory efforts made by the enemy:—The ecclesia of the Deity at Jeffersonville, Ind., send christian salutation to all true brethren and sisters in Christ to whom this may come—Dearly beloved brothers and sisters of the one body.—This will certify that most of us are personally and well acquainted with brother J. H. Spear, of Sweet Water, Illinois. Each and every one of us are fully satisfied that he is truly a man of God, and well worthy to be called a Christadelphian; he is a bold defender of the faith, is gentle, kind, pleasant, loving, and lovely in his usual manner of presenting the truth; he is apt to teach, he writes and talks well. As such, we commend him to the love of the brethren, in confidence that all who have been scripturally engrafted into the Christ will love him when they have become

acquainted with him.—Affectionately, yours in the one faith,—R. H. GRESHAM, Cor. Sec., June, 1867; L. M. NICHOLSON; Clerk and Treasurer; R. L. LOGAN; SALLIE BOTTORFF; J. M. ESSINGTON; MARY E. LOGAN; O. C. WOOLLEY; WM. T. SHEPHERD; WM. WALKER; SALLIE A. WOOLLEY; MARY E. SHEPHERD.

The representations of brother Gresham, are confirmed by the following note from Dr. Thomas:—"July 27th, 1867. Dear brother Roberts,—brother Gresham has given a true account of himself, as I believe. I am personally acquainted with him, and since he has obeyed the truth in the midst of great discouragement and opposition, we may regard him as a reliable brother of our Lord, who is not ashamed to be called a Christadelphian, which is becoming a term of reproach with the worshippers of the beast. The brother J. H. Spear is the correspondent whose enquiries I replied to, as published in your July number. I have no reason to doubt the truth of all the brethren in Jeffersonville have to say in his favour"

Affectionately yours, JOHN THOMAS.

NORFOLK, VA.—Bro. J. L. Hathaway, writing from this place, under date Sep. 24th. says "We have only a small church in Norfolk: about twenty brethren and about twelve sisters. We get along as harmoniously as believers can. We hold two meetings on Sunday, in the forenoon for the benefit of those without, when brother Beezley lays before them, in a plain and emphatic style, the truths of the Kingdom and Name. We have another speaking brother, A. J. Coffman, who was formerly a Methodist preacher. In the afternoon we attend to the commemoration of the Lord's death. On Tuesday and Thursday nights, we have meetings for the study of the apostles and prophets. I think you get along in Britain with more success than we do; your people, though priest-ridden, don't seem to run riot into every fancy notion. Anything will take over here, from the Pope down to Joe Smith and John Brown's body."

The *Ambassador* is this month a week late, owing to the pressure of business. The delay, however, is made up for by the addition of twelve extra pages, which our readers will please accept as a Christmas present.

A title page and table of contents for 1867, will be issued with our next.

THE EDINBURGH ECCLESIA AND THE EDITOR.

The remarks in the October number of the *Ambassador*, in reference to the attitude of the ecclesia on the occasion of the editor's recent visit to that city, gave offence to the brethren there, as was to be expected, though such a result was not intended, except with a view to wholesome results. In reference to these remarks, they transmitted to the editor a collective protest against what they conceived to be misrepresentations contained in them. This led to correspondence, as the result of which, we are prepared to make amends by admitting that the remarks in question were too severe in tone, and incorrect in the general effect they would have on the mind of the reader. Wherein we appeared (in the hypothetical questions and answers made use of—see p. 238.)—to accuse them of parsimony and shame toward the truth, we retract what we have said. We did not affirm this of them, but put the

matter suggestively for the sake of argument. We believe them to be open-handed and brave where their eyes are open to duty. Wherein we attributed their want of enterprise on the occasion in question to personal prejudice, we accept their repudiation of all unworthy feelings in the matter. We believe them to be actuated by a desire to do right; though conceiving them in some matters to have had defective views of what is expedient to be done. Our object was to apply a remedy where it appeared to be needed. If it was too rough and a little overdone, we beg pardon. "Open rebuke is better than secret love." We have not failed on former occasions to make mention of their excellencies, and they will not, on reflection, be angry with equal frankness on the other side. Our object is secured if the truth gets the benefit, and this we feel confident it will do.

NOTES.

THE ADVERTISING SCHEME.—Having remitted the money to bro. Andrew, we have received the following acknowledgment:—

"376, Strand, London, Nov. 12, 1867.

Dear brother Roberts,—I beg to acknowledge yours of the 11th instant, enclosing £7 15s. 3d., the total amount subscribed to the Advertising Fund. To each of the subscribers I am personally obliged for their response to this suggestion, and as we are told to 'honour the-Lord with our substance,' they may rely upon it that their contributions toward the extension of the truth will not be forgotten. I will send you the vouchers for the money paid to the various papers advertised in.

Yours faithfully, J. J. ANDREWS.*

FALSE LITERALISM.—In one of the letters by bro. Paterson, published last month, there was an omission which we now supply as follows:—

"But looked at from another point of view, their position and ours differ at the very outset, that is, in the manner of interpreting scripture, or in other words, the right division of it. They say that the true mode of interpreting the scriptures is by "*literal interpretation*:" * just reading it as it stands; that it needs no explanation—it can explain

itself. We say "No." For Paul lays down another rule in his letter to the Corinthians, where he says that "he spoke not the words which man's wisdom taught, but which the holy spirit taught, *comparing spiritual things with spiritual.*" We hold from this and other scripture, that it is only by a continual meditation on the Word—and in this we have Jesus for our great example—and a diligent comparison of its contents, one part reflecting upon another, that we can become *learned and stable* in the truth: otherwise, we are of that class whom Peter in his second epistle designates as *un-learned and un-stable*, and who wrest the scriptures to their own destruction, which words occur by the way, in a chapter which those in Union Hall expound in a fashion that utterly makes void the promises made to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, that they should inherit the land of Palestine for an everlasting possession, and that the nations should be blessed in them. The inference here is plain, and need not be stated. Indeed this rule has led in their case to no end of absurd ideas, as it is natural to suppose it would, seeing that it is applied to the whole book; and it must prove utterly ruinous to any growth in the knowledge and wisdom of the Deity.

* The use of the phrase "literal interpretation" here is not in contra-distinction to what are known as the "spiritualistic" interpretations of orthodoxy. To these all Christadelphians oppose the plain, *literal* teachings of the spirit, of which Paul inculcates the comparison of one part with another,—so that they who did so might be right dividers or interpreters of the Word, as a whole. The "literal interpretation" of the D-wie brotherhood is of an entirely different kind, and is a principle which underlies most of their error. It is a literalism which ignores the sym-

bolism of many expressions and has no regard for the *harmony* of the Word, but adhering to the mere surface of the *words* employed by the spirit's ideas, is continually setting one part of the spirit's teaching against another. The things held by them which are treated of in this letter are all prominent examples. Two instances will suffice the intelligent reader—Paul's second letter to Corinth 5th chapter: against his first letter, 15th chapter: Genesis 13th and Romans 4th against second, Peter 3rd chapter—R. P.

TWELVE LECTURES ON THE RELIGIOUS ERRORS OF THE TIMES, &c.

BY THE EDITOR.

NEW AND ENLARGED EDITION.

The third edition of this work having been entirely sold out, and the demand still continuing, it is intended to publish a **FOURTH EDITION**, with a larger size of page, and an increased quantity of matter, and got up in a more workman-like style than previous editions,

The Lectures will be thoroughly revised and several new Lectures added, on such topics as: Resurrection and Judgment, the Nature of Christ, the Abrahamie and Davidian Covenants, the Doctrine of the Devil, the Signs of the Times, &c.

The price of the new edition will necessarily be higher than that of previous editions. The amount of increase we are not at present able to state, but it will probably amount to threepence or sixpence.

The work has been commenced by the printer, and will be got out as soon as possible; but owing to the demand upon the Editor's time, there will necessarily be a little delay in the completion.

WILL SHORTLY BE PUBLISHED AT ONE PENNY, a *New Tract*, entitled

A DECLARATION

OF THE FIRST PRINCIPLES OF THE ORACLES OF THE DEITY,

Set forth in a series of propositions attested and illustrated by a right division of the Word of Truth, in a classification and full quotation of appropriate proof-texts, for the purpose of demonstrating that the faith of Christendom, is made up of the fables predicted by Paul (2 Tim., iv, 3), and is entirely subversive of the faith once for all delivered to the saints.—By R. C. BINGLEY, Chicago, United States. *The Editor will take charge of orders.* The Tract, which we may mention is published below cost price, will be a useful addition to the Christadelphian literature now in circulation, furnishing a convenient touchstone in the trial of "spirits" and a ready guide to those who are enquiring after the way of truth.

RECEIPTS FROM DECEMBER 2nd TO DECEMBER 21st INCLUSIVE.

Ambassador.—T. Fuller, Headingley 1 copy (12 months); Margaret Mc.Donald, 1 copy. (4 months); W. Birkenhead, Manchester, one set, Nos. 1—30, also 1 copy for 12 months in advance; Martha Lee, Hamilton, 1 copy (12 months); R. C. Bingley, Birmingham, 3 sets Nos. 1—30; also 8 copies, 12 months to come, and 10 odd numbers; T. Davis, Birmingham, £1 to account; B. Goldie, Swansea, 5 copies, (12 months); also one set Nos. 1—30; I. Clissett, Heckmondwike, 5 copies (one month); P. Robertson, Blairgowrie, 9s. to account; W. Milne, Galashiels, 10 copies, (2 months); J. Robertson, Turriff, 10s. to account; H. Clarkson, Whitby, 1 copy, (1 month); C. Bennett, Mumbles, 1 bound copy for 1864 65; G. Cree, Biggar, 1 copy, (12 months); John Hage, Newark, 6 copies, (12 months); A. Willis, Leeds, balance of account in respect of 20 copies monthly; John Brown, Otago, New Zealand, 4 copies, (12 months); J. Mulholland, Glasgow, balance of account to December, 1866; Dr. Hipkins, Burford, C.W., Nos. 19—30; J. Goody, Toronto, vol. 1867; J. Coombe, Toronto, 5s. to account.

Twelve Lectures.—W. Birkenhead, Manchester, 1 copy; Martha Lee, Hamilton, C.W., 1 copy; John Brown, Otago, New Zealand, 64 copies, (4th edition.)

Eureka, Vol. II.—R. C. Bingley, Birmingham, 1 copy; D. Brown, London, 1 copy; W. Wilne, Galashiels, 1 copy; J. Grant, Carbridge, 1 copy; John Hage, Newark, 1 copy; A. J. Willis, Leeds, 1 copy; John Brown, Otago, New Zealand, 1 copy

Eureka, Vol. I.—(Out of print).—D. White, New Zealand; John Brown, New Zealand. What shall we do with the money?

Elpis Israel.—D. White, Dunedin, New Zealand, 4 copies, (4th edition.)

Anatolia.—W. Birkenhead, Manchester, 1 copy; C. Bennett, Mumbles, 1 copy; John Brown, New Zealand, 4 copies.

Discussion.—T. Fuller, Headingley, 1 copy; W. Birkenhead, Manchester, 2 copies; John Brown, Otago, New Zealand, 10 copies.

Miscellaneous.—W. Birkenhead, Manchester, 4 copies *What is Truth*, 12 *Summaries*, 2 *How to Search*, 2 *Devil and Hell*, 2 *Destiny B. E.*, 1 *Antipas*, 1 *Contrast*, 1 *Bible Companion*; R. C. Bingley, Birmingham, 1 *Contrast*, 4 *Bible Companions*; A. Tarves, 2 *Devil and Hell*; H. Clarkson, Whitby, 1 *Devil and Hell*; H. Flint, Birmingham, 1 *Hymn Book*; John Brown, Otago, New Zealand, 10 *Hymn Books*

EDITOR'S BUSINESS ADDRESS—R. Roberts, Athenæum Rooms Temple Row, Birmingham.

TWELVE LECTURES ON THE RELIGIOUS ERRORS OF THE TIMES &c.

BY THE EDITOR.

NEW AND ENLARGED EDITION.

The third edition of this work having been entirely sold out, and the demand still continuing, it is intended to publish a **FOURTH EDITION**, with a larger size of page, and an increased quantity of matter, and got up in a more workman-like style than previous editions.

The Lectures will be thoroughly revised and several new Lectures added, on such topics as: Resurrection and Judgment, the Nature of Christ, the Abrahamic and Davidian Covenants, the Doctrine of the Devil, the Signs of the Times, &c.

The price of the new edition will necessarily be higher than that of previous editions. The amount of increase we are not at present able to state, but it will probably amount to threepence or sixpence.

The work has been commenced by the printer, and will be got out as soon as possible; but owing to the demand upon the Editor's time, there will necessarily be a little delay in the completion.

WILL SHORTLY BE PUBLISHED AT ONE PENNY, a Large New Tract, entitled

A DECLARATION

OF THE FIRST PRINCIPLES OF THE ORACLES OF THE DEITY,

By R. C. BINGLEY, Chicago, United States.

JUST RE-PUBLISHED—PRICE ONE SHILLING.

A TREATISE,

By BROTHER COOMBE, of Toronto, Entitled,

“THE SOUL AND THE KINGDOM,”

Written in reply to Five Lectures by a Doctor of Divinity, on Old and New Testament teaching respecting the soul and the nature of Christ's Kingdom. Orders to the Editor.

RECEIPTS FROM DECEMBER 22nd TO JANUARY 25th, 1867, INCLUSIVE.

Ambassador.—James Donaldson, Detroit, Mich., U. S., balance to December, 1866, in respect of 148 copies monthly; Fanny Lofthouse, Leeds, 1 copy, (6 months); J. Mitchell, Ballus, 1 copy, (6 months); Thos. Kidd, Dundee, 4 copies (December), 2 copies (January); W. Clark, Glasgow, 4 copies (6 months); J. R. Norrie, Edinburgh, 3 copies, (2 months); A. Hart, Jarrow on Tyne, 10s to account; W. Dent, Nottingham, 6 copies, (one month); J. Rhodes, Huddersfield, 2 copies, (6 months); G. B. Findlay, Fraserburgh, 1 copy, (3 months); H. E. Bond, Sheffield, 186d. balance of account; E. Rackham, London, 1 copy, (for 1867); W. Dew, Walkerburn, 8 copies, (6 months); E. Bradley, Whitby, 5s to account; J. Douglas, Glasgow, 3 copies, (6 months); R. Hodgson, Wishaw, 12 copies, (6 months to Dec. 1866); F. R. Shuttleworth, Halifax, 19 copies, (one month); T. Davis, Birmingham, 63 copies, (one month); W. Mitchell, Edinburgh, postage for 1866; J. Gillies, Beth, Vol. iii, and £1 13s 1d balance; J. Milne, Dunkeld, 4 copies, (6 months); W. Ellis, Edinburgh, 32 copies; J. W. Moore, 7s 1d, to enlargement of *Ambassador* from August to December 1866; J. K. Ramsey, Galston, 11d. extra postage last year; Thomas Wilson, Chicago, United States, 2 vols., (to Dec. 1867); Charles Boddy, Rochester, United States, 1 vol., (1867) Mrs. G. E. Oliver, Edinburgh, (to Dec. 1867,) 1 copy; W. J. Turney, Nottingham, 28 copies, (two months.)

Twelve Lectures.—J. Donaldson, Detroit, Mich., balance to 110 copies; D. White, New Zealand, £2 to extra copies, 4th edition.

Eureka, Vol. II.—H. Dyer, Bradford, 1 copy; J. K. Ramsey, Galston, 1 copy.

Discussion.—W. Clark, Glasgow, 1 copy; W. Dent, Nottingham, 2 copies; A. Rood, Liverpool, 1 copy; W. Ellis, Edinburgh, 50 copies; J. Donaldson, Detroit, balance to 43 copies.

Declaration.—S. G. Hayes, Jersey, 12 copies; J. Rhodes, Huddersfield, 12 copies; W. Mitchell, Edinburgh, 12 copies.

Miscellaneous.—J. Spackman, Bradford, 24 *Hymn Books* 1 *What is Truth*; Thos. Kidd, 1 *How to Search*, 2 *Bro. Brown's Tracts*; J. Butler, 7 *What is Truth*; A. Rood, Liverpool, 1 *How to Search*, 1 *Devil and Hell*, 2 *Destiny B. E.*; R. C. Bingley, Birmingham, 1 *What is Truth*, 1 *Summary*, 1 *Contrast*; W. J. Turney, Nottingham, 6 *Hymn Books*; J. W. Moore, 17 *What is Truth*; J. Donaldson, Detroit, 24 *How to Search*, 39 *Devil and Hell*, 24 *Destiny B. E.*

WILL BE PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND, IN A FEW DAYS.—PRICE 1s9d.

ANASTASIS;

Or the Fall of the Roman Pontificate, the Resurrection of the Dead, and the Judgment of the World; a New Pamphlet, by Dr. Thomas. Orders to the Editor.

PRICE SIXPENCE.

DISCUSSION ON THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL,

Between the Editor and Mr. Nightingale. Orders to the Editor.

HERALD OF THE KINGDOM & AGE TO COME, Vols. 1, 2, 4, and 11, are to be had of Dr. Thomas, West Hoboken, Hudson County, New Jersey, U. S. Postage at cost of purchaser.

The New Tract by R. C. BINGLEY, (which is being revised by the Editor,) entitled

A DECLARATION

OF THE FIRST PRINCIPLES OF THE ORACLES OF THE DEITY,

Will be ready in a few days, Price One Penny, less than a third of the cost price.

Just Re-published—Price One Shilling, A TREATISE, by BROTHER COOMBE, of Toronto, entitled "THE SOUL AND THE KINGDOM." Written in reply to Five Lectures by a Doctor of Divinity, on Old and New Testament teaching respecting the soul and the nature of Christ's Kingdom. Orders to the Editor.

RECEIPTS FROM JANUARY 26th TO FEBRUARY 21st, 1867, INCLUSIVE.

Ambassador—W. Dent, Nottingham, 8 copies (2 months) and two back nos.; T. Meakin, Derby, 3s to account of 4 copies monthly; Mkt. McDonald, Chobton-cum-Hardy, 1 copy, (12 months); W. Gill, Awhin, 23 copies, [6 months] and postage; W. Ellis, Edin., 1 additional copy, [twelve months]; J. Harrison, Owen Sound C. W., 1 copy, [12 months]; W. Pengilly, do. do. E. Ho. ms., do. do. C. Howell, do. do.; Mary Ann Ellison, B'ham, 1 copy [1 month]; J. Turner, B'ham, 3 copies, [4 months]; T. Davis, B'ham, 63 copies, [1 month]; C. Appleby, Barton-on-Trent, 5s to account; M. s. W. Harg, Newark, 1 copy, [12 months]; G. Davidson, Jarrow-on-Tyne, 1 copy, [12 months]; W. Gilmour, Hamilton, C. W., 1 copy, [12 months]; J. S. Harris, Bartonville, C. W. do, J. Wanless, Waterloo County, C. W. do.; J. Reushaw, Blair, C. W. do.; W. D. Jardine, Dublin, 8 copies, [6 months]; H. Turner, B'ham, set of *Ambassadors* from commencement; F. Jones, B'ham, [from Kington] 2 copies, [2 months]; Mrs. C. B. Hume, Nova Scotia, 6 copies, [6 months]; J. Mitchell, Huddersfield, 1 copy, [6 months]; F. Willis, Huddersfield, balance of account to Dec. 1866; J. Mulholland, Glasgow, 14 copies, [6 months]; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 26 copies, [1 month]; F. R. Shuttleworth, Halifax, 19 copies, [1 month] and postage; W. Gall, Fraserburgh, 1 copy, [6 months] and postage; T. Haining, Auchincloch, 14 copies [6 months] and postage; J. Robertson, Turriff, 13 copies, [six months] and postage.

Elpis Israel—J. Hughes, Kington, 1 copy; W. Mitchell, Edin., 1 copy, [ought to have appeared last month]; J. Grant, Cerrbridge, 1 copy; E. Rackham, London, 1 copy; W. Hage, Newark, 2 copies; J. Nesbit, Berwick, 2 copies; F. Jones, Birmingham, 1 copy; Mrs. Taylor, Birmingham, 1 copy; F. R. Shuttleworth, Halifax, 6 copies.

Ambassador Supplement—W. Gill, Aberdeen [for several brethren] 5-91; Mrs. Harrison, Gainsville, Alabama, 2s; R. Goldie, Swansea, [for Ecclesia], 10s. W. Gall, Fraserburgh, 1s; J. Gillies, [for certain in Beith], 10s

Bounty to Dr. Thomas.—Mrs. Hewitt, Birmingham, 10s; R. Goldie, Swansea, [for Ecclesia], £2 15s 6d; J. W. Moore, Devonport, [for Ecclesia], £2 15s; J. Phelps, Nottingham, [for Ecclesia], £1 10s; J. Gillies, [for certain in Beith], 4s; A. Tait, Edin. (for brethren in Tenant, £5; do., Dundeld, £1) £6

Eureka, Vol. II—J. Alexander, Innerleithen, 1 copy; D. Brown, London, 2 copies; J. G. Tomkins, B'ham, 1 copy, [part payment].

Anastasis.—Mrs. W. Hage, Newark, 1 copy; D. K. Ramsey, Galston, 1 copy; D. Brown, London, 10 copies; W. Mitchell, Edinburgh, 1 copy; Eliza Hare, Creektown, Kircudbright, 1 copy; W. Dent, Nottingham, 3 copies; J. W. Moore, Devonport, 2 copies; Dr. Hayes, Jersey, 6 copies; F. R. Shuttleworth, Halifax, 3 copies; J. Robertson, Turriff, 2 copies.

Miscellaneous.—H. Turner, Birmingham, 3 *Bible Companions*; J. Finnie, Glasgow, 1 *Discussion*; Sunday Brethren, Birmingham, 16 *Bible Companions*; E. Rackham, London, 2 *Bible Companions*; D. K. Ramsey, 1 *Soul and the Kingdom*, 6 *Declarations*; D. Brown, London, 12 copies *Twelve Lectures*, 24 *Devil and Hell*; J. Robertson, Turriff, 2 *What is Truth*, 2 *How to Search*, 1 *Discussion*.

WILL BE PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND, IN A FEW DAYS.—PRICE 1s9d.

ANASTASIS;

Or the Fall of the Roman Pontificate, the Resurrection of the Dead, and the Judgment of the World; a New Pamphlet, by Dr. Thomas. Orders to the Editor.

PRICE SIXPENCE.

DISCUSSION ON THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL,

Between the Editor and Mr. Nightingale. Orders to the Editor.

HERALD OF THE KINGDOM & AGE TO COME, Vols. 1, 2, 4, and 11, are to be had of Dr. Thomas, West Hoboken, Hudson County, New Jersey, U. S. Postage at cost of purchaser.

Just Re-published—Price One Shilling, A TREATISE, by BROTHER COOMBE, of Toronto, entitled "THE SOUL AND THE KINGDOM." Written in reply to Five Lectures by a Doctor of Divinity, on Old and New Testament teaching respecting the soul and the nature of Christ's Kingdom. Orders to the Editor.

LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE MARCH NUMBER.—*February* 22, A. Tait, F. R. Shuttleworth; 23, C. Appieby, T. Fuller, W. Newport, J. Martin; 25, T. Kidd, J. Wootton; 26, A. Mason, W. Harvey, R. C. Bingley, H. Dyer, W. Ellis; 27, Jno. Gillies, W. Gill; 28, W. Dent, Mrs. Pitt, J. Coombe. *March* 1, J. Spackman, A. Roberts; 2, T. Moss, R. C. Bingley, J. J. Andrew, J. Graham, (New Zealand); D. White, (New Zealand); 4, W. Newport; 5, Mrs. Hage; 7, J. Coombe, (Toronto, C.W.) J. Donaldson, (Detroit, Mich., U.S.); 8, Mrs Hage; 11, A. P. Willis, J. J. Andrew; 12, J. Rhodes, W. S., (Nottingham); 14, E. J. Lassius; 15, W. Dent, T. Haining; 17, D. Clement; 18, W. Ellis, J. J. Andrew; 19, W. Gill, F. R. Shuttleworth, R. Paterson, W. Osborne, W. D. Jardine; 20, W. D. Hackney, (Listowell, C.W.); W. Gall, J. Coombe, W. Mitchell, W. Clark, P. Moss; 21, T. Haining, J. Pettigrew; 22, A. P. Willis, A. Pitt, J. Grant; 23, J. Robertson, R. C. Bingley; 25, J. Wootton.

RECEIPTS FROM FEBRUARY 22nd TO MARCH 25th, 1867, INCLUSIVE.

Ambassador—J. Wootton, Grantham 1 copy, [6 months]; W. Dent, Nottingham, 8 copies, [1 month]; T. Moss, Earlsrundle, 1 copy, [12 months] and postage; C. Packham, Guelph P. O., C. W., 1 copy, [12 months] and postage; J. Coombe, Toronto, C. W., 1 copy, [12 months] with postage and balance to credit; T. Davis, Birmingham, 63 copies, [1 month]; J. Griffith, Kingston, 2 copies [1 month]; A. P. Willis, Armley, near Leeds, 10 copies, [3 months] and postage; W. Ellis, Edinburgh, 1 (additional) copy, [12 months]; J. Beavan, Steeple Aston, 1 copy, [12 months]; F. R. Shuttleworth, Halifax, 19 copies, [1 month] and postage; J. T. Shapter, Toronto, C.W., 1 copy, [12 months] and postage; P. Moss, Doncaster, 1 copy, [12 months] and postage; Jas. Pettigrew, Dalry, Ayrshire, 3 copies [six months].

Elpis Israel.—Thos. Fuller, Headingley, near Leeds, 1 copy; W. Newport, Weston-super-mare, 1 copy; F. Jones, Birmingham, 1 copy; W. Ellis, Edinburgh, 6 copies, [in addition to 7 previously paid for]; F. R. Shuttleworth, Halifax, 1 copy, [in addition to 6 previously paid for]; W. Mitchell, Edinburgh, another copy; J. Pettigrew, Dalry, Ayrshire, 1 copy.

Anastasis.—F. R. Shuttleworth, Halifax, 1 copy, [in addition to 3 previously paid for]; W. Newport, Weston-super-mare, 1 copy; J. Martin, Plymouth, 1 copy; W. Dent, Nottingham, 1 copy; A. P. Willis, Armley, near Leeds, 3 copies; J. Beavan, Steeple Aston, 1 copy; W. Clark, Glasgow, 6 copies; J. Grant, Cambridge, 3 copies [and balance to credit].

Twelve Lectures, 4th edition.—W. Newport, Weston-super-mare, 1 copy; W. Dent, Nottingham, 2 copies; J. Beavan, Steeple Aston, 2 copies; P. Moss, Doncaster, 1 copy; J. Wootton, Grantham, 1 copy.

Declaration.—W. Newport, Weston-super-mare, 100 copies; Mrs. Hage, Newark, 1 copy; W. Clark, Glasgow, 24 copies; W. Gall, Fruserburgh, 1 copy; T. Fuller, Headingley, 12 copies.

Miscellaneous.—T. Fuller, Headingley, near Leeds, 2 *What is Truth*; W. Newton, Weston super-mare, 1 *Hymn Book*; F. Jones, Birmingham, [for J. Griffith Kingston] 2s. to Athenæum expenses, and 1s. to *Ambassador Supplement*; W. Dent, Nottingham, 1 *Discussion*; J. Butler, Birmingham, 2 *Discussions*; W. Holland, Birmingham, 1 *Soul and the Kingdom*; Mrs. Hage, Newark, 1 *Soul and the Kingdom*, and 4 vols. *Herald of the Kingdom and Age to come*, [1, 2, 4, and 11]—[Will Dr. Thomas please send to care of Editor?]; J. Beavan, Steeple Aston, 3 *What is Truth*; 5 *Devil and Hell*; 2 *How to Search*; D. Clement, Mumbles, 15s. to *Ambassador Supplement*; W. Clark, Glasgow, 2 *Soul and the Kingdom*; P. Moss, Doncaster, 1 *What is Truth*, 1 *Summary*, 1 *How to Search*, 1 *Bible Companion*.

EDITOR'S BUSINESS ADDRESS.—R. Roberts, Athenæum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham.

NOW READY, Price 11s. 6d., including freight and postage,

THE NEW EDITION OF ELPIS ISRAEL,

By DR. THOMAS, of WEST HOBOKEN, HUDSON COUNTY, NEW JERSEY, U.S.

This edition, which has been thoroughly revised by the author, is prefaced with a treatise on the signs of the times, and enhanced in value by the addition of the Doctor's exhaustive analysis of chronology, known as *Chronikon Hebraikon*.

Orders to the Editor will be punctually attended to.

ALSO READY, Price 1s. 9d., carriage free,

ANASTASIS; or the Fall of the Roman Pontificate, the Resurrection of the Dead, and the Judgment of the World, BY THE SAME AUTHOR. *Orders to the Editor.*

PRICE SIXPENCE.

DISCUSSION ON THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL,

Between the Editor and Mr. Nightingale. *Orders to the Editor.*

Just Re-published—Price One Shilling, A TREATISE, by BROTHER COOMBE, of Toronto, entitled "THE SOUL AND THE KINGDOM." Written in reply to Five Lectures by a Doctor of Divinity, on Old and New Testament teaching respecting the soul and the nature of Christ's Kingdom. *Orders to the Editor.*

LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE APRIL NUMBER—*March 26*, J. Kirkwood, D. Brown, Mrs. Hage; *27*, S. Fletcher, J. Mulholland; *28*, Miss Hayes, W. Dent; *29*, J. Gillies, J. Hodgson; *30*, Dr. Thomas, W. J. Bishop, J. Coombe; *31*, Mrs. Hage. *April 1*, W. Newport, R. Cranshaw, R. C. Bingley, D. Clement; *2*, E. Turney, T. Randies, D. Brown, W. Ellis, Box, containing 275 copies of *Elpis Israel*, and 252 copies of *Anastasis*; *3*, P. Moss, W. Dent, Mrs. Browning, D. Clement; *5*, J. W. Moore, D. K. Ramsay, J. Donaldson, J. Mowat, W. Dent, H. Evans, Mrs. Hage; *6*, A. Roberts, W. Milne, D. Brown, (Calcutta); *8*, E. Turney, Mrs. Hume, F. R. Shuttleworth, W. Ellis; *9*, E. A. Pitt, W. Dew, J. Harvey, J. Phelps; *10*, Mrs. Hage, J. Mulholland, H. Sharp, A. Mason; *11*, E. Turney, A. E. B., (Toronto) J. Robertson, R. Goldie, D. Clement; *12*, E. Turney, A. Hall; *13*, E. Turney, J. J. Andrew, J. Parsons; *15*, T. Blunt, A. Pitt, S. Fletcher, C. Walker, F. R. Shuttleworth; *16*, Anonymous, E. Turney; *17*, J. Spackman, W. Bain, H. Evans, T. Kidd, E. Turney, J. Donaldson; *18*, E. Turney, J. Rhodes, G. Smith, W. Rooke; *19*, W. Ellis, J. J. Andrew; *21*, T. Blunt, F. Jones, J. Turner, John Albert, (Toronto); *22*, R. C. Bingley, Hannah Williamson, (Calcutta) A. Pitt.

RECEIPTS FROM MARCH 26th TO APRIL 22nd, 1867, INCLUSIVE.

Ambassador.—J. Kirkwood, Wishaw, 5 copies, [6 months] and postage; J. Mulholland, Glasgow, 1 copy, [6 months]; W. Dent, Nottingham, 8 copies, [1 month]; John Teece, C.W., 1 copy, [12 months] and postage; T. Davis, Birmingham, 63 copies, [1 month] and twelve and sixpence stamps, to account; D. Brown, Calcutta, 4 copies, [12 months]; Mrs. Hume, Nova Scotia, 6 copies, [6 months]; [This acknowledgment ought to have been included in that of last month; it was omitted through inadvertence.] J. Phelps, Nottingham, 26 copies, [2 months]; F. F. Shuttleworth, Halifax, 19 copies, [1 month]; T. Kidd, Dundee, 2 copies, [4 months] and postage; W. Rooke, Sidney, 3 copies, [12 months] and bound vol. for 1866.

Anastasis.—J. Mulholland, 5 copies; J. Hodgson, 4 copies; J. W. Moore, Devonport, 2 copies; R. H. Dean, Birmingham, 1 copy; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 1 copy; J. Robertson, Turiff, 2 copies; F. R. Shuttleworth, Halifax, 2 copies; J. Spackman, Bradford-on-Avon, 12 copies.

Elpis Israel.—S. Fletcher, Nottingham, 1 copy; D. Clement, Mumbles, 9 copies; R. Bowman, Birmingham, 1 copy; H. Evans, Swansea, 1 copy.

Declaration.—J. Mulholland, Glasgow, 12 copies; John Harvey, Liverpool, 2 copies; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 12 copies; T. Kidd, Dundee, 6 copies.

Miscellaneous.—D. K. Ramsey, Galston, 1 copy *Eureka*, vol. I. (supplied by a friend in Devonport); D. Brown, Calcutta, 6 copies *Twelve Lectures*, and balance to credit, as a contribution to the general work of spreading the truth in Birmingham; W. Holland, Birmingham, 1 copy *Anatolia*; J. Robertson, Turiff, 1 copy *Twelve Lectures*; T. Kidd, Dundee, 1 *Soul and the Kingdom*; W. Dent, Nottingham, 6 copies *Discussion*; J. Gillies, Beth, 6 copies *Discussion*; J. Hodgson, Liverpool, 1 copy *Devil and Hell*, and ten shillings towards Brother Robertson's operations in the North; W. Rooke, Sidney, 6 copies *Devil and Hell*; J. W. Moore, Devonport, 12 copies *What is Truth?*

EDITOR'S BUSINESS ADDRESS—R. Roberts, Athenaeum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham.

NOW READY. Price 11s 6d., including freight and postage,

THE NEW EDITION OF ELPIS ISRAEL,

This edition, which has been thoroughly revised by the author, is prefaced with a treatise on the signs of the times, and enhanced in value by the addition of the Doctor's exhaustive analysis of chronology, known as *Chronikon Hebraikon*.

Orders to the Editor will be punctually attended to.

LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE MAY NUMBER.—April 23, G. Davidson; 24, E. Turney, T. Kidd; 25, J. Donaldson, J. Coombe, J. Grant; 27, W. Dent, A. Masou, D. Brown; 28, W. Blunt, J. J. Andrew, D. Brown; 29, L. King, W. Dent; 30, W. Mitchell, H. Clarkson, I. Clissett, T. Fuller, H. Evans. May 1, D. Brown, R. C. Bingley, A. P. Willis, J. Phelps; 2, E. Turney, T. Moss, J. Turner, J. Gillies, C. Smith, W. Gill, H. Dyer, R. C. Bingley, W. H. Hacking; 3, J. Rhodes, J. Milne, F. Sothe, Mrs. Hendry, Anonymous, S. G. Hayes; 6, Mrs. Hume, Mrs. Shiells; 7, Mrs. Hage, T. Kidd, J. Alexander, W. Bain, J. Kirkwood, T. Moss, E. Turney, J. Clissett, T. Haining, W. Harvey; 8, E. Turney, J. Murray, W. Gall, P. Robertson; 9, W. Mitchell, J. Phelps; 10, W. Birkenhead; 11, F. Shuttleworth; 11, J. J. Andrew, A. Tait; 13, W. Bain, H. Clarkson, D. Aikins, W. Clark; 14, W. Gill, J. Ward, W. H. Davis, printer, J. Phelps, H. Evans; 15, G. Andrew, J. K. Ramsay, A. Hall, J. Mitchell, R. C. Bingley; 16, S. G. Hayes, J. J. Andrew, Gavin Cree, T. Moss; 17, D. Brown, J. Gillies, J. Phelps; 18, W. Dent, Mrs. Hume, W. Crichton, J. Donaldson, J. Coombe; 20, J. Grant, R. Godlie, R. Hodgson, J. Bryan, A. Pitt; 21, T. Haining, G. Soar, J. Robertson, H. Dyer; 22, D. Clement, J. Ward, W. D. Jardine, T. Moss, J. W. Moore, H. Turner, A. E. Balmain, Mrs. Williams, D. Brown, F. R. Shuttleworth; 23, J. Kirkwood, A. P. Willis; 24, T. Kidd, D. Brown; 27, Mark Allen, H. Clarkson, W. Mitchell, J. Bryan, D. B. own.

RECEIPTS FROM APRIL 23rd TO MAY 27th, 1867, INCLUSIVE.

Ambassador—J. Lind, Liverpool, 45 10s. to account; C. Smith, Edinburgh, 1 copy, [12 months]; and postage; J. Donaldson, Detroit, Michigan, U.S., 202 copies, [12 months] and postage; J. F. Williamson, Hamilton, C. W., 1 copy [12 months] and postage; W. H. Hacking, Liswell, C. W., 1 copy, [12 months] and postage; James Grant, Tomintoul, Scotland, 1 copy, [12 months] and postage; W. Dent, Nottingham, 1 copy [12 months] and postage; T. Davis, Birmingham, 63 copies, [1 month]; 1 Clissett, Heckmondwike, 4 copies [6 months] and postage; W. J. Turney, Stourbridge, 1 copy, [12 months] and postage; I. Phelps, Nottingham, 26 copies [1 month]; Mrs. Hume, Halifax, Nova Scotia, 2 copies, [12 months] and postage; J. Alexander, Innerleithen, 1 No. for August, 1864; P. Robertson, Blairgowrie, 5s. and 6l. to account of 3 copies monthly; James Murray, Lunark, 1 copy [2 years] and postage; F. R. Shuttleworth, Halifax, 19 copies, [1 month] and postage; F. Jones, Birmingham, for J. Griffith, Kingston, 2 copies, [5 months]; W. Ellis, Edinburgh [by R. Paterson,] 2 copies [12 months] and postage, and 2 single Nos.; C. M. Taylor, Waterloo County, C.W., 1 copy, [12 months] and postage; J. Wanless, Waterloo Co., C.W., balance for 1 copy, [12 months] and postage; J. Grant, Carrbridge, balance to credit; J. W. Moore, Devonport, 18 copies, [6 months] and postage; J. Bryan, Newport, Mon., 1 copy, [1 month].

Amstasis—J. Gillies, Beith, 6 copies; 1 Clissett, Heckmondwike, 1 copy; T. Fuller, Headingley, 1 copy; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 6 copies; J. Rhodes, Huddersfield, 4 copies; W. Harvey, Aberdeen, 4 copies; T. Haining, Auchinlech, 5 copies; T. Moss, Earlsferdale, 3 copies; J. Kirkwood, Wishaw, 1 copy; P. Robertson, Blairgowrie, 1 copy; W. Birkenhead, Manchester, 2 copies; J. Richards, Montgomery, 1 copy; H. Turner, Birmingham, 2 copies; H. Evans, Swansea, 2 copies; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 2 copies; Gavin Cree, Biggar, 2 copies; W. Ellis, Edinburgh, [per R. Paterson,] 40 copies; R. Hodgson, Wishaw, 6 copies.

Elpis Israel.—D. Brown, [per W. Mitchell, Edinburgh] 3 copies; A. P. Willis, Armley, near Leeds, 1 copy; J. Kirkwood, Wishaw, 1 copy; W. Bain, Dundee, 1 copy; F. R. Shuttleworth, Halifax, 1 copy; H. Evans, Swansea, 2 copies; W. Ellis, [per R. Paterson, Edinburgh] 2 copies; A. Tait, Edinburgh, 3 copies; D. Clement, Marnhull, 42 towards ten copies extra to those already acknowledged; C. Meakin, Birmingham, [for friend in Derby,] 1 copy.

Declaration.—H. Clarkson, Witby, 60 copies; 1 Clissett, Heckmondwike, 31 copies; W. J. Turney, Stourbridge, 50 copies; A. P. Willis, Armley, near Leeds, 42 copies; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 48 copies; H. Dyer, Bradford on Avon, 48 copies; J. Rhodes, Huddersfield, 36 copies; Mrs. Hendry, Glasgow, 10 copies; T. Davis, Birmingham, 100 copies; W. J. Bailey, Birmingham, 100 copies; other brethren and sisters in Birmingham, 92 copies; T. Haining, Auchinlech, 67 copies; J. Kirkwood, Wishaw, 10 copies; J. Alexander, Innerleithen, 1 copy; P. Robertson, Blairgowrie, 6 copies; W. Gall, Fraserburgh, 2 copies; F. R. Shuttleworth, Halifax, 60, [12] ordered; W. Birkenhead, Manchester, 30 copies; J. T. Harvey, Liverpool, 9 copies; J. W. Moore, Devonport, 120 copies; W. Clark, Glasgow, 36 copies; J. Ward, Derby, 100 copies; G. Andrew, Whitehills, Scotland, 4 copies; J. Mitchell, Ballus, Scotland, 8 copies; T. Moss, Earlsferdale, 12 copies; Gavin Cree, Biggar, 6 copies; J. Grant, Carrbridge, 6 copies; R. Hodgson, Wishaw, 6 copies; A. Pitt, London, 1 copy; C. Meakin, Birmingham, [for friend in Derby,] 30 copies; T. Kidd, Dundee, 10 copies; J. Bryan, Newcastle, 6 copies. [Carriage paid in all the foregoing cases.]

Miscellaneous.—W. Blount, Ripley, 1 copy each *Anatolia*, *Summary*, *Synopsis*, and *Contrast*; J. Grant, Tomintoul, 1 copy, *Soul and Kingdom*; Lemuel King, Whalley, 1 copy, *Devil and Hell*; W. Birkenhead, Manchester, 2 copies *Soul and Kingdom*; D. Brown, Edinburgh, 5 copies *Twelve Lectures*; J. Rhodes, Huddersfield, 8 copies *Twelve Lectures*; 4 copies *Soul and Kingdom*; J. Richards, Montgomery, 1 copy *How to Search*; H. Clarkson, Whitby, 1 copy *Soul and Kingdom*; W. Allen, Birmingham, 1 *Hymn Book*; H. Evans, Swansea, 1 copy *Soul and Kingdom*, 2 copies *Anatolia*; Gavin Cree, Biggar, 1 copy *Soul and Kingdom*; W. Dent, Nottingham, 1 copy *Soul and Kingdom*, 1 copy *Devil and Hell*; R. Hodgson, Wishaw, 2 copies *Discussion*; R. Bowman, Birmingham, 1 *Hymn Book*; J. W. Moore, Devonport, 20 copies *Twelve Lectures*; J. Kirkwood, Wishaw, 1 copy *Twelve Lectures*; D. Brown, London, freight and carriage on 25 copies *Elpis Israel*.

NOW READY. Price 11s 6d., including freight and postage,

THE NEW EDITION OF ELPIS ISRAEL.

This edition, which has been thoroughly revised by the author, is prefaced with a treatise on the signs of the times, and enhanced in value by the addition of the Doctor's exhaustive analysis of chronology, known as *Chronikon Hebraikon*.

Orders to the Editor will be punctually attended to.

WILL SHORTLY BE READY, PRICE ONE SHILLING.

THE NEW EDITION OF "TWELVE LECTURES,"

The Lectures have undergone a thorough revision, some being nearly re-written; and five new ones have been introduced at appropriate places. There will be a short appendix.

PRICE SIXPENCE.

DISCUSSION ON THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL,

Between the Editor and Mr Nightingale. Orders to the Editor.

Just Re-published—Price Sixpence, A TREATISE, by BROTHER COOMBE, of Toronto, entitled "THE SOUL AND THE KINGDOM"; written in reply to Five Lectures by a Doctor of Divinity, an Old and New Testament teaching respecting the soul and the nature of Christ's Kingdom. Orders to the Editor.

LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE JUNE NUMBER.—May 28, Mary Appleby, Fanny Lofthouse, J Spackman, R. Bowman, W. Ellis; 29, A. Tart, J. Turner, W. Gill; 30, D. Brown (Calcutta), W. Dent; 31, S. Gresham; A. P. Willis; June 1, Mrs. Hendry, D. Clement; 3, G. Soar, H. Clarkson; 4, W. D. Jardine, Dr Thomas, W. Ellis, W. Gill, F. Pitman, A. Mason; 5, D. Brown, T. Randles, D. Atkins, J. W. Moore, C. Braddon; 6, J. Coombe, I. Clissett; 7, Mary Appleby, D. Brown, W. Dent, G. Soar; 8, F. Pitman, T. Moss, W. Cundall, A. Williams, T. Fuller; 9, E. Turney, Mary Appleby; 11, W. Osborne, J. Richards, A. Tait; 12, J. Coombe, Anonymous, R. Smith, W. Gall, J. Mitchell; 13, A. Roberts, W. Clark, W. Ellis, C. H. Kidd, E. Turney, D. Clement; 14, I. Clissett; 15, W. Blount; 17, W. Gill, J. J. Andrew; 18, I. Clissett, A. C. Gillespie, W. J. Hughan, J. Cowie, R. Paterson; 19, J. Douglas, J. Milne, W. Milne; 20, W. Rooke, J. Robertson, J. Phelps, Miss Hayes; 21, J. J. Andrew, T. Randles, W. G. Hughan, J. Spackman; 22, Ellen Le Lievre, Geo. Inwood; 24, H. Evans, W. Dew, Mrs. Hendry, W. Gill, T. Fisher; 25, W. Ellis.

RECEIPTS FROM MAY 28th TO JUNE 25th, 1867, INCLUSIVE.

AMBASSADOR.—F. Lofthouse, Leeds, 1 copy (6 months) and postage; J. Spackman, Bradford-on-Avon, 1 copy, (twelve months) and postage; W. Dent, Nottingham, 10 copies, (one month) and five back numbers; S. Gresham, Sheffield, 1 copy, (12 months) and postage; H. Clarkson, Whitty, 4 copies, (1 month); T. Davis, Birmingham, 63 copies, (one month); A. Williams, Stratford, 1 copy, (6 months) and postage; J. Mitchell, Minton, 2 copies, (6 months); W. Clark, Glasgow, 5 copies, (6 months) and postage on sundries; W. Blount, Ripley, 1 copy, (1 month); A. C. Gillespie, Tarbolton, 1 copy, (twelve months); J. Douglas, Glasgow, 3 copies, (6 months) and postage; W. Milne, Galashiels, 10 copies, (6 months) and postage; J. Milne, Dunkeld, 4 copies, (6 months) and postage; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 26 copies, (one month) and postage for six months; W. Dew, Innerleithen, 4 copies, (six months) and postage; T. Fisher, Huddersfield, 1 copy, (six months) and postage.

ANASTASIS.—F. Lofthouse, Leeds, 1 copy; D. Atkins, Bradford, Barnstaple, 1 copy; W. Blount, Ripley, 1 copy; W. Milne, Galashiels, 6 copies; J. Milne, Dunkeld, 1 copy.

ELPIS ISRAEL.—W. Rooke, Sydney, 4 copies; T. Gethin, Birmingham, 1 copy.

DECLARATION.—F. Lofthouse, Leeds, 200 copies; J. Spackman, Bradford-on-Avon, 60 copies; C. Braddon, Upton-on-Severn, 4 copies; J. W. Moore, Devonport, 60 copies; T. Davis, Birmingham, 153 copies; J. Clissett, Heckmondwike, 42 copies; J. Coombe, Toronto, C. W., 100 copies; W. Dent, Nottingham, 12 copies; T. Fuller, Headingley, 16 copies; T. Moss, Earlstendale, carriage on 12 copies; W. Gall, Fraserburgh, 2 copies; J. Mitchell, Minton; 14 copies; G. H. Kidd, Scarborough, 24 copies; H. Turner, Birmingham, 50 copies; Miscellaneous Brethren in Birmingham, 157 copies; A. C. Gillespie, Tarbolton, 6 copies; J. Milne, Dunkeld, 12 copies; Phelps, Nottingham, 12 copies; W. T. Hughan, Truro, 6 copies; W. J. Bailey, Birmingham, 50 copies.

Twelve Lectures, 4th edition.—W. Clark, Glasgow, 9 copies; G. H. Kidd, Scarborough, 1 copy; A. C. Gillespie, Tarbolton, 1 copy; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 6 copies. The following ought to have been acknowledged last month.—W. Harvey, Aberdeen, 3 copies; W. Bickenhead, Manchester, 7 copies; J. Richards, Montgomery, 2 copies.

Miscellaneous.—C. Braddon, Upton-on-Severn, 3 copies, Summary; E. Pitman, 61 copies Discussion; T. Davis, Birmingham, 4 Hymn Books; H. Turner, Birmingham, 2 copies; John Cowie, New Pitsligo, 1 copy, Discussion, 1 copy, *Destiny of the British Empire*; W. J. Hughan, Truro, 1 copy, *Discussion*; R. Bowman, Birmingham, 3 copies, Summary; Jane Perkins, Birmingham, 1 copy, Summary.

NOW READY. Price 11s 6d., including freight and postage,

THE NEW EDITION OF ELPIS ISRAEL.

This edition, which has been thoroughly revised by the author, is prefaced with a treatise on the signs of the times, and enhanced in value by the addition of the Doctor's exhaustive analysis of chronology, known as *Chronikon Hebraikon*.

Orders to the Editor will be punctually attended to.

NOW READY.

THE NEW EDITION OF TWELVE LECTURES. FIVE NEW LECTURES AND A NEW APPENDIX.

PRICE ONE SHILLING (1st Thousand); BOUND IN CLOTH, 2s.

For Explanation, see page 204 of the present number.

PRICE SIXPENCE.

DISCUSSION ON THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL,

Between the Editor and Mr. Nightingale. Orders to the Editor.

LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE JULY NUMBER.--June 26, W. Blount, F. R. Shuttleworth, J. Rhodes, D. K. Ramsay; 27, S. G. Hayes, A. P. Willis, F. R. Shuttleworth; 28, A. Pitt, W. Dent, R. Strathearn, R. Goldie; 29, S. Walker, C. J. Aspin. July 1, R. C. Bingley; 2, Mrs. Appleby; 3, W. Coultts; 4, J. Coombe; 5, W. D. Jardine, Mrs. Lassus, Fanny Lofthouse, Ellen Le Lievre, Dr. Thomas, W. Dent, J. Coombe, J. Donaldson, S. Fletcher; 11, E. Turney, F. Willis; 12, C. J. Aspin, R. C. Bingley; 13, H. Clarkson, F. Moss; 15, R. Goldie, J. B. Newlands, J. J. Andrew; 16, R. C. Bingley, A. Pitt; 17, J. H. Bubler, James Robertson; 18, John West, J. Spackman, R. Paterson, T. G. Newman; 19, J. Gillies, A. Tait, H. Goodman; 20, J. Spackman, R. Paterson, J. Flemming, W. Ellis, H. Clarkson, J. Wootton, J. Phelps, Jane Cox; 23, J. Mowatt, T. Fisher, R. E. Thomas; 24, J. Roberts, John Coombe, W. H. Hacking, J. Pettigrew, W. Coultts; 25, T. Kidd, J. Gillies, W. Birkenhead; 26, J. J. Andrew.

RECEIPTS FROM JULY 26th TO AUGUST 26th, 1867, INCLUSIVE.

AMBASSADOR.--F. R. Shuttleworth, Halifax, 19 copies (two months); D. K. Ramsay, Galston, Ayrshire 1 copy (two months) and postage; A. P. Willis, Armley, 10 copies, (three months) and postage; W. Dent, Nottingham, 10 copies, (one month); J. Coombe, Toronto, a year's single subscription each for J. Cove and W. Rainsford, and postage; T. Davis, Birmingham, 63 copies, (one month); J. Griffiths, Kington, (per F. Jones), 2 copies, (2 months) and postage; J. Rhodes, 3 copies, (six months) and postage; H. Clarkson, Whitby, 5 copies (one month); J. B. Newlands, Paisley, 1 copy, (12 months) and postage; A. Pitt, London, 1 copy, (one month); T. G. Newman, Teignmouth, 1 copy (twelve months); J. Phelps, Nottingham, 26 copies (one month) and postage; J. Wootton, Grantnam, 1 copy (six months) and postage; J. Roberts, Ottawa City, C.W.; 3 copies, (twelve months) and postage; T. Kidd, Dundee, 2 copies, (two months) and postage; T. Meakin, Derby, 2s.6d. to account of 5 copies monthly.

DECLARATION.--J. Turney, Stourbridge, (for Brother Davis, ditto,) 60 copies; R. Strathearn, Tranent, 24 copies; S. Walker, Bradford, 1 copy; W. Dent, Nottingham, 48 copies; Sundries in Birmingham, 141 copies; C. Young, Gateshead, 15 copies; J. B. Newlands, Paisley, 50 copies; J. West, Acton, Middlesex, 2 copies; R. E. Thomas, Truro, 1 copy; J. Roberts, Ottawa, C.W., 3 copies, W. H. Hacking, Listowell, C.W., (toward) 100 copies.

TWELVE LECTURES, (4th Edition)--D. K. Ramsay, Galston, 5 copies, R. Strathearn, Tranent, 6 copies, George Arncliffe, Heckmondwike, 6 copies, W. Dent, Nottingham, 1 copy, J. Roberts, Ottawa, C.M., 1 copy, W. H. Hacking, Listowell, C.W., (toward) 50 copies, T. Kidd, Dundee, 3 copies.

MISCELLANEOUS--J. Adair, Birmingham, 1 copy "Discussion"; an Enquirer after truth, ditto, 1 copy each "Discussion," "What is Truth?" "The Devil and Hell," "Summary and Contrast;" W. Dent, Nottingham, 1 copy "Elpis Israel;" J. Drew, Birmingham, toward 1 copy "Elpis Israel" and 2 "Bible Companions;" T. Davis, Birmingham, 2 "Hymn Books;" F. Moss, Doncaster, 1 copy "Elpis Israel;" Fanny Lofthouse, Leeds, postage of 10 copies "Declaration;" H. Clarkson, Whitby, 3 copies "Soul and the Kingdom," and 3 "Hymn Books;" C. Young, Gateshead, 1 copy "Elpis Israel;" R. E. Thomas, Truro, 1 copy each "Discussion," "The Devil and Hell," and "Summary;" J. Roberts, Ottawa, C.W., 1 copy "Discussion;" Dr. Coultts, Rothes, Morayshire, "Eureka," vol. I and II.

EDITOR'S BUSINESS ADDRESS--R. Roberts, Athenæum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham,

NOW READY.

THE NEW EDITION OF TWELVE LECTURES.

PRICE TWO SHILLINGS, (the first thousand being sold out); A FEW
BOUND COPIES 2s. each.

PRICE SIXPENCE.

DISCUSSION ON THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL,

Between the Editor and Mr. Nightingale. Orders to the Editor.

LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE AUGUST NUMBER.

July 27th, F. R. Shuttleworth, W. Dent; 30th, J. Richards, J. Mowatt, R. Hodgson, S. Chambers, J. Naylor, W. Milne, J. Gillies; 31st, J. Mulholland, H. L. Drake, F. Sintzenich; Aug. 1st, D. Brown, C. G. Aspin; 2nd, S. Chapple, E. Culow, J. Naylor, E. Turney, A. Black; 5th, S. G. Hayes; 6th, W. Dent, W. Routley; 7th, J. Mulholland, R. Paterson, W. Gall; 9th, W. Weyers, E. Turney, W. Routley, C. Dealtry; 10th, Mrs. Hage, D. Clement, J. Robertson; 12th, D. Atkins; 13th, H. Evans, J. D. Harvey, Joseph Hodgson, J. W. Moore, D. Brown, P. Robertson; 15th, J. Donaldson, S. Gresham, H. Clarkson, J. Coombe; 16th, J. K. Ramsey, J. West; 17th, Mrs. Hage, Mrs. Ellis, Mrs. Shields; 19th, H. Turner, Joseph Slack; 20th, J. Coombe, W. Newport, W. Fowler; 21st, J. Phelps, F. W. Smith, R. H. Gresham; 22nd, F. W. Smith, A. Sister, H. Hadley; 23rd, S. G. Hayes, H. Bannister, H. Dyer; 24th, T. Haining, J. Slack, Parsons; 26th, H. Dyer, H. Clarkson, F. R. Shuttleworth, A. Mason, T. Cheshire, A. McAllister, G. Lillie; 29th, J. W. Moore; 31st, A. P. Willis, R. Paterson; Sep. 1, W. Dent, H. Bannister, R. Armstrong; 3, J. Phelps, J. Coombe, T. Aspin, J. Hawkins, J. W. Moore, W. Dent, (Kaber Fold.)

RECEIPTS FROM JULY 27TH TO SEPTEMBER 4TH, 1867, INCLUSIVE.

AMBASSADOR--W. Dent, Nottingham, 8 copies (one month); R. Hodgson, Wishaw, 12 copies (6 months) and postage; Jas. Mulholland, Glasgow, 15 copies (six months) and postage on sundries from January to July, 1867; J. McIntosh, Edinburgh, 1 copy (18 months); W. Gall, Fraserburgh, 1 copy (six months) and postage; Wm. Hage, Newark, one copy (twelve months) and postage, D. Atkins, Bradford, 1 copy (twelve months) and postage; Henry Clarkson, Whitby, 5 copies, (one month) and postage; J. Coombe, Toronto, a single year's subscription each for Mrs. Connel and John Chart, and postage, also 1s.4d. balance for H. L. Drake, Francis Malcolm, Innerkip C.W. 1 copy (twelve months) and postage; D. P. Ross, Toronto, 1 copy (twelve months) and postage, also 6d. towards enlargement of 1864; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 25 copies (one month); T. Haining, Auchinleck, 14 copies, (six months); F. E. Shuttleworth, Halifax, 19 copies (one month) and postage; T. Meakin, Derby, 2s. 6d. to account; W. Dent, Nottingham, 8 copies (one month); J. Gillies, Beith, 8 copies (6 months); W. Gill, Aberdeen, 23 copies (6 months); T. Davis, Birmingham, 63 copies (1 month); J. Robertson, Turriff, £1 to account of 10 copies monthly; W. T. Cleverdon, Burford, C.W., 1 copy (12 months) and postage, (per J. Coombe); J. Teece, Toronto, C.W., 2s.2d. to account (per J. Coombe); J. Phelps, Nottingham, set of Ambassadors from commencement; W. Osborne, Tewkesbury, 1 copy (3 months).

DECLARATIONS--Mrs. Hage, Newark, one copy; D. Brown, London, 100 copies; W. Ellis, Edinr., 200 copies; Samuel Chapple, Schooner 'Morta Mawr', 2 copies; Joseph Hodgson, Liverpool, for ecclesia 144 copies; J. West, Middlesex, 2 copies; W. Gall, Fraserburgh, 2 copies; J. W. Moore, several copies; J. Gillies, Beith, 206 copies; W. Gill, Aberdeen, 100 copies; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 24 copies; W. Osborne, Tewkesbury, 12 copies; W. Tarves, Police Station, Ormond, 3 copies.

TWELVE LECTURES, (4th edition)--G. Armitage, Heckmondwike, 6 copies; S. Chambers, Derby, 1 copy, J. Naylor, York, 1 copy; D. White, New Zealand, 30 copies and carriage; David Atkins, Bradford, 1 copy, and postage; Joseph Hodgson, Liverpool, 4 copies; J. West, Middlesex, 1 copy; J. K. Ramsey, Galston, 1 bound copy; J. Milne, Dunkeld, 4 copies, 1s. edition, and 2 copies, 2s. edition; Joseph Slack, Hindlow Station, 3 bound copies; Wm. Fowler, Whitby, 3 copies, and postage; F. W. Smith, 3 copies, and postage; Parsons, Devonport, 1 copy; T. Cheshire, London, 2 copies; J. W. Moore, Devonport, 13 copies two remittances; P. Robertson, Blairgowrie, 2 copies and postage; S. Gresham, Sheffield, 4 copies; J. Gillies, Beith, 20 copies for self, and 50 copies for C. Smith, Edinburgh; J. Douglas, Glasgow, 4 copies, (2s. per copy); W. Gill, Aberdeen, 12 copies; Sundry Brethren in Birmingham, 141 copies; W. Harvey, Aberdeen, 5 copies, (in addition to 3 formerly paid for); W. Clark, Glasgow, 54 copies; Miscellaneous purchasers, Aberdeen, 29 copies; J. Robertson, Turriff, 8 copies; Thomas Aspin, Halifax, 20 copies; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 6 copies; W. Osborne, 6 copies at 1s., and 2 at 2s.

MISCELLANEOUS--F. R. Shuttleworth, Halifax, 1 copy, "Elpis Israel"; W. Milne, Galashiels, 1 copy "Discussion"; Mrs. Hage, Newark, 1 copy each, "What is Truth" and "How to search"; A. Brother, 4 copies Hymn Book; J. Naylor, York, 1 copy each, "Devil and Hell" and "What is Truth"; J. Hodgson, Liverpool, 1 copy "Discussion"; J. W. Moore, Devonport, 24 "What is Truth," 12 "Way of Life," 1 copy "Elpis Israel," 1 copy "Anastasis"; Joseph Slack, Hindlow Station, 6 copies "Way of Life"; W. Fowler, Whitby, 12 copies "Way of Life"; G. Lillie, Fraserburgh, 1 copy "Discussion"; J. Gillies, Beith, 6 "Bible Companions," 3 Hymn Books; J. Douglas, Glasgow, 4 copies, "Destiny of British Empire," W. Osborne, Tewkesbury, 1 copy each "Soul and the Kingdom," and "Discussion."

NOW READY, Price, 11s.6d., including freight and postage,

THE NEW EDITION OF ELPIS ISRAEL.

This edition, which has been thoroughly revised by the author, is prefaced with a treatise on the signs of the times, and enhanced in value by the addition of the Doctor's exhaustive analysis of chronology, known as *Chronikon Hebraikon*.

Orders to the Editor will be punctually attended to.

NOW READY.

THE NEW EDITION OF TWELVE LECTURES.

PRICE TWO SHILLINGS.

WE CAN NO LONGER SUPPLY

"WHAT IS TRUTH?" "HOW TO SEARCH THE SCRIPTURES," and Brother Brown's Tracts. The supply of DECLARATIONS will also be exhausted by the order (ist, now awaiting the next (and last) arrival from the printer. Till we hear from Brother Bingley, we can say nothing about the time when a future edition may appear.

Price One Penny, 16 pages, crown octavo,

THE WAY OF LIFE, OR THE GREAT SALVATION,

By BROTHER W. WOOD, JOPPA.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS TO BE HAD OF THE EDITOR.

EUREKA, Vol. II; exposition of the Apocalypse, (Dr. Thomas.) 14s.6t.
ANATOLIA; Daniel Interpreted, (Dr. Thomas.) 2s.
THE SOUL AND THE KINGDOM, (J. Coombs.) 6s.
SUMMARY OF CHRISTIANITY, (Dr. Thomas.) 1d.
DESTINY OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE IN THE LIGHT OF SCRIPTURE (Dr. Thomas.) 6d.
THE CONTRAST; an Exposure of Protestantism, and, of course, of Catholicism. 6s.

LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE SEPTEMBER NUMBER.

September 5th. D. Brown, Elliot Stock; 6, J. J. Andrew, W. King; 7, J. S. R. Cranshaw, J. C. Gell, W. Cundall, J. D. Benedict, W. Dent (Kaber Fold), G. M. Mitchell; 8, P. Armstrong; 9, J. W. Moore, F. B. Tining, J. Hawkins; 10, S. Hodgson, J. Kirkwood, T. Fuller, R. A. Horsfield, W. Harvey; 11, H. Clarkson, C. G. Aspin, F. B. Tining, W. Gill, W. King; 12, A. Mason; 13, J. Rhodes, C. Young, R. Armstrong; 14, W. Aspin, W. Harvey; 16, F. R. Shuttleworth; 17, J. Phelps, W. Osborne, J. Grant, H. Goodman, R. A. Horsfield, J. K. Ramsey, D. Clement, W. Osborne; 18, T. Kidd, J. S. Aspin, W. Osborne, J. Slack, J. W. Moore, A. P. Willis; 19, E. Lilley and brother, (Hong Kong); 20, R. Paterson, W. King, W. D. Jardine; 21, E. Turney.

RECEIPTS FROM SEPTEMBER 5TH TO SEPTEMBER 23RD, 1867, INCLUSIVE.

Ambassador.—J. J. Andrew, London, to general accounts; H. Clarkson, Whitby, 5 copies (1 month) and postage; F. R. Shuttleworth, Halifax, 19 copies (one month and postage); T. Davis, Birmingham, 60 copies (one month); J. Phelps, Nottingham, 27 copies (one month); T. Kidd, Dundee, 2 copies (two months); A. P. Willis, Armeley, 10 copies (three months) and postage.

TWELVE LECTURES, (4th edition)—D. Brown, London, 25 copies; R. Cranshaw, Waterbury, Conn., U.S., 2 copies; J. Hawkins, Frome, 1 copy; R. A. Horsfield, Kingswood, Surrey, 1 copy; J. Kirkwood, Wisahaw, 1 copy; H. Clarkson, Whitby, 6 copies; Miss Hayes, Jersey, 12 copies; W. King, Littlebury, 4 copies; W. Gill, Aberdeen, 30 copies; R. Armstrong, Haddington, 2 copies; J. Grant, Carbridge, Strathspey, 3 copies; T. Davis, Birmingham, 5 (bound) copies; T. Kidd, Dundee, 1 copy.

DECLARATION.—R. Cranshaw, Waterbury, Conn., U.S., 20 copies; J. Hawkins, Frome, 12 copies; Miss Hayes, Jersey, 50 copies; F. R. Shuttleworth, Halifax, 96 copies.

MISCELLANEOUS.—R. Cranshaw, Waterbury, Conn., U.S., 2 "Hymn Books," 2 "What is Truth," 2 "Bible Companions," 2 "Summaries;" J. Grant, Carbridge, Strathspey balance to credit; M. S. Hodgson, Brigham, 1 "Elpis Israel;" J. K. Ramsey, Guleston, 1 "Discussion" and 1 "Soul and the Kingdom."

EDITOR'S BUSINESS ADDRESS—R Roberts, Athenæum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham.

NOW READY, Price, 11s.6d., including freight and postage,

THE NEW EDITION OF ELPIS ISRAEL.

This edition, which has been thoroughly revised by the author, is prefaced with a treatise on the signs of the times, and enhanced in value by the addition of the Doctor's exhaustive analysis of chronology, known as *Chronikon Hebraikon*.

Orders to the Editor will be punctually attended to.

NOW READY.

THE NEW EDITION OF TWELVE LECTURES.

PRICE TWO SHILLINGS.

WE CAN NO LONGER SUPPLY

"WHAT IS TRUTH?" "HOW TO SEARCH THE SCRIPTURES," and Brother Browe's Tracts. The supply of DECLARATIONS will also be exhausted by the order list, now awaiting the next (and last) arrival from the printer. Till we hear from Brother Bingley, we can say nothing about the time when a future edition may appear. Brother Coombe's pamphlet "THE SOUL AND THE KINGDOM," is also all sold.

Price One Penny, 16 pages, crown octavo,

THE WAY OF LIFE, OR THE GREAT SALVATION,

By BROTHER W. WOOD, JOPPA.

The present supply is exhausted. A new edition will be printed when the orders are sufficient in number.

LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE OCTOBER NUMBER.

September 24, C. B. Hume, W. Dew, D. Brown; 25, J. Kirkwood, F. R. Shuttleworth, J. W. Clough, J. Mulholland; 26, J. B. Mann, T. Haining, W. Ellis, C. Meakin; 28, Major General Goodwyn, D. White; October 1, T. Bateson, W. Dent; 2, A. Ramsden, H. Clarkson; 3, Major General Goodwyn, J. Spackman, W. King, J. S. Aplin; 4, J. Stevens, J. S. Aplin, J. Turney, J. Kirkwood; 7, J. Rhodes, W. Dew, W. C. Hume, J. Pepper; 8, J. L. Hathaway, C. Walker, W. Osborne, J. W. Moore, W. J. Turney; 9, R. Paterson, J. Bateson; 10, W. Dent, A. Ramsden, H. Clarkson, J. Roberts; 11, G. Dick; 12, C. Smith; 14, J. Naylor, A. Pitt; 15, D. Brown, J. Douglas, F. Dunne, R. Armstrong, J. Gillies, A. F. Willis, J. J. Andrew; 16, H. Lester, F. R. Shuttleworth, F. Cuesetham, J. Coombe, W. Newport, G. Pattigrew; 17, J. Douglas, J. Naylor; 18, R. Goldie, J. Phelps, F. W. Smith; 19, R. Paterson, W. D. Jardine; 20, W. Clark, D. Wilson, W. Rooke; 22, S. Dixon, J. Kirkwood, F. Price, W. Wood, J. Slack, C. Smith; 23, Dr. Couits, J. Robertson, J. Coombe, F. R. Shuttleworth; 24, J. Hedgley, H. Clarkson, J. Moss, C. Smith, A. P. Willis; 25, J. Nesbit, J. Phelps; 26, R. Paterson, J. W. Moore.

RECEIPTS FROM SEPTEMBER 24TH TO OCTOBER 26TH, 1867, INCLUSIVE.

Ambassador.—J. Kirkwood, Wishaw, 5 copies, (retrospective for three months) and 3 copies for a like period to come; W. Dent, Nottingham, 8 copies (one month); H. Clarkson, Whitby, 5 copies, (one month) and postage; H. Dyer, Bradford-on-Avon, 2 copies, (two and half months) G. Dick, Glasgow, 6 or 4 numbers; T. Davis, Birmingham, 63 copies (one month); F. Dunne, Barrow-in-Furness, 1 copy (three months); T. Meakin, Derby, (per C. Meakin), to account of 5 copies monthly; J. Coombe, Toronto, (for Dr. Emery), 1 copy (twelve months), and surplus 14s.5d. for discretionary use in the truth's service; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 27 copies, (one month); P. Sims, Wynford, P.O., Ontario Co., C.W., one copy, (twelve months); J. Robertson, Turriff, for subscriber, 1 copy (twelve months).

Twelve Lectures, (4th edition).—T. Haining, Auchincloch, 2 copies; Major General Goodwyn, London, 1 copy; W. Dent, Nottingham, 6 copies; J. Spackman, Bradford-on-Avon, 12 copies; J. Stevens, Egremont, 1 copy; W. J. Turney, £5 towards deficiency in publication; H. Clarkson, Whitby, 1 copy; J. Douglas, Glasgow, 4 copies; a Friend, £2 towards deficiency in publication; J. Robertson, Turriff, 10 copies.

Declaration.—J. B. Mann, Maldon, 4 copies; Major General Goodwyn, London, 1 copy, W. Dent, Nottingham, 1 copy; J. Spackman, Bradford-on-Avon, 200 copies; John Stevens, Egremont, 1 copy; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 12 copies; J. Slack, Hindlow, 3 copies.

Miscellaneous.—J. Spackman, Bradford-on-Avon, 6 copies *Soul and the Kingdom*, 6 copies *Discussion*; J. Stevens, Egremont, 1 copy *Summary*; J. Kirkwood, Wishaw, 1 copy, *Elpis Israel*; J. W. Moore, Devonport, 24 copies *Way of Life*; H. Clarkson, Whitby, 24 copies, *Way of Life*, £. Phelps, Nottingham 6 copies *Summary*, 6 copies *Way of Life* 3 copies *Hymn Book*, F. Price, Jersey, 1 copy *Contrast*, 1 copy *Discussion*, 1 copy *Summary*, 1 copy *Destiny of the British Empire*.

EDITOR'S BUSINESS ADDRESS.—R. Roberts, Athenæum Room Temple Row, Birmingham.

NOW READY, Price, 11s.6d., including freight and postage,

THE NEW EDITION OF ELPIS ISRAEL.

This edition, which has been thoroughly revised by the author, is prefaced with a treatise on the signs of the times, and enhanced in value by the addition of the Doctor's exhaustive analysis of chronology, known as *Chronikon Hebraikon*.

Orders to the Editor will be punctually attended to.

NOW READY.

THE NEW EDITION OF TWELVE LECTURES.

PRICE TWO SHILLINGS.

Price One Penny, 16 pages, crown octavo,

THE WAY OF LIFE, OR THE GREAT SALVATION,

By BROTHER W. WOOD, JOPPA.

The present supply is exhausted. A new edition will be printed when the orders are sufficient in number.

LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE NOVEMBER NUMBER.

Oct. 27: J. J. Andrew; 28. J. Hawkins, R. Paterson, W. Wood, B. Ellis; 29. W. King; 30. J. B. Newlands; 31. G. M. Mitchell, J. Coombe. Nov. 1. W. Dent, J. Hedgley; 2. E. Jones Miner, J. D. Harvey, W. King; 4. R. Paterson, D. Brown (Calcutta), J. Douglas; 5. W. R. Otter, F. W. Smith, W. Osborne, A. B. C.; 6. J. Phelps, W. H. Hacking, J. Boshier, W. Fowler; 7. A. Tait, J. Milne, H. Evans; 8. W. R. Otter; 9. C. Dealtry, 0. Clement, H. Clarkson, W. Dew, S. Fletcher; 11. J. W. Moore, "Rev." J. Thornley; 13. J. J. Andrew, B. Green, W. Ellis, F. R. Shuttleworth, J. Coombe; 14. J. Donaldson, H. L. Drake, G. Packham, Chas. Lee, "Rev." J. Thornley, R. Goldie, A. Vernon; 15. G. M. Mitchell, C. G. Aspin, J. Gordon; 18. J. Hawkins, T. Williams, A. Heaton, M. McDonald, W. Fowler; 20. W. Clark, H. Frankland, W. Vernon, J. Mulholland, B. Green; 21. J. Phelps, W. Ellis; 22. W. Aspin; 23. J. Haggood, H. Frankland; 25. J. Phelps, Geo. Borrow; 26. R. Paterson, J. Heaton, J. W. Moore, W. Milne, W. Newport; 27. J. Coombe, W. Ellis, R. Paterson, D. Clement, W. D. Jardine; 28. Geo. Borrow; 29. E. Acton, W. Dent; 30. Editor of *Homilist*.

RECEIPTS FROM OCTOBER 27TH TO NOVEMBER 30TH, 1867, INCLUSIVE.

Ambassador.—J. Hawkins, Frome, 1 copy (two months); W. King, Littlebury, 1 copy (three months); J. Coombe, Toronto, (for L. C. Thomas, P. Degeer and C. Smith), 3 copies (two months) & postage; W. Dent, Nottingham, 8 copies (two months); W. Fowler, Whitey, 5 copies (one month) and postage; W. H. Hacking, Listowell, C.W., 1 copy (two months); H. Clarkson, Chesterfield, 1 copy (1 month) and postage; J. W. Moore, Devonport, 18 copies (six months) and postage; F. R. Shuttleworth, Halifax, 19 copies (one month) and postage; Charles Lee, Hamilton, C.W., 1 copy (two months) and postage; H. L. Drake, Guelph, C.W., 1 copy (24 months) and postage, &c.; T. Davis, Birmingham, 63 copies (one month); M. McDonald, Manchester, 1 copy (two months) and postage; G. Dodd, Esq., Melrose, 1 copy (three months) and postage; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 26 copies (one month) and postage; S. G. Hayes, Jersey, 6 copies (12 months); W. Milne, Galashiels, 10 copies (six months).

Twelve Lectures (4th edition).—J. Hawkins, Frome, 2 copies; B. Ellis, Hove, 1 copy; J. D. Harvey, Liverpool, 1 copy; H. Evans, Swansea, 36 copies; B. Green, Southport, 1 copy; A. Vernon, London, 1 copy; H. Frankland, Southport, 1 copy; W. Vernon, Dorchester, 1 copy; J. Mulholland, Glasgow, 1 copy; S. G. Hayes, Jersey, 12 copies and one bound copy; Geo. Borrow, York, 1 copy; J. Heaton, Southport, 1 copy; W. Milne, Galashiels, 2 copies; P. Degreer, Queensville, 2 copies; J. A. Devenish, Dorchester, 1 copy; E. Acton, Southport, 1 copy.

Declaration.—B. Ellis, Hove, 14 copies; H. Evans, Swansea, 60 copies; B. Green, Southport, 1 copy; S. G. Hayes, Jersey, 61 copies. (We have had to decline several applications for copies of the Declaration for want of copies to supply. Anyone having a spare stock would do a service to the truth by placing them at the disposal of applicants.)

Miscellaneous.—J. Hawkins, Frome, 1 copy *Discussion*; B. Ellis, Hove, 1 copy *Discussion*, 1 *Summary*, 1 *Contrast*; A. B. C. Stratford on Avon, 1 copy *Discussion*, 1 *Contrast*, 1 copy *Anastasis*; "Rev." J. Thornley, Belper, 1 copy *Discussion*; W. Vernon, Dorchester, 1 copy *Anastasis*; B. Green, Southport, 1 *What is Truth?*; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 3 *Hymn Books*; Geo. Borrow, York, 1 *Discussion*, 1 *Summary*, 1 *Devil and Hell*; J. W. Moore, Devonport, 1 *Elpis Israel*; W. Rooke, Sydney, £1 for Declarations not to be had.