

# THE AMBASSADOR

OF

## THE COMING AGE:

A MONTHLY PERIODICAL, DEVOTED TO THE EXPOSITION AND DEFENCE

OF

DIVINE TRUTH, AS APPREHENDED FROM A  
CHRISTADELPHIAN POINT OF VIEW.

---

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

VOLUME V.

BIRMINGHAM: PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR,  
ROBERT ROBERTS, ATHENÆUM ROOMS, TEMPLE ROW.

---

MDCCLXVIII.

# CONTENTS OF VOL. V.

	PAGE		PAGE
Judgment, New Testament Doc- trine of	1, 28, 63, 95, 123	London ..	23, 106, 324, 351
Trinitarianism and the Truth..	6	Leicester ..	.. 289, 324
Sunday Morning at the Christ- adelphian Synagogue, Birmingham, 13, 32, 74, 101, 133, 174, 195, 221, 246, 305,	341	Mumbles ..	.. 23, 289, 352
Political Heavens and the Signs Thereof ..	15, 85, 147, 282	Manchester ..	.. 93, 324
<i>Ambassador</i> , Proposed Enlarge- ment ..	.. 19, 57	Newcastle, 119, ..	.. 206
POETRY: "The Beginning of the End" ..	.. 20	Nottingham, 23, 57, 93, 119, 151, 106, 289	352
"Mortal and Spiritual Life" ..	354	Oldbury, 151, 178, 207 ..	238
INTELLIGENCE:—		Oshkosh, U.S. ..	.. 294
Aberdeen (Scotland) ..	56, 206	Philadelphia, U.S. ..	94, 181
Ashtabula, U. S. ..	353	Peterhead, Scotland ..	.. 176
Birmingham, 22, 56, 93, 118, 150, 176, 206, 237, 286, 321	351	Quincy, U.S. ..	.. 181
Barnstaple ..	.. 56	Swansea, 93, 119, 151 ..	207
Berwick-on-Tweed ..	206	Scarborough ..	.. 178
Burrawang, New S. Wales	208	Sidney, New S. Wales, 326 ..	352
Chicago, U.S. ..	.. 24	Stratford-on-Avon ..	.. 299
Cavesham, New Zealand ..	121	Turriff, Scotland ..	151, 207, 238
Cumnock, Scotland ..	178	Tranent ..	.. 290
Cheltenham ..	322	Tewkesbury ..	.. 324
Detroit, Illinois ..	353	Weston-super-Mare ..	.. 24
Devonport ..	178, 287, 351	Whitby, 24, 57, 93, 120, 179, 207, 238, 290	324
Edinburgh, Scotland, 56, 93, 118, 206, 287	351	Wishaw, Scotland, 24, 94, 120, 179	207
Glasgow, Scotland, 22, 56, 238,	323	Worcester, U.S. ..	.. 238
Guelfh, Canada 57, 121, 152,	353	Winona City, U.S. ..	.. 325
Green Island, Otago, New Zealand ..	57, 294	Waterloo, Canada ..	.. 325
Grantown, Scotland ..	119	Modern Heathenism ..	.. 25
Grantham ..	.. 288	Visit to Whitby, Scarborough, and Swansea ..	.. 36
Galston ..	.. 323	Jesus Christ, who was the Father of? ..	.. 44 80
Huddersfield ..	23, 150	Dr. Thomas's Visit ..	.. 60
Hoboken, N.J. ..	.. 353	Apocalypse Paraphrased, 67, 218,	302
Hong Kong, China 94, 151,	208	The Providence of God ..	.. 70
Heckmondwike ..	.. 150	The Gospel Quadrilateral ..	.. 99
Harvard, U.S. ..	.. 238	Resurrection of the Dead ..	106
Hull ..	.. 324	Christ, the First Fruits of them that Slept ..	.. 109
Innerkip, Canada ..	163, 207	The Truth Assailed ..	.. 127
Jersey ..	.. 150	Extracts from an Unpublished Letter of Dr. Thomas ..	.. 128
Kidderminster ..	.. 23	The Roman Question ..	.. 132
Kankakee, U.S. ..	.. 121	Everlasting Punishment of the Bible, not Everlasting Tor- ment ..	.. 132

	PAGE
Visit to Swansea, Devonport, and Yeovil .. ..	141
Third Volume of Eureka ..	153
ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS:—	
Obedience of the Truth, and the Difficulties thereof, W.O.	52
The Preaching of the Cross ..	113
What is to become of the good and "pious" people of orthodoxy? .. ..	114
An Insignificant Period of Enjoyment .. ..	116
Inheriting the Promises ..	117
When and where did Christ make the one great Offering? (Dr. Thomas) .. ..	117
Believing Devils (E. L. C.) ..	319
Marriage (E. L.) .. ..	319
The Change from Flesh to Spirit (J. W. C.) .. ..	319
Jesus, not a Descendant of Aaron (J. B.) .. ..	319
Re-immersion (W. J. B.) ..	319
The Bidden and Unbidden Guests, Jews and Gentiles (L. M.) .. ..	319
The Birth of Christ (C. D.) ..	320
"Catechesis" by Dr. Thomas ..	155
The Good Confession .. ..	162
Were there Human Beings on the Earth before Adam? ..	171
The Truth, the Attack on, at Swansea .. ..	172
The New Tracts .. ..	182

	PAGE
Strong Delusion, or Spiritualism in the light of science and scripture .. 183, 211,	239
What think ye of Christ? 199,	228
Midsummer Tour .. ..	202
Baptism and the Good Confession	203
Truth's Progress, statistics of ..	209
Revilings of the Enemy .. ..	209
Saying and Doing .. ..	226
Pre-immersional Examination ..	233
New Hymn Book .. ..	238
Signs of the Times .. ..	245
The Dowcites .. ..	250
The Voice upon the Mountains answered .. 253, 275,	310
Tour through England and Scotland .. ..	256, 267
Fellowship .. ..	265
Touch me Not .. ..	280, 326
John Bowes at Wishaw .. ..	290
The Truth in Scotland .. ..	292
The New Jerusalem explained 295,	327
Campbellism and Dowieism in America .. ..	315
A Christadelphian, and not a Christian .. ..	316
Notes .. .. 24, 62, 94	266
Scripture Knowledge Concerning Jesus Christ .. ..	331
Lion-Roarings of the Devil ..	336
Clerical Helps to a Seeker after Truth .. ..	346
Letter from Dr. Thomas's Daughter .. ..	353



# THE AMBASSADOR

## Of the Coming Age.

---

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

---

---

No. 43.

JANUARY, 1868.

Vol. V.

---

---

### THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF JUDGMENT.

---

BY J. J. ANDREW, LONDON.

---

In all these parables and illustrations, the punishment of the unfaithful is represented as taking place—not a thousand years after, but—at the same time as the bestowal of blessings on the faithful, and, in some cases, it is even described as occurring *previous* to that event. How then can this be accomplished if the unrighteous are not to be raised from the dead at the second advent? The theory which places the resurrection of the just at the beginning of the millennium, and the resurrection of the unjust at the end, necessitates the separation of the former from the latter; but the parables of Jesus teach us that it is the unjust which are to be separated from the just, because they are not worthy "to stand in the congregation of the righteous"—(Ps. 1-5.) When this occurs, they will feel, with intense shame, the degradation of their position, and then will be fulfilled the words of Jesus: "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."—(Matt. viii, 38.) This passage of itself affords strong proof of the resurrection of the unjust at the second advent, because it is difficult to see how Jesus can be ashamed, at his coming in glory, of persons not then in existence; but what are we to say when we find that the individuals themselves are to feel ashamed on that occasion? That such is the case is evident from the exhortation of the apostle John: "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.) And not only are they to “be ashamed before him,” but others are to be witnesses of their shame. Hence the Apocalyptic meaning: “Behold I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, *and they see his shame.*”—(Rev. xvi, 16). For a disciple to “keep his garments” is to take the advice given to the church at Laodicea: “I counsel thee to buy of me \* \* \* white raiment, that thou mayest be clothed, and “the fine linen is the righteousness of the saints.”—(Rev. xix, 8.) For anyone to be “naked” is to be without “the garments of salvation”—“the robe of righteousness” (Isa. lxi, 10.) necessary to all who will be present at the “marriage of the lamb”—(Rev. 19, 7.) Those who are in this destitute condition will constitute the “unrighteous,” who, Paul says “shall not inherit the kingdom of God.”—(1 Cor. vi, 9.) When they appear at the judgment-seat, and the judge pronounces sentence of condemnation upon them, they will be like Adam and Eve were when they hid themselves among the trees of the garden of Eden, after eating of the forbidden fruit; they will be ashamed of themselves; their Master will be ashamed of them; and all who are present will be witnesses of their nakedness and shame. These events are predicted by Jesus Christ and his beloved apostle John; and all the three passages quoted unite in declaring that they will be fulfilled at the second appearing of the King of the Jews.

It is inferred by some, from the use of the word “reward” in such passages as the following, that when Jesus appears he will merely bestow benefits upon the righteous: “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 work.*”—(Matt. xvi, 27.) “Behold I come quickly, and my reward is with me, *to give every man according as his work shall be.*”—(Rev. xxii, 12.) But this is a very narrow view to take of the word “reward,” and one which is not warranted by its use in other parts of scripture. For instance, David and Moses both speak of good being rewarded with evil: “They *rewarded me evil* for good, to the spoiling (depriving) of my soul.”—(Psalm xxxv, 12.) “Whereupon have ye *rewarded evil* for good?”—(Gen. xlv, 4) We also find that the wicked are to be rewarded: “He shall *reward evil* unto mine enemies.”—(Psalm liv, 5.) “The Lord preserveth the faithful, and plentifully *rewardeth the proud-doer.*”—(Psalm xxxi, 23.) “The great God that formed all things, both *rewardeth the fool*, and *rewardeth transgressors.*”—(Prov. xxvi, 10.) “The Lord shall *reward the doer of evil* according to his wickedness.”—(2 Sam., iii, 39.) Paul also used “reward” in the same sense when writing of Alexander the coppersmith, who had been committing mischief: “Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil; the Lord reward him according to his works.”—(2 Tim. iv, 14.) And in the Apocalypse we are told that mystical Babylon, when she has filled up the cup of her iniquities, is to be duly rewarded: “For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered *her iniquities. Reward her*, even as she rewarded you, and double unto her double according to her works; in the cup which she hath filled, fill to her double.”—(Rev. xviii, 5, 6.) In the book of Samuel we read of both

good and evil being rewarded: "Thou hast rewarded me good, whereas I have rewarded thee evil."—(1 Sam. xxiv, 17.)

From these passages it is evident that the word "reward" is used in the sense of reaping, whether the fruit reaped be good or bad; and that, therefore, the "rewarding of every man according to his works" comprehends both blessings and punishments. The former are the fruits of the spirit, but the latter are the fruits of unrighteousness; and they are both referred to by Solomon as follows: "The fruit of the righteous is a tree of life \* \* \* Behold the *righteous* shall be recompensed in the earth: much more *the wicked and the sinner*."—(Prov. xi, 30, 31.)

The phrase "every man" is in itself sufficient to decide the meaning of the word "reward;" because, as we have already seen, all Christ's disciples—faithful and unfaithful—are to appear before him at his second advent, to reap that which they have sown. To "reward every man according to his works," therefore, is to give to them "the things through the body according to that which they have done, *whether it be good or bad*." The word "reward" is, in fact, used as a synonym for the word "judge," and hence we read: "The father, without respect of persons, *judgeth* according to every man's work."—(1 Peter i, 17.) The reason why it is used in this sense is to be found in the fact that when the bible was translated, this word had a more comprehensive meaning than at the present time; it meant "to recompense without reference to good or evil;" in proof of which we quote the following passages from early English writers: "Which, however, heaven and fortune still *rewards with plagues*."—(Shakspeare.) "*Rewarding* them with *traitorous recompense*."—(Herwood.) The principal passage in which the word "reward" is used in the modern sense, as applicable to blessings only, is the following: "And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, *and the time of the dead that they should be judged*, and that thou shouldst *give reward unto thy servants*, the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; *and shouldst destroy* them that destroy (corrupt, see margin) the earth."—(Rev. xi, 18.) In this case, however, the context clearly shews the sense intended to be conveyed. It will be seen that the dead are first to be *judged*, and then the righteous portion are to be rewarded, and the unrighteous destroyed. From the testimony already quoted as to the mode in which the dead in Christ are to be judged, this passage cannot be adduced as affording any proof that they are to be judged while in the death-state; because in that case, they could not appear before the judgment-seat of Christ to give an account of their conduct, and to reap, through the body, that which they have sown.

It will, perhaps, be said that the class referred to as corrupting the earth, does not comprise the unrighteous disciples of Christ. The phrase is, doubtless, not confined to such persons, but we think it necessarily comprehends them, because all who adulterate or nullify the truth of God, whether believers or unbelievers, may be truly said to corrupt it. This is evident from Paul's injunction to Titus: "In doctrine shewing uncorruptness."—(Titus ii, 7.) But even if this

phrase be viewed as alluding specially to the great apostasy, there is sufficient evidence from the word "judged" that two classes will be raised at this "time of the dead," which is undoubtedly that of the second advent; for, as we have seen, the judgment is to apply to both sheep and goats, faithful and unfaithful, and is to take place after the resurrection, not before it.

For further proof that responsible sinners are to be punished at the appearing of Jesus Christ, we need only refer to such texts as the following, which present the dark side of that momentous event: "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them, that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of His power."—(2 Thess. i, 7-9.) "*The Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds, which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches, which ungodly sinners have spoken against him.*"—(Jude xiv, 15.)

It will, doubtless, at once be said by some, that these passages refer to the vengeance to be poured out upon the nations. That this is one of the truths they are intended to teach there can be no doubt; but then, it does not exclude the infliction of punishment on those unworthy servants, who are to be judged and condemned by Christ at his appearing and kingdom. On the contrary, if the passage be carefully examined, it will be seen that they are sufficiently comprehensive to embrace *both believing sinners and unbelieving sinners*. Paul says that vengeance shall be inflicted on them that "obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." It is quite true that to obey the gospel is to believe it and be immersed; for, we are told that the mystery of the gospel was "made known to all nations for the obedience of faith;" but at the same time, it must not be forgotten that obedience to the injunctions necessarily arising out of it is required from all believers throughout the whole of their probationary career. Some of the early Christians manifested great disobedience to the gospel law of liberty, and, therefore, it was necessary for Paul to sharply rebuke them: "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you that ye should *not obey the truth?*"—(Gal. iii, 1.) If these Galatians continued in their disobedient state, can there be any doubt that at the second advent they will be "punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power?"

It is apparent that those who sin in the clear light of knowledge, do so under far greater responsibilities than those who sin in ignorance. It is scarcely reasonable, therefore, that the latter should be punished before the former. In the case of the Israelites, it is well known that they have been punished for their sins in accordance with the privileges they enjoyed: "*You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore, I will punish you for all your iniquities.*"—(Amos iii, 2.) The divine principle illustrated in their history is this:

the first to enjoy the favour of God shall be the first to be punished for the abuse of that blessing, a principle which is equally applicable to all others who occupy a similar position. "All these things happened unto them for our ensamples (or types); and they are written for our admonition, on whom the ends of the world are come."—(Heb. x, 11.) Seeing then, that the fleshly Israel are but a type of the spiritual Israel, it follows that the whole of the latter will be judged, and the disobedient among them punished before those Gentiles who never believe the gospel nor obey its first commandment. This is absolutely essential to the fulfilment of the apostolic statement, that "*judgment must begin at the house of God.*" Writing to the early christians, Peter, in his first epistle, says "For the time is come\* (is coming; see *Diaglott*) that *judgment must begin at the house of God*; and if it first *begin at us*, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God? And if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?"—1 Peter iv, 17. The truths taught by this passage are:

1.—That "judgment" is to be administered on both believers and unbelievers.

2nd.—That the judgment of believers (righteous and unrighteous) will be so strict that the righteous scarcely will be saved.

3rd.—That the judgment of the unbelievers will result in severe punishment, but no salvation.

4.—That the judgment of believers is to take place before the judgment of unbelievers.

The chief point to be noticed is, that the "judgment" to which the house of God will be subjected, is but the beginning of a series of national judgments. The character of the former may be ascertained from the nature of the latter; and as we know that the judgment on the nations will consist almost wholly of punishment, it follows, as a logical sequence, that the judgment of God's household must also comprise punishment. If it do not, there is no point in the apostle's argument; for on the supposition that the judgment of God's household is merely the bestowal of rewards on the righteous after they have received immortality, what force or consistency is there in asking "if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?" The process by which the righteous are to be saved—and that too, by a hair's breadth, as it were—is the judgment, and as this will necessitate the rejection of the unrighteous, it follows that the judgment of the house of God is for the purpose of deciding who is and who is not worthy of salvation. If this result is obtained by raising the righteous only from the dead, leaving the unrighteous in their graves, then the judgment takes place while the members of God's house are in hades; and, in that case, the bestowal of rewards on the righteous cannot be called the judgment, for they would then be subjected to two judgments, one while dead and the other when in the enjoyment of eternal life.

---

\* The words "is come" are in italics in the common version, thus shewing that they are not in the original text.



If it be said that the judgment Peter refers to, took effect at the destruction of Jerusalem, we would ask in what sense were the righteous saved at that time? It is true that the early christians were saved from the calamities of that event; but the apostle is writing about *eternal* not temporal *salvation*, and, therefore, the judgment he alludes to, must be essential to the bestowal of that salvation.

(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 301.)

HENCE, as from this it is evident it was not the physical which first caused the moral to sin, but the moral, the physical; so, is it equally evident, it is not by the flesh, or any physical or intellectual power, as derived from external nature, or the circumstances surrounding us, the moral can be made to do right. For, though the flesh was not the first cause of sin, Adam derived no advantage from it to keep him from sin. Pure as he was in flesh and blood, he derived no assistance from it to withstand the temptation. And if so, with Adam, what advantage would it, or a superior flesh, have been to Jesus Christ? Had Jesus been physically incapable of sinning, he neither could have sinned morally, for what is capable in this respect in one faculty is capable in all. Had Jesus therefore, been incapable of sinning, in what relation could he have stood to moral law, since it would have been an impossibility for him to have broken it? His keeping of the law in such circumstances would have been a farcical proceeding, but his being capable

of sinning, and yet maintaining obedience, is a certain evidence his training and education were that by which he became perfect. And an evidence too, that if from his flesh, there came fewer promptings to sin, than is the case with other men,—which we have every reason to believe—and if this is to be taken as an indication that his flesh must have been purer than any other man's flesh; this purity was not natural to it; it came not from the womb; but from the training he was subjected to, the restrictions he placed on himself, his education, his moral culture, in short, the applied power of the written word of God to bring his flesh in subjection to its every principle of thought and action. He was holy, harmless, and undefiled, not by his creation, formation, and birth, but by his non-transgression of God's moral law, by his supplication and action, of "not my will but thine be done." And though this perhaps did not bring health to *his* flesh, nor marrow to *his* bones—though it did not bring happiness to his being, while in

the flesh, seeing he was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief; and likewise, as his brethren in following him partake of the same sorrows, and therefore do not find the happiness which in the compliance with God's precepts they might expect; this does not in the least detract from the virtue which the submission, the voluntary prayerful submission to God's will possesses, as the prime restorer of man's flesh to comparative purity, and vigorous health. The example of Christ and his sufferings, and their example and their sufferings, are for the age that now is, and thence for a life of immortality far above the life the future presents to fleshly-man: hence in their sufferings they have in this, a weight of glory waiting them far exceeding the weight of their afflictions, which makes their sorrows light. The age in which man now lives, is one of transition, and therefore does not permit, or give freedom to the natural effect, which submission to the divine law would produce on the flesh, but in the future age of man,—not of men in spirit or spiritual bodies, not of men made immortal, but of man in the flesh, of men mortal,—it will be one of fleshly perfection and purity: and this, not as the result of a physical or intellectual culture, though these doubtless will have their place,—but as the result of a moral culture, of an education not based on what is now called "learning and science" but of an education based on the written word of God. Men in that age will live in health and happiness, by their knowledge of God, and the virtue of their obedience to his will. Then every proverb of God will have its trial, every trial its fruition, and every fruition its praise. *Now*, "There is a vanity which is done upon the earth; that there be

just men into whom it happeneth according to the work of the wicked: again, there be wicked men to whom it happeneth according to the work of the righteous"; but, *then* it will be otherwise. *Now*, there be men "whose labor is in wisdom, and in knowledge, and in equity, yet to others who have not labored therein shall he leave it for his portion"; but, *then*, "they shall not labor in vain nor bring forth for trouble, they shall not build and another inhabit, they shall not plant and another eat." *Now*, men live in ignorance of God, and therefore go down to their graves ere they see one-fourth their days; but *then*, it will be the opposite of this,—the knowledge of God will pass from sea to sea and shore to shore. *Then*, all shall know God from the least to the greatest, and hence, the life of man will be prolonged. Health, and happiness, will so follow from their knowledge of, and obedience to God, that the reckoning of a child's years will rise up to a hundred. And if, at that age, man as a child will die, at what age will man aged and full of years die? His days will reckon with the extent of his knowledge, and the perfection of his obedience as related to that knowledge, as coupled with the disposition of hereditary and social tendencies to induce and foster obedience. For, as the hereditary tendency of sin or disobedience *now*, is to develop itself with greater force, and so more and more deprave; so, will the hereditary tendency of obedience be to elevate man to greater perfection. And just as the power of association *now* gives vitality to sin to ramify itself through society of every shade; so will the power of association *then* give such vigour to obedience to ramify itself throughout the nations of the earth. *Now*, sin reigns, and they who obey the

commandments of God are persecuted for their righteousness; but, *then* righteousness, or obedience will reign: the obedient will be exalted, transgressors punished, and this not by the persecution or agency of the righteous—for the righteous will seek rather to alleviate than distress—but as the natural consequence of their own sinning. *Now*, “*all is vanity and vexation of spirit,*” but it will not be so *then*. *Now* one event happeneth to all, as dieth the fool so dieth the wise man, but it shall not be so *then*. *Now*, a man may hate all the labor of his hands, since he has to leave it to others, and knows not whether his heir will be a wise man or a fool, but it will be very different *then*. *Now*, therefore, apart from the written testimony of God there is much reason for people grumbling. It is no wonder they grumble. We all grumble because of this apparent inequality of God’s present moral government of men, but when David grumbled at the same thing, (Ps. lxxii)—even in his day, while the government of his kingdom was a theocracy—when David grumbled, he entered the sanctuary, and the light there appeased his vexation. There he condemned himself as a fool, and worse, for so grumbling. “So foolish was I and ignorant: I was as a beast before thee.” He there saw within the inner court, the springs of the outer action of God’s dealings with man. He there saw the balances of God, just and equal. He there saw a compensation more than equal to the apparent injustice of the present state of things. And if like him, men now will enter the sanctuary also, if they please to search the written testimony, they will find that obedience to the precepts of God is as fruitful of blessings now as in his day, or as ever it will be. And inasmuch as this

fruit is of an eternal value, and that the righteous of the present age will have the government of the future age in their hands, that they shall be the administrators of the justice and equity that will then on the earth prevail; so does it show, that the very injustice they meet with now—their trials, their sufferings for righteousness’ sake—is just that very experience and education they need, to prepare them as gods, knowing good and evil, as judges experienced in the discrimination of right and wrong, as men of sympathy with the flesh they had once inherited, to know how to reward, and how to punish; how to meet obedience with its merit, and sin with its deservings. All these things therefore “justify the ways of God to man,” and reflect a light on the cause and cure of human depravity. They show how death came by sin, and how life is produced by obedience. They show the contrast between Adam the first, and Adam the second. They show that the depraved nature of man will be reclaimed by the very faculty it became depraved. Just as from the absence of a moral culture Adam failed to obey, so from the presence of a moral culture Jesus was enabled to obey, and hence, by the same process, or a similar one, as the disobedience of the one brought death into the world, so will the obedience of the other bring life. As the first sin lowered the intellect, and corrupted the flesh into many foolish and hurtful lusts, and as these by the natural forces of hereditary law and association have depraved man to the level of the brute, and converted the world into one great charnel house, so will the first obedience by the power with which it will be infused into the hearts of men in the future age, elevate the intellect,

purify the flesh, destroy its unnatural desires, and by force of hereditary tendencies and social influences, impart health, beauty, and tenacity of life to the person, delight and satisfaction to the mind, purity to the thoughts, peace and happiness around, and bring back the earth to fructify again as the garden of the Lord. And these all, as the natural fruits of obedience as based on the first obedience of Jesus Christ. Jesus learned obedience by the things *he* suffered; as Adam learned sin by what he suffered. Adam through ignorance of sin disobeyed, and he certainly came by his disobedience to understand it. Jesus through his knowledge of sin as imparted to him by the written word, learned the mind and will of God, but he did not learn obedience without suffering. Had he not suffered he would never have experienced the difficulty to obey. It was from his knowledge he obeyed, but had he experienced no difficulty, no trial, while observing obedience, there would have been no virtue in his obedience, no moral force, no example of any kind, nothing to create and perpetuate a faith in obedience. His flesh therefore must have been corrupt, since, in obeying, he suffered. He could not have suffered while obeying if his flesh had been pure. Adam never would have suffered had he continued in obedience simply because his flesh was pure, but Jesus as much counteracted the tendency of his being, in obeying; as Adam counteracted the tendency of his being, in disobeying. It was from the counteraction of the opposite natures the suffering in both cases arose. The tendency of Adam's being at the beginning was pure and lasting, but after he sinned it became impure and declined. Jesus, therefore, in being bone of Adam's bone,

and flesh of Adam's flesh, as after he sinned, partook of Adam's sinful nature, and as the tendency of this nature is to continue in sin, he in obeying that which he had been taught went in direct opposition to his fleshly nature, and hence suffered. His fleshly nature knew not what obedience meant, but he taught it obedience by the force and exercise of his cultivated moral faculty. Had he not suffered therefore, as he did, he would have been either, as Adam was before he sinned, with the advantage of knowing good from evil, and hence of knowing how to satisfy the desires of his pure flesh without partaking of anything forbidden; or he would have been as other men a sower unto the flesh. In either case, he would not, nor could not, have suffered as he did. His suffering therefore, while learning obedience, is a certain evidence he was of sinful flesh, and his obedience an example of the power of the written word to train the moral faculty, despite the opposition of the sinful desires of the flesh, and bring them into subjection. So much has the moral faculty power over the physical. Untrained, it produced sin and consequent suffering in flesh that was pure and undefiled. Trained, it produced obedience and consequent suffering in flesh that was impure and sinful. And when the days come, in which obedience will be infused into man by the power of Him who first suffered to learn it, it will produce health and happiness. Much of this we learn not merely from scripture, but also from experience. In the ratio man's moral power is diminished, the power of the fleshly instincts increase, and from their increase the flesh becomes more and more corrupt. Hence in Adam's case it is easily perceived how his flesh became corrupt after his sinning. He

by his transgression, destroyed the harmony of his threefold nature, by diminishing the power of his moral faculty. He could have resisted the first temptation with ease, but not so easily the second, simply because his fleshly instincts became stronger through the first transgression, while his moral instinct became weaker. On the other hand, in the ratio man's moral power is increased, the power of the fleshly instincts is decreased, and a more healthful action of the whole physical organism is induced. Hence in Je-us' case, it is as easily perceived how in the battle he fought, he had to contend infinitely more with the contradiction of others *against* himself than *with* himself, and how in the future man will be so happy. Certainly, we have no direct testimony to the effect that Jesus had to fight with himself, as Paul had (Rom. vii, 23) nor do we believe he ever did, but this nevertheless, does not necessitate the conclusion he had no carnal desires to deny. His having had no such battle, only implies that from his training his fleshly desires had never been permitted to grow, as Paul's evidently had. Paul was brought up at the feet of a man of the world, a man whose character was not like that of Mary and Joseph. Paul was brought up to know and handle the laws of men, but Jesus was brought up to know and handle the laws of God. The education of each was the antithesis of the other. We need not wonder, therefore, though Jesus did not carry about with him the internal warfare Paul did. The habits of their youth had become their second natures in maturity; still, notwithstanding this, Jesus had at times been subjected to the ordeal. His temptation in the Wilderness exhibits "the lusts of the flesh, the lusts of the eye, and

the pride of life" as having existed in him, as in any other man. In the panorama of the world's glory, which from his long fasting, he had there naturally dreamed, and seen as a vision of abundance is seen, by a hungry man's eye; in what sense would that fleshly glory have been to him a temptation had he not possessed the fleshly instincts to desire it, the will to possess it, yes, and the power to command it. *Was he not hungry? Had he not the instinct to eat? the desire to possess food, and the power to command even the stones to be made bread?* And if so, of *this* fleshly desire, why not of all the other instincts of his flesh as related to that temptation? Talk of the devil tempting him! True, indeed, the devil did tempt him. We do not for one moment doubt the strict integrity of the narrative. It is a great truth enigmatically expressed. But, what devil? The Trinitarian devil? Pah! Pooh! Pshaw! The devil who tempted Jesus was *his flesh*; the impure flesh; the flesh he inherited of Adam's sinful nature. This was the devil. Every man carries about with him his own devil. There is no necessity for man fearing another devil. If a man is not led away by his own fleshly desires, he will not be led away by any other devil. Resist the flesh and the devil will flee. Mortify every lustful desire which warreth against the soul, sow to the spirit and not to the flesh, and the devil will be harmless. Repress every sinful instinct, improve the moral faculty with the knowledge of God and obedience to his precepts, and leave Trinitarians to exorcise their own devil as they please. They do so by smoking incense, lighting candles, beating the air, and praying all manner of vengeance upon some imaginary being, but this was not the devil whose works Jesus came to

destroy. Jesus did not come to destroy the devil, but to improve him. He came to destroy the works only of the devil not the devil himself. He came simply to destroy the works of sinful flesh, not the flesh itself. He came to improve the flesh as he improved his own by applying the mighty power of God's written word to repress his lustful desires and so purify his flesh. The flesh of man is not in its essence impure. It is only degenerated by hereditary sin, and in the age to come it will be regenerated by God's word. Hence, the devil in that age will be bound a thousand years. He will be bound hand and foot, neck and heel, by the very faculty he was let loose—the moral faculty—the faculty which Adam could not use because of his ignorance, but which the men in the age to come, will know how to use by the aid of their knowledge. In that age therefore, the devil, the flesh, will be greatly improved by his being bound. He will be repressed, mortified, kept down. He will be always a devil, but not so mischievous a devil as he is at present. In plain language the flesh will be under moral restraint; and when that age is done, it will be destroyed. The devil then will be cast into a lake of burning fire. Those whose names are not found written in the book of life, whose characters are not formed by the subjection of the flesh to the word of God, will be consumed, and all others will be made immortal, in bodies spiritual. Death then, will have no work, and the grave no followers. In the simple destruction of only one thing, namely, the flesh; the devil, death, and hell (the grave) will be as a matter of course destroyed. In the casting of the flesh into the lake of fire, death and hell will be necessarily cast along with it. The existence of death and hell depends on the existence of the flesh. When it is consumed therefore, death and hell can exist no longer. Death is not a *being*, neither is hell a *burning fire*: fire cannot consume fire, neither can it consume that which hath no being, but in the consuming that which causes death, and necessitates a grave, it, in the burning of the one, consumes all. All this therefore, reflects a light on the nature of Jesus Christ. His flesh was earthly, his nature sensual, and both were devilish, antagonistic, contrary to, and hence the very opposite to the character he exhibited. On the other hand, the character he exhibited was holy, harmless, and undefiled. It

did not originate from the flesh, but from the written word of God and the power of the Holy Spirit. Hence it was not his flesh he gave for the life of the world, but his words. His flesh "profits" nothing. His words were spirit and life, not his flesh. Had he given his flesh to be eaten, then there would have been some cause for supposing his flesh was very different from any other man's flesh. But not so, he gave his body to be consumed not to be eaten, that in the destruction of his flesh, his words might remain. He rose and ascended to heaven from whence he came. His flesh was not Jesus Christ, but his words were. He was but Jesus Christ in flesh, or fleshly body, not Jesus Christ the flesh. Before this he but existed in character, as reflected in Moses and the prophets, and from the bosom of the Father. The character he exhibited was a revelation in man of the holiness of God as taught in Moses and the prophets. Had the flesh been the cause of his holiness then he would have been Jesus Christ *the* flesh, not in the flesh. But he was Jesus Christ the word made flesh, or by whose flesh the word or holiness of God was made manifest. So effectually had he subjected his flesh to the will of God, that he, in his walk among men, presented nothing to them but what was the mind of the spirit. He presented nothing to them of the mind of the flesh. He never walked after the flesh, he purely walked after the spirit. He came from heaven therefore in the sense of word, or character as representing the mind of the spirit, but not in the sense of anything else. He acquired his character from the word, and thence became the word made flesh, dwelling among men, and exhibiting in flesh what the word could do to man in making him holy, harmless, and undefiled. The word therefore, was himself, or that which the word had made him. A man is only known by his character, not by his flesh. When a man falls from his character he is by a beautiful metaphor, said to "fall from himself" and when he regains it he is said to return to "himself," as for example,

"Richard is himself again."

It is, therefore, not the mere blood and bones which make the man, but that which makes the character. Man may acquire his character from his flesh, but so long as he has it in his power to acquire a character from something else, the flesh does not necessarily make him a fleshly character, or flesh-made man. The carnal

mind is a flesh-made mind, a mind seduced by the corruptions of the flesh, hence the possessor of such a mind is a flesh-made man, a man of the earth, earthy, sensual, devilish. On the other hand he "who walketh not after the flesh, but after the spirit" is a spirit-made man, a man of the word, a man who derives his character not from the flesh, but from the word, or teachings of the spirit as written in the word. And in this sense, he, the man, is begotten or generated by the spirit, a man whose character is not of the earth, though he is born of it, but from heaven though he never was there. Though of the earth, earthy, he is nevertheless from heaven, heavenly. Being known only by his character, and as from heaven his character comes, he in a true metaphorical sense cannot but come from heaven too. As Jesus therefore, was known only by his character, since he was rejected on every side by those only who repudiated his character, and did not see him in any light different from a flesh-made man—seeing, he was known only by his character, that character was himself, and not the flesh. The Jews knew him in flesh, they knew him as the son of Mary and Joseph, and they knew his brethren in the flesh, but they did not know him as the son of God, and therefore did not know him as Jesus Christ, though they knew him to have that name, simply because they did not understand the scriptures, and therefore did not understand his character. As Jesus therefore, was only known by his character, and as that character was of the spirit or word, and not of the flesh, he necessarily was the word. His character being the word in manifestation through flesh, he was necessarily that character. He was not Jesus Christ the flesh—a fleshly character, an earthly character, but he was Jesus Christ the word, a spiritually minded character, a character from heaven. Being the word therefore, in flesh, he on his ascension carried that character along with him: he could not have left it behind him and ascended without it, because without the character, he could not have carried his name, and hence could not have carried himself. It is not the name that gives the character, but the character the name. Being the word in flesh, therefore, he on his ascension, became the word in spirit, or the same character manifested in a spiritual body. First, was the word, as word, in the bosom or mind of the Father. Second, the same word or mind of God manifested in flesh; and, third, the

word manifested in spirit. The first is spirit pure and simple, as it comes from God, possessing no personality in itself, but simply the personal influence of God himself; the second is the same spirit, as spirit and life acting upon flesh, the third is the same spirit corporealized. Hence, this word being Jesus' character, and this character Jesus himself, he on ascending to heaven "ascended up *where he was before.*" Metaphorically, he came down from heaven, metaphorically he was in heaven "before." And as this sense of the phrase is borne out by the metaphorical features of the whole chapter in which the phrase is found, it appears in beautiful harmony with the whole instruction of Jesus' teaching in that chapter.\* Now, whatever peculiarity Jesus exhibited, may be traced to the purity of the seed from whence he sprung; still, in the antagonism which in all things of life, is necessary to give virtue to every effort, we cannot fail to perceive, that the nature of the blood by which he was formed was necessary to the formation of the character he exhibited, though positively he did not profit from it. Naturally disposed to receive the truth by reason of the purity, or uncontaminated nature of the former, he was as naturally tempted to evil by the contaminated nature of the latter, and had he been left to himself, he would have grown up like other men, upon the same principle Adam became depraved. Adam had a superior advantage to Jesus Christ, in being pure in all his parts, and from this we might judge that Adam should have been the less likely to transgress. But no, the purity of his flesh was of no advantage to him, and hence, much less was a partial purity to Jesus Christ. Adam was left to himself, as if it were to show how impotent the flesh is to produce moral goodness, no matter how pure it is; but Jesus in being trained and educated by means of the written word of God, grew in wisdom as he grew in years, and from thence suffered, fought, and conquered. The contaminated nature of the flesh and blood as exhibited in the lustful desires it gives rise to, was that with which he had fought. The uncontaminated nature of the seed had been that which had rendered him so susceptible of instruction: but his education was the weapon, the double-edged sword by which he had obtained the mastery. Hence, had his flesh and blood not been contaminated, he could have exhibited no moral grandeur, nor illustrated the power of the written word to make a

\* John vi, 27 to 64.

man holy, harmless, and undefiled. His flesh in such a case, would have been the man Jesus Christ, not his character as based upon anything else but his flesh, and hence not the word. It would then have been pure flesh eliciting its own character, not the character of the word which is apart from flesh. It would have then been himself manifesting himself, speaking his own thoughts, working his own works, and not the words and works of God. It would then have been the flesh made the word, not the word made flesh. In place of the purity of the word being manifested through flesh, it would have been the purity of flesh manifested through word—the very antithesis of what he taught, “I came not to do my own will, but that of my

Father,”—a reversion of the whole principle of divine truth as related to its effects on man, and a flat contradiction of his own statement “The flesh profits nothing.” Good flesh or bad flesh, pure or impure, both are equally incapable of producing a character such as the word can impart. It is the word therefore, and not the flesh which profits anything—“it is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing, the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life, the words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself, the Father, (the word) who dwelleth in me, he doeth the works.

(To be continued.)

---

## SUNDAY MORNING AT THE CHRISTADELPHIAN SYNAGOGUE, BIRMINGHAM.—No. 2.

---

*From Phonetic Notes by brother JOHN BUTLER.*

---

WE are called upon this morning to consider Jesus in the particular aspect in which he is presented to us in the emblems spread upon the table. We are invited to look a very long way back, through the dim distance of 1800 years, to the time when Jesus was in the flesh—when he was “a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief”—learning obedience by the things which he suffered, submitting to humiliation and death, in order that he might lay the foundation of the glorious state of things, which we are now permitted in him to hope for.

But it seems highly probable it will not be very long before we and the world at large, will have to look upon him in a very different aspect indeed. How remarkable that exactly between 1866 and 1868, the Roman Question should be the great question of the hour—a thing that all who have ever given any attention to prophecy, have been expecting at this period, for hundreds of years, viz., that things would take such a course as would in the present epoch end off the career of the Papacy. That is just the thing that is now in everybody's mouth—the expectation of every politician—the prediction of every newspaper editor and correspondent—that the Pope's dominion can no longer last.

Of course the Pope is of no consequence to us; he is the head of a system which to every son of God, is an object of hate and execration. The Papacy is a mockery, a refuge of lies, the hold of every foul spirit. The great fact that makes its history and destiny interesting to us, is that the expiration of the period allotted to its dominion, marks the epoch when we may at any time expect the return of this “Man of Sorrows.” About that there is no mistake; for in Dan. vii. where this matter is more strikingly presented, than perhaps in any other part of the Bible, we find that the little horn of the fourth beast prevailed until the Ancient of Days came; and the period of his domination is measured by what we know to represent a period of 1260 years. The end of this period is marked by this, that “the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end; and the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High.” This is the thing that makes current events interesting to us, because we see in the present state of Europe the sure prognostication of the approach of the time when the prediction of Daniel shall be



fulfilled. The particular course that events may take, it is not permitted us to know; all that we get in the vision is simply a broad outline. We have the symbols of the four great dominions that have existed on the earth; but there is nothing to represent the details involved in the setting-up of one, and the casting-down of another. You do not, in the vision, see the causes which led to the transitions represented. So in the present, it is enough for us to see the broad course of events. All we do know and expect is that at this time, the Papal supremacy will come to an end, and that afterwards the Ancient of Days will soon be manifested in the person of Jesus.

We have been singing about the "Man of Sorrows," in the garden of Gethsemane. There the work began. In that dark and bitter hour, he laid the foundation of the mighty triumph which he is shortly to effect in the earth. "He bowed beneath the sins of men" even to the grave: but he rose again, and went away to heaven, and has been away all this time—so long, that men have forgotten him, except as a worthless tradition. But we, thanks to God's unmerited favor, have had our attention called back to the truth concerning him, and are waiting in silence, in quietness and patience, for his return from heaven. Are we worthy of this position? Are we quite ready to go and meet him, with the account which everyone of us will have to render? James indicates the principle of readiness, in the chapter read. He says "Ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves; for if any be a hearer of the word and not a doer, he is like a man beholding his natural face in a glass; for he beholdeth himself, and goeth his way, and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was." Now that is very plain and simple, there is no mistaking the meaning of it. The "perfect law of liberty" is to be found in the Bible. Jesus says "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free:" that is to say, the unfolding of God's mind to us in the various matters made known in the Bible, constitutes the law of liberty. What we have to do, is to look into it, and not to forget what we read. A great deal depends upon memory, in reference to salvation; in fact, it is true what was once said by Dr. Thomas "that salvation is very much a matter of good memory." To "orthodox" ears, this would seem a most irreverent remark; but it is exactly true. Proof of it you will find in 1 Cor. xv, 1, 2; and Heb. iii, 26.

Both these agree with James when he says that "that man is blessed who is not a forgetful hearer of the word." But some may say that some persons have good memories, and some have bad ones, by natural constitution. The answer to this is, that everybody has a good memory for what they give their attention to, and what they like. Nobody forgets the house he lives in; no one forgets his friends; no one ever forgets the money that is owing to him. Why? Because these things are continually under cognisance—seen by the eyes or heard by the ears. Now the reason why the majority of people are forgetful hearers of the word, is because they are not constant readers of it. They do not "continue" in this law; they allow themselves to be diverted by the ephemeral things of life, from the important business of making themselves familiar with God's word, by reading. They are without excuse. They plead bad memories, but they forget they have the power of making a good one. They have a good memory for what they continually busy themselves about. This is a universal rule. Do you think anybody would have a good memory for Greek or Algebra, if they did not apply themselves with diligence? People dive into musty and intricate studies to qualify themselves for a good position in society. In this way they make a memory for learning, and gain their object. So it must be with us. We must qualify ourselves for the great future, by studying day and night, those disclosures of the divine mind which have been preserved in record for our benefit. We must be diligent readers of the Bible, and thus we shall gain a good and serviceable memory of all that God would have us remember, viz., the truth concerning Christ, and His will concerning us. In this way, we shall stand ready for the summons which may at any time come forth. When Christ sends for us, very likely the message will come by the hands of an angelic visitor. The angels have always been used in times past, in the furtherance of divine arrangements. They had much to do with the first advent of Christ, with his birth, his sufferings and his resurrection. And we know that at his second appearing, he will be accompanied by a multitude of them. Now this may happen any day. Supposing you are sitting quietly by the fireside at night, the labours of the day completed, and you think of going to bed, how shall you feel if all of a sudden, a beautiful and dignified visitor present himself with the intimation that "the Master is come and

callesth for thee?" It will all depend upon the disposal you have been making of your time and your money and your strength. What sort of a day have you been spending? You have been exceedingly troubled, and taken up with business or the house. You have been in a ferment of discontent. You have been very angry with somebody. You have neglected your reading. You thought something else more important than the meeting. You have not been thinking about Christ at all; have not been doing anything for him—how shall you feel? Very much abashed, very much frightened—paralysed with consternation. But let us suppose the case stands the other way. You are depressed with sorrow. You have had a hard fight. You have been harassed in a variety of ways; but you have done your duty. You have snatched your reading amidst the pressure of life's duties; you have given your countenance to the work done for Christ. You have preferred his assemblies to private or worldly pleasure. You have done what you could to promote his service in the proclamation of the truth, the visitation and comfort of the lambs of his flock, and in the relief of his poor. You are sad with a sadness the world does not understand. You are grieved at the triumph of Christ's enemies, the faithlessness and unconcern of those who profess his name, and it may be, at your own shortcomings hindering you in the race. The pressure of individual circumstances bows you down. Your pocket may be empty, because of what you considered it your duty to do. In tears you pour out your complaint before God, and that messenger comes to you. How shall you feel? You shall feel as no language can express; you will not be filled with ecstasy, because the judgment has to

pass, before you know your lot; but you will feel a calm relief from the knowledge that there is nothing in the present state worth living for; and that your inmost desires and highest aspirations are towards the things that are of God. Joy (mixed with fear) will fill your heart, to know that God has taken the work in hand himself. You go to the judgment-seat, and whom do you meet there? Why the man who, above all others, has been for a lifetime the cherished ideal of your heart—an ideal implanted there by the truth, and which has been growing sharper in outline, dearer to the affections, more real to the assurance, and consciousness as years roll by. You see him after whom your soul longs, in whom you have confided all your hope, and for whom you have risked all your interests. Shall you be afraid now? You will tremble, because a righteous man has a deep sense of the greatness and holiness of God. You will feel in that great presence like Daniel in the presence of the angel. But listen, "Oh man, greatly beloved, be strong, and be of good courage."

Who would not labour for such a result? It is not too late for us to mend, to become devoted, to throw our soul into the things that belong to Christ. We may rest assured of this, that any man or woman who simply tinkers at Christ's work, who simply compliments the truth with a nominal adhesion, who is a mere patron of the truth, who does not feel it a privilege of the highest kind to lay themselves on the altar of its service—aye, beneath the wheels of its chariot, if needs be, to be crushed in its onward progress—will be rejected. "If any man love father or mother, sister or brother, house or land more than me, he is not worthy of me."

---

## THE POLITICAL HEAVENS AND THE SIGNS THEREOF.

---

THE year closes with dark clouds and thickening portents of storm. The Roman and Eastern Questions are in a state of intense excitation, and the gloomiest anticipations are indulged in by those who look at things with the eye of a mere politician, as may be seen from the subjoined newspaper extracts. Those who contemplate the situation from a prophetic point of view are very differently affected; what inspires the

politician with distrust and apprehension, inspires them with hope and anticipation. The dreadful omens of the political sphere are the brightest points in the firmament of their political vision. They indicate the instant proximity of the great event upon which they have been taught to set their heart. They indicate the arrival of the time when the divinely-appointed ruler of the world, and the Saviour of mankind, will

come forth from the privacy in which he has secluded himself for eighteen hundred years, to lay hold of human affairs with omnipotent hand, and guide them to the glorious issue appointed; when God will be exalted in all the earth, and men will dwell together in righteousness and peace. This issue cannot be reached without a revolution of the most terrible description, involving a time of trouble such as never has been on earth since the organization of the human family into nations. The thrones of the world overturned, armies dispersed, all human power subverted, society disorganized, human life largely destroyed, are events to be accomplished before the Sun of Righteousness can rise with tranquillizing glory upon this sin-cursed and desolated world.

The political occurrences of the passing hour are interesting as the tokens of these coming wonders. They are significant of the future to those who understand the sure word, in which they were foreshadowed centuries ago; to others, they are the fortuitous and meaningless evolutions of history, ever repeating itself. "Behold, I come as a thief; blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments," are words that are loudly trumpeted by passing events.

There has been little change since our last. The conference is abandoned. The leading European Powers refused to take part in it, and the necessity for holding it was done away with by the declarations of the French foreign minister, in the French Chambers, that Italy should never possess herself of Rome, and that France should insist on the faithful execution of the September Convention, that is, on the maintenance of the temporal sovereignty of the Pope. This attitude of the French government has inflamed the Italian nation with the bitterest feeling of animosity, and has developed a warlike determination, which it is difficult (if possible) for the Italians to resist, and which is finding expression in extensive preparations for war. France, already armed to the teeth, responds with increased activity in the arsenal and military depots. The latest telegrams announce the imminence of a rupture. The state of

things in Italy may be learned from the following communication from Florence, written by a statesman, and published in the *Globe* of November 26th.

"There appears to me much danger arising out of the unsatisfactory relations between France and Italy. The public are not aware of the harsh tone of the despatches which reach our Cabinet from the French Foreign Office. Whether the Emperor is cognisant of the language employed by the Marquis de Moustier, we know not. The tone of French diplomacy encourages Rome in its obstinate and insulting attitude towards Italy. Louis Napoleon ought to know that he may be too enthusiastic in encouraging the enemies of his dynasty. The Legitimists and clerical party want to bring about, through the aid of French hostility to Italy, a return of the Bourbons, and a division of Italy into three sections—namely, Rome, Naples, and Upper Italy. That is why you had the Prince of Caserta, and so many Legitimist nobles, fighting with the Pontifical foreign legions. The whole of Italy is now infested with the agents of the exiled sovereigns, who are exciting the Garibaldians to fresh action, and offering them arms and money. The Legitimists and Church party (the Blacks) work with the Republicans (or Reds), who have ever been the dupes of the former. If the present government falls, and the extreme party comes into power, the designs of the Republicans and Clericals will probably triumph. Then will follow a war with France of very brief duration, anarchy, and then the return of the exiled sovereigns. The king, yielding to the storm, abandons Ratazzi for the moment (the man is with him at the Pitti every day.) Menabrea, able, but without much political stamina, without any practical knowledge or tradition of 'power,' brings together a cabinet as ignorant as himself of the way of working a constitutional coach, in a country always accustomed to arbitrary rule and conspiracy. Menabrea finds the army shaken, not in its allegiance, but in its opinion; puzzled by the orders and counter-orders for and against Garibaldi, for and against the Roman question. Ratazzi has contrived to weaken discipline, to sow distrust in the mainstay of this country against Reds and Blacks in the army. Menabrea, anxious for a policy of reconciliation with Rome, for a reasonable settlement of a perplexed question, is met by a storm of insults from Antonelli, and of equally impertinent remarks from the French Foreign Office; and this, with the king still with Ratazzi, still anxious for a league with Prussia, still jealous of French power and prestige, still frightened by his failure at Rome, and the attitude of the Reds."

The *Globe* editorially expresses itself on

the subject as follows :

“ So far as it concerns herself, England has no objection to the temporal sovereignty of the Pope. But every day is bringing into view the fact, that the bitter animosity, the deadly hatred between the Papal and the National parties in Italy, is certain to do permanent damage to the interests of the Catholic church, indeed, to the cause of ecclesiastical establishments everywhere. All the legions of France will not suffice to crush the burning desire of the Italians : but their continued intervention may—will—throw all Italy into a seething mass of revolution. Faint though the external indications be at present, it seems as if Europe has yet another revolution to pass through, and one in which the spirit of nationality will be combined in some quarters with deadly hatred towards what is called “ the reign of the priests.”

The *Telegraph*, of December 11th, concludes a commentary on the proposed conference with the following graphic delineation of the general state of European politics, with special reference to \*

#### THE EASTERN QUESTION.

The conference gone, and the Roman question settled for the moment *ex cathedra*, Europe may imagine that she has a right to some repose. One peril, however, roughly removed, another complication already throws its dark shadow over the unborn year. The new danger to which we refer has its seat in the Northern and Western Provinces of European Turkey, and it is far too widely-spread and serious to be disregarded. For some months an agitation, more or less manifest, has pervaded the land lying between the Adriatic and the Black Sea ; it has now assumed proportions that give rise to grave apprehension. Montenegro, practically independent—wholly so, indeed, as long as she behaves fairly—is discontented. Servia, whose independence is guaranteed by the Powers, not only keeps up but increases her armaments. The Danubian Principalities—always turbulent, though now self-governed, and rejoicing in a ruler of their own choice—are torn with discord and seething with troubles. Bulgaria has, for months, been a prey to an imported agitation. The presumed cause is the example of Crete, where an insurrection, sustained from without, and countenanced by great powers, aims at separation from Turkey. It may be said that the Sultan will do well to cede Crete to Greece, but it can also be answered that such an act would renew the external stimulus which moved the Cretans. Whatever *la haute politique* may recommend, our duty, for the moment, is to signalize this new disturbing force, and to prepare the public for future events. Whence comes the

motive power which sets agitation afoot every one will divine. The very question will seek its answer in the word **RUSSIA**. The condition to which the European Provinces of Turkey have now been brought by ceaseless intrigues is so grave, and the outlook so gloomy, that we feel fully justified in anticipating the bursting of the storm-cloud in the spring of 1868. In short, the new danger, which threatens the peace of the coming year, is the dreaded Eastern question !

Only those who hate repose and delight in turbulence, who listen eagerly for the tramp of armies and the boom of the first gun fired in anger, can look with satisfaction on the present state of Europe. Professions of amity are uttered profusely, but above the smooth tones we hear the rattle of machinery fabricating engines of war. Nations live side by side in seeming friendship, but each keeps a hand on the hilt of the sword ; each accumulates, secretly or openly, stores of arms, munitions, and men, not knowing how soon the friend of to-day may be the foe of to-morrow. We live in a state of armed truce, which a word or an act may close in a moment. Confidence and security have fled, and the merchant, the manufacturer, the labourer, work on from hand to mouth, consoling themselves with the trustful maxim that sufficient for the day is the evil thereof. There are no longer any international relations worthy of the name, save those of commerce. Not one single State can feel secure of its future. The condition of Europe was sufficiently discouraging a week ago. We were all aware of the obstacles which Russia was throwing in the path of Austrian regeneration ; we knew how her intrigues covered the land from the head waters of the Vistula to the Grecian Archipelago and the Adriatic ; we said that France and Germany were watching each other with ill-concealed suspicion, and that no love was lost between Italy and France. But this painful state of things has been rendered far worse by the emphatic approval which the French Chambers have given to the selfish doctrines of M. Thiers. It may be said that what he propounded is nothing new ; that more than once he has shown a total want of foresight, and that the wiser policy of the emperor has prevailed. Yet, such a reflection affords cold comfort ; for the violence of the clerical and political reactionaries has driven the imperial minister to make declarations, which add tenfold to the distrust and *malaise* already prevailing throughout the continent. It is the characteristic of a barbarous society, that every man is on his guard against his neighbour ; and such is the condition, modified by the usages of civilization, toward which nations seem tending. For the hour, however, the comity of nations appears everywhere to be replaced by international intrigue, and true statesmanship, abdicating its function,

leaves peace to be guarded by the doubtful guarantee of suspicions, fear and selfish interest."

The *Morning Star* of December 2nd, usually a peace-preaching paper, has the following comments on the relations between Turkey and her dependencies, which are interesting, as exposing to view the process by which the political Euphrates is being fast evaporated:

"But the Servian Government wants a pretence for a quarrel with the Porte, and so it, of course, regards the killing of ZVETKO as an outrage. Whether it will commence hostilities to obtain satisfaction, and to overthrow the Turkish authority in the present frontier provinces, depends, of course, upon the Court of St. Petersburg; and it is the certainty, that any such enterprise would be countenanced by the Russian Government, that alone renders the course of the Servians of any very great importance. It is very much easier to defend a frontier than to suppress an insurrection, and the Servian army, well equipped, as it may be, would, of itself do the Turkish Government little harm, even occupied, as its forces are, with the Cretan revolt. But if the Servians take the field, they will do it with the assurance of support from Russia. Not that the government of the Czar will declare war against Turkey. Certainly not. But it will feel itself bound, out of its concern for the welfare of the Turkish empire—see the despatches of Prince Gortschakoff—to put a stop to an internecine conflict, if the result seems likely to be unfavourable to the Servians; and having interfered, and paralysed the Turkish government, it will invite Europe to make some fresh arrangements more suitable to its interests than those established by the Treaty of Paris.

The Russian Government has frankly avowed that its object, for the present, is to obtain the autonomy of the christian populations of Turkey, under some kind of vassalage like that of Servia and Roumania; "*cette autonomie*"—to use Prince Gortschakoff's own words—"étant la seule garantie qui inspirerait de la confiance a ces populations." That the christian populations of Turkey might like an autonomy, practically amounting to a perfect independence, may be allowed, but what would become of the Turkish Empire, and who would be benefited but Russia? The example of Servia justifies but too well the reluctance of the Porte to divest itself of its authority over its christian populations. It is said that the consequence of that surrender would be peace and contentment. Unfortunately the Turkish Government has found that every concession it has made has only created fresh demand, whilst weakening its own strength. The Sultan is asked now by Russia to give up all

but a nominal power to Crete. Well, that surrender would, no doubt, save him any further trouble with the Cretans, if his Mussulman subjects would turn a deaf ear to the complaints of their brethren abandoned to the tender mercies of the Cretan christians. But what real peace would it give him? One concession on his part only prepares another difficulty for him. If he gave Crete autonomy, an insurrection would break out in the provinces bordering on Greece. The Greek Government, secure in the protection of Russia and the embarrassments of France, would feed the fire without incurring itself any danger, and in a few weeks we should have Prince Gortschakoff drawing the attention of Europe to the lamentable state of affairs in Turkey, and suggesting the application of the same remedy, say to Thessaly and Epirus, as has just been applied to Crete. Supposing the Great Powers weak and blind enough to urge that concession upon the Turkish Government, and that Government in such a helpless condition that it had no resource but to comply, there would, in a very short time, be another rising of the population—say in Bulgaria—and, in a few years or months, the Sultan would be sovereign of an enormous territory, over hardly an inch of which he would have any real authority. It is idle to talk about satisfying the christians of Turkey, whilst foreign powers continue to stimulate dissatisfaction among them. Look at Servia. Of what real grievance have the Servians to complain? They are really quite independent of Turkey. Only a few months ago the Sultan, at the instance of the Great Powers, withdrew his garrison from the Servian fortresses. Has that concession conciliated the goodwill of the Servians, or satisfied their hatred of the Mussulman? Not at all. A religious war is being preached throughout the country. Every preparation is made for hostilities, and the Government only waits the word for a war, the object of which is of the vaguest, but in which it is believed not the slightest risk will be run.

We do not denounce the Russian government. It is perfectly consistent. It might spare, indeed, its professions of a regard for the maintenance of the integrity and independence of Turkey, which are palpably false. But, in seeking the overthrow of Turkish power, it pursues its traditional policy. Everybody really knows what it aims at, and no Government can be the dupe of its denials."

The *Leader*, of November 23rd, under the heading "The Russian Bugbear again," publishes the following editorial remarks, on the steady expansion of the Russian power, which, as prophetic students know, is another striking sign of the times:

“Russian progress in Central Asia is one of those questions which keep bobbing up on the face of British politics, like some inconvenient corpse, which the murderer cannot sink for ever down to the bottom of its watery grave. After a pretty long disappearance, it has once more come up to the surface, to awaken thrills of long-laid misgivings, in the British mind; especially in the British Indian mind. The “Colossus of the North” is once more figuring grandly in the Indian journals, not in the stationary character of the Rhodian original, but as a kind of Giant Blunderbore, coming along, with appropriate strides, to eat up our poor helpless little empire of Hindostan. Look at him, stalking nearer and nearer. A few minutes ago he was ever so far away; now you can already count his teeth, and the number of movements—if your wits are still about you—after which British India will have passed out of sight, like a choice morsel in the mouth of an expectant hound. There is no denying the broad reality of which our alarmists are making so dreadful an account. Russia

has for years been moving forward, at a pace varying with circumstances, over the wild steppes and amidst the populous cities of central Asia. On one pretext or another, her outposts have gradually been pushed across the Yaxartes, until they are already touching the Oxus. Whole tribes of Kirghises have already owned allegiance to the mighty invader. Of the three old Khanats of Turkistan, Khokand is no longer free; Khiva and Bokhara are apparently doomed to furnish one or more meals for the Python of the North. Mr. Hermann Vambery, in an essay recently contributed to a German review, avows his great surprise at the amount of food that monster has contrived to swallow, in the three years that have passed since his own return to Europe. According to the same stern reprover of English optimists, Afghanistan will, in due time, share the doom of its Turkoman neighbours; and then the still advancing armies of the White Czar will pour their resistless numbers through many different channels into the fertile, ill-guarded plains of Northern Hindostan.”

---

## THE PROPOSED ENLARGEMENT OF THE AMBASSADOR.

---

ON this subject, on which we will have something definite to say to our readers by-and-bye, we make a few quotations from the letters of correspondents, making use, by way of variety and for the better ventilation of the subject, of some adverse expressions of opinion.

“All the brethren here are well pleased with the *Ambassador*, and we will do what in us lies to keep it up. I am afraid that the raising of its price will limit its circulation among outsiders; to prevent this, and keep up the circulation, how would it do to double the price of the copies taken by the brethren, and let those taken by strangers remain at the present rate; but of course this is only a suggestion more feasible be propounded. We will gladly endorse it for perish the thought of the *Ambassador* going down when there is so much need for a valiant and faithful ambassador to contend for the faith in this cloudy and dark day, when the truth has almost perished out of the earth.” W. DEW, Innerleithen.

“We have considered your statement concerning the *Ambassador*. We cannot

for a moment entertain the idea of its being given up. We are quite willing to submit to an increase in price, or otherwise, as may be determined upon, so as not to be deprived of so valuable a medium for the interchange of thought, and as a defence of the truth.”—J. RHODES, Huddersfield.

“I am sorry to learn from this month’s *Ambassador* that your present employment in the Bankruptcy business is likely to come to an end, but we cannot hear of the *Ambassador* being discontinued on that account. Price is out of the question with me, and I think all lovers of the truth will make every effort to keep the *Ambassador* in circulation.”—W. J. TURNER, Stourbridge.

“From October *Ambassador*, received yesterday, I see that what I hoped had disappeared will come about, viz., the closing of the Bankruptcy Court. Your subscribers have now the matter fairly before them, ought the decision to be doubted? If the brotherhood have one or more among them both able and willing to devote all his time and energies to the interests of the truth, will it be otherwise than both a duty and a true pleasure to assist? One of the brethren here, on hearing of possible suspension, said at

once, sooner than that should be, he would, if necessary, double or treble his subscription; and I feel convinced that this would be the general expression of subscribers throughout Canada.

Certain I am that no one of them would think of writing to you as the "literary" brother in Britain I perceive has lately done. Allow me, brother Roberts, to say through the *Ambassador*, as on your behalf that the "reprofe" of such "friends" is to us evidence of its merit in an unmistakable degree. The writer of that letter to you, I venture to say will live to regret it.

But, dear brother, *entre nous*, if you take comfort, or ease, or independence into account, I pray you pause before committing yourself entirely and unreservedly to the *Ambassador*. Some brethren we know are alive more or less to duty; others, we know, unhappily are not. But as I believe you do not allow any of these considerations to have weight as against duty, it will be no use my writing a great deal that I had intended on reading the notice in the October number. And so mentally considering you as committed to the *good cause*, I can only say, that as heretofore, I shall get all I can to take the magazine. But really from present events, how long may any of us be writing and reading any of the aforesaid books."—J. COOMBE, Toronto.

"Rather than have the *Ambassador* stopped, I will pledge myself in the sum of one pound sterling per annum for the mental labour in its production in addition to the price (increased) for its mechanical production either monthly or semi-monthly, as it may be deemed best. It may seem a little out of place to make such a pledge, considering that I am at the present moment clearing off old indebtedness on the *Ambassador* which ought to have been done long ago; but I make the offer in good faith, and trust it will be so received. I believe, however, that the brethren generally will sustain the *Ambassador* at a

price which will leave quite a margin over the cost of printing."—HENRY L. DRAKE, Guelph, Ontario.

"I see, by this month's *Ambassador*, a proposal for an increase in the number of its pages, or its abandonment. I earnestly hope the brethren will rather see it trebled in price than lose such an excellent and useful publication. I don't like to hear of abandoning such a noble work begun. I have derived much good from it, and know that it is at present very instrumental in spreading the truth. May God bless you with wisdom, and words, and money for its future welfare."—J. HEDGLEY, Devonport.

'With regard to the proposition that the *Ambassador* should be advanced in its price, we had rather it were doubled than it should fail. I think with the Doctor that it ought to be raised to such a price as would maintain yourself and family. We take four at Ripponden, which come with the Halifax parcel."—F. CHEETHAM, Ripponden.

"I notice in the *Ambassador* just received, that you propose enlarging next year; I think every lover of the truth will say *Amen*. Enlarge, or issue semi-monthly, by all means, but don't desert your post till the master arrives, if it can possibly be avoided; the time is at hand beyond all doubt; let us be found actively engaging in his service when he comes."—W. H. HACKING, Listowell, C. W.

An interesting and emphatic letter (of approval) from brother Packham, Guelph, C. W. has been mislaid.

Brother T. WILLIAMS, writing for the ecclesia at Mumbles, says that at a special meeting, a resolution was adopted approving of the enlargement of the *Ambassador* at an increased price.

Brother CLARK, of Glasgow, communicates a similar resolution on behalf of the ecclesia in that city.

[THE OTHER SIDE OF THE QUESTION.—  
We are obliged, for want of space, to keep over till next month.]

---

## THE BEGINNING OF THE END AND THE THREE DAYS OF TROUBLE.

This is the beginning of the end.  
How awful, yet sublime, the events  
Belonging to that end!  
All the kingdoms of the world,

In a few short years, shall be o'erthrown,  
And be no more. But how know we  
This is a certainty and not a dream?  
We see it by the light of God's own word.

The stranger asks "Where is the testimony,  
And in what quarter are the signs  
Of dissolution visible?" Daniel and John in  
chief  
Furnish the unmistakable predictions;  
While from the Holy Land, the western sky  
appears o'ercast;  
And peals of thunder rend the heavy clouds.  
In the far north, rises a mighty host;  
(Ezek. xxxviii, 15.)  
Their king obeys the Spirit's voice.  
"Prepare thyself," (verse 7.) subdue the  
neighbouring nations,  
Unite and lead them to the East. (Dan xi, 41, 45.)  
The many days (Eze. xxxvii, 8), are fast  
expiring,  
The glorious land receives her captive sons;  
(xxxvi, 8.)  
See how they dwell unguarded!  
Rich in gold, and flocks, and goods, (xxxviii,  
11, 12.)  
Are they not an easy prey?  
Gog, the northern king, has heard the  
summons.  
The quarrels of the nations (Rev. ii, 18.)  
weaken them,  
And strengthen him.  
"He ladeth himself with thick clay;"  
(Hab. ii, 6.)  
The fragile kingdoms of the feet and toes.  
(Dan. ii, 41-43.)  
He feels himself a covering,\* a Gog.  
Scythians, Persians, Galls and Greeks,  
And even Afric's swarthy sons, compose  
His bands.—(Ezek. xxxviii, 2, 5, 6.)  
His wings are heard from far.—(verse 9;  
Dan. xi, 48.)  
Like an eagle darting on his prey,  
He strikes the Israelitish fold.—(Zec. xiv, 2.)  
This is the time of Israel's greatest trouble,  
(Jer. xxx, 7.)  
And the period well agrees  
With the other two.

\* \* \* \*

The spies in forty days of toil  
Surveyed the land, with false report returning

\* Gog signifies a covering.

Laid a burden on the waiting tribes.  
Then came the forty years of trial,  
Solaced by wise counsels of the meekest man,  
Prepared by slavery and merciful severity  
They earned a free retreat.  
Freedom forged their chains; time put them on,  
And when the greater Moses came  
It was a time of trouble. The tribes  
Heard not the great Deliverer's voice.  
These days were also forty years,  
Reckoning from the anointing to the city's  
sack and ruin,\*  
And the rapt seer has measured forty more  
To purge the nation clean. †  
Three days of trouble these,  
Of forty years apiece.

\* \* \* \*

While the Assyrian's roaring on his prey,  
Judah's gentle prince steps forth, (Dan. xii, 1;  
Jer. xxx, 7, 23.)  
He stands, but not as at the first,  
For smiting on the cheek, (Micah v, 1.)  
He stands begirt with power;  
The ancient platform of his dread discourse  
Is cleft beneath his feet.—(Matt. xxiv, 3;  
Zec. xiv, 4.)  
The voice of Israel's king  
Is heard through all the land. The robber  
Trembling quits his grasp upon  
The fainting prey, and loses  
All the spoil; (Is. xvii, 14.) blindness, madness,  
And a hundred woes torment his guilty soul.  
(Eze. xxxviii, 21, 22.)  
His pains infect his bands;  
From all the vales and hills their death-cry  
Mingles with the raging storm. (v. 22.) Alone  
secure  
Stands Israel's tower of strength.  
The voice that slew the robber (Isa. xvii, 14.)  
wakes the dead,  
And gathers them to judgment;

\* Jesus was 30 at his immersion, [Luke iii, 23,] and Jerusalem was destroyed about 40 years after, or A.D. 72.

† [Mi. vii, 15.]—According to the days, &c. (v. 9.) of thy coming out of the land of Egypt will I show unto him marvellous things.



Not all that slept, but "many," (Dan. xii, 2.)  
 The rest shall never rise.—(Isa. xxvi, 14.)  
 The judge of all the earth is seated,  
 And to the final bar are summoned  
 Quick and dead, to give account of deeds  
 Done in the body, and in body to receive  
 What they have done, whether good or bad.  
 (2 Cor. v, 10.)  
 Nor is the judgment that of fleshly sense.—  
 (Isa. ii, 3.)

The piercing eye of Spirit  
 Tries the hearts, and reins, and sifts  
 The inmost thoughts. Yet mercy  
 Tempers justice, and the honest frailties are  
 forgiven.  
 And now apart they stand;  
 These to life ordained, those to shame and  
 death.

"Z,"

## INTELLIGENCE.

**BEITH**—Brother Gillies, writing Dec. 18, announces the immersion at Galston, Ayrshire, of Dr. Ramsey of that place. Dr. Ramsey has been enquiring his way to the truth for a lengthened period, and has finally embraced it with full purpose of heart. This result will doubtless be detrimental to his professional interests, but should it be the will of God that he suffer in this way, he will have the consolation of knowing that a special recompence awaits those who patiently endure for the truth's sake. "If we suffer, we shall also reign with him; if we deny him, he also will deny us." Bro. Gillies also states that on Sunday, Nov. 18, bro. Chas. Smith of Edinburgh, delivered a lecture in Beith, on "The absolute necessity of believing that the earth is the only inheritance promised by God," and again on Tuesday on "What does Jesus mean when he says 'My kingdom is not of this world?'" Both lectures were well attended.

**BIRMINGHAM**.—During the month, there have been two immersions—the obedient believers in both instances being persons from a distance. The first was **WILLIAM NEWPORT**, (23), confectioner and baker, 3, Claremont buildings, Weston-super-Mare; this brother was attracted to the truth in the first instance by hearing Mr. Dealtry at Weston-super-Mare. He was formerly a Plymouth brother, but at the time of Mr. Dealtry's visit, had reached that state of enquiry which prepared him to hear with profit. Subsequent reading for eighteen months, enabled him to lay hold of the truth with assurance, and he came to Birmingham to render the obedience required. Bro. Newport has hope of several in the same town with himself, and intends doing something in the way of conversational meetings to enlighten sincere enquirers. The other case is that of **ALBERT WALTER POOLE**, (17), designer, 6, Bromsgrove-st., Kidderminster, who acquired a knowledge of the truth through contact with one of the Birmingham

brethren who came originally from Kidderminster. His reception of the truth has awakened the hostility of relations.—In Birmingham there is a large number of interested learners of the truth who are on the eve of yielding obedience. The attendance at the Tuesday night lectures has diminished, owing doubtless to the non-continuance of public notification, and the prevalence of Christmas festivity. Those who come (to the number of about 100) are, however, those who wish to know the truth.—On Friday, Dec. 27, there was an open tea meeting, when many interested strangers were present, in addition to the brethren. Brothers W. D. Jardine, J. J. Andrew and Arthur Andrew were also present on the occasion. Bro. Bailey occupied the chair, and several addresses relating to the truth were delivered. At intervals, the assembly sang Christadelphian anthems, and a profitable evening was spent. Before dispersion, there was introduced to notice, on behalf of the managing brethren, a pamphlet prepared for the ecclesia, containing a verified statement of the faith; a scripturally supported specification of the fables to be refused, an enumeration of the arrangements adopted for the guidance of ecclesial affairs, the various meetings held, with a statement of their objects and mode of procedure, the names and duties of official brethren; and a list of the names and addresses of the brethren and sisters, constituting a complete "RECORD OF THE BIRMINGHAM CHRISTADELPHIAN ECCLESIA." The pamphlet extends over 34 pages, of a size convenient for the pocket, and is issued at 4d. Brethren at a distance can be supplied should they so desire.

**GLASGOW**.—Bro. W. Clark, writing on the 23rd ult., announces the immersion of Mrs. Hamilton and her daughter Agnes, on the previous Sunday week. He says of them that they formerly belonged to the U. P. section of the Apostacy, but were upset in their religious convictions by a perusal of

*Twelve Lectures*, which he says "left them like Noah's dove without a resting place for the sole of their foot, or rather in a worse position, for they could not go back to the house from whence they came out. They set themselves earnestly to the study of the word, and not knowing there was a meeting in Glasgow where these things are taught. They were thrown entirely upon their own resources, until your arrival and lectures in Glasgow, when they were made aware of the fact, and have taken advantage of the help thus providentially thrown in their way."

**HALIFAX.**—The brethren here have suffered a deprivation in the removal of Bro. Shuttleworth to Whitby, to which he has been transferred through facilities afforded by the friends of the truth in the latter place. The cause of the truth as a whole, will gain by the change. Though the Halifax ecclesia will suffer loss, they will receive benefit in the stimulus brought to bear upon some of its number, who may hitherto have felt no special necessity for making the best of the gifts God has given them; while as regards Whitby, (of which more next month), the change will directly contribute to develop a harvest from the field there broken up, but not put into agricultural trim, by the labours of Mr. Dealtry. Previous to his departure, bro. Shuttleworth gave a farewell course of lectures on the following subjects;—

Man's degradation, constitutionally, socially, and politically.

The political and religious nostrums of the would-be-teachers of the 19th century, weighed in the balances of the testimony and found wanting.

The Deity's purpose concerning the kingdoms of men.

The gospel or the good news concerning the Deity's purpose to establish a dominion of righteousness and truth in all the earth.

The certainty of the near approach of the anointed King of Israel, and the consequences thereof to the believing and unbelieving people of the earth.

**HUDDERSFIELD.**—Bro. Rhodes writes as follows:—Since the formation of the ecclesia here about nine months ago, we have been endeavouring to progress in the truth by a constant application to the word of God, not content to rest in first principles, but to press forward towards perfection in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. We are few in number, but united in the faith once delivered to the saints. We have not hitherto been able to come much in contact with the public, but we contemplate doing something to make ourselves known, so as to have an opportunity of offering the saving truth to our fellow-men.

**KIDDERMINSTER.**—See Birmingham intelligence.

**LONDON.**—The brethren here have commenced a series of Sunday evening meetings for the ventilation of the truth in the metropolis. They have issued notices worded as follows:

"Search the Scriptures."—(John v, 39.)  
"The Holy Scriptures are able to make thee wise unto salvation."—(2 Tim., iii, 15.) A MEETING is held every Sunday Evening, at the School Room, 59, Stamford Street, Blackfriars Road, for the purpose of investigating the Scriptures, which all seekers after truth are earnestly invited to. The subjects examined comprise

- The Second Advent of Jesus.
- His Reign for 1,000 years on earth.
- The Restoration of the Jews.
- The Nature of Man.
- The Reward of the Righteous
- The Destiny of the Wicked.
- The Nature of the Devil.
- The Nature of the Holy Spirit.
- The Nature of Jesus Christ.
- The Ordinance of Baptism.

There have been two immersions, of which we have not been supplied with particulars.

**MUMBLES.**—Brother T. Williams announces the immersion of the following individuals, after a profession of faith in the things set forth in the ancient gospel, concerning Christ as the deliverer of fallen man from all the woes in which he is involved through sin—**JANE BENNET, MARY BENNET, and CATHERINE BENNET;** also, **ANDREW HORNEY** and his wife, **MARY ANN.**

**NOTTINGHAM.**—Brother Phelps, writing December 17th, states that on the 3rd ult., the brethren in Nottingham held their annual social meeting. After tea, brother Turney delivered an address on *The First Principles of the Oracles of God.* Enquiring strangers were present; and it is hoped that good may be the result. Brother Turney has commenced a course of twelve Sunday evening lectures, which, so far, have been well attended. The subjects are as follow:

- The Coming Kingdom.
- Jesus Christ the Universal King.
- No Kingdom beyond the Skies taught in the Bible.
- The Restoration of the Jews and Re-establishment of the Kingdom of Israel.
- No Hell nor Devil as generally supposed.
- Sin, or the Devil and Satan of the Scriptures.
- The Destruction of the Devil and his Works by Jesus Christ.
- The Return and Personal Reign of Christ on the Throne of David, rebuilt.
- The Formation and Nature of Man, or no immortal principle in Sinful Flesh.
- Eternal Life, a Conditional Gift.

Only one Gospel in the Bible, all others Shams.

The One Faith, without which it is impossible to please God.

The Signs of the Times, and Way of Escape from Impending Destruction.

WESTON-SUPER-MARE.—See Birmingham Intelligence.

WHITBY.—Brother and sister Shuttleworth (transferred from Halifax) have settled here, taking up their abode at 8, Grey street. Breaking of bread has for the meantime been suspended among the friends of the truth gathered by the labours of Mr. Dealtry. The reason of this is that they have seen the fallacy of the belief upon which their immersion was based, that Jesus was the son of Joseph; and are progressing toward a mature comprehension of the truth in its several details. Upon this new foundation they desire to place themselves, and will shortly be re-immersed and organized as a Christadelphian ecclesia.

WISHAW.—Brother Kirkwood, writing December 24th, says that brother Ellis visited Wishaw on the previous Sunday, and gave two lectures; one in the morning on Heaven, when the attendance was scant, and one in the evening on Hell, when there was a crowded house. There was some degree of opposition at the second meeting. Brother Kirkwood thinks that some impression for good has been made.

#### UNITED STATES.

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.—Brother W. A. Harris, of this place, writing to Brother Andrew, of London, on the 2nd of December, makes

the following observations in reference to a division that has recently taken place, among the professors of the truth in that republican city: "We have taken this position, that we will not fellowship those who teach and believe in a superhuman devil, or who do not believe in the saints appearing in body at the judgment-seat of Christ, there to receive the approval or condemnation resulting from our probationary career. This separates us from the mass of those who profess to be of the one faith and also from those in this city from whom we withdrew, who have now taken the position that the saints come up in immortal bodies to receive rewards, and not to the scriptural judgment of life and death. Thus they pervert and wrest the scriptures to their own destruction. *Anastasis* they do not seem to think much of: it is too philosophical they say; as though it was not full of scriptural proof, and (to my mind) as perfect an exposition as could be obtained from an uninspired man. You know pretty well the arguments brought against the mortal resurrection and judgment: one of the most absurd I ever heard is as follows: "For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven."—(Matt. xxii, 35.) This they take to prove that a man is immortal, and like the angels the moment he comes out of the ground, when, if they examined the scriptures, and understood them, they would see in Luke xx, 36, a perfect explanation, shewing that those who are "accounted worthy of that world," are the ones who shall be made like unto the angels, immortal and glorious, and no others."

## NOTES.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.—The answer to "W. O.," intended for this number, is unavoidably held over. We have many queries on hand, which will be attended to as opportunity allows.

The EDITOR acknowledges contributions from "J. G." and "W. H.," towards the labours of brother Robertson in the north. Another brother has mentioned good intentions in the matter.

THE PROPOSED VISIT OF DR. THOMAS TO BRITAIN.—We have a goodly number of responses to this proposal. We shall give

extracts from letters next month. We should have done so in the present issue had time and space permitted. In the meantime, let those who have not spoken make known their mind.

"WHO WAS THE FATHER OF JESUS CHRIST?"—We have a partial answer from Mr. Dealtry to our remarks on his letter on this subject. There is no room this month to deal with it, but, should he favour us in time with the whole of his reply, we hope to publish it, with a complete rejoinder, next month.

# THE AMBASSADOR

## Of the Coming Age.

---

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

---

---

No. 44.

FEBRUARY, 1868.

Vol. V.

---

---

### MODERN HEATHENISM;

STYLED IN SCRIPTURE "DAMNABLE HERESIES."—2 Peter ii, 1.

---

SPECULATORS of the Romanist and Protestant types teach :

1. That the priests and parsons of what they term "Christendom" are the divinely called and sent ambassadors of Jesus Christ.

2. These "Ministers of Satan," styling themselves "Successors of the Apostles" (2 Cor. xi, 13-15; Rev. ii, 2), unscripturally affirm that men are all born into the world with "souls" in their bodies, that are incorruptible and deathless particles of the Divine Essence.

3. They assert that these "immortal souls," of every age and sex, go at death to purgatory or "hell;" or direct to a heaven "beyond the realms of time and space;" which is equivalent to *nowhere!*

4. In effect, they teach that a man may be the most disgusting wretch that ever cursed society, yet he may be saved in their heaven, by "the consolations" of their "divinity," ministered by them in the article of death!—John iii, 15: Yea, even upon the scaffold.

5. They ignorantly teach that death is not death; but only a change in the mode of "the soul's" existence!

6. They absurdly affirm that when new born babes and children die, they become winged angels in heaven, and guardian spirits to their friends on earth!

7. They teach that when sprinkled or poured upon at the font, and signed with the "sign of the cross" (which is "the Mark of the Beast"—Rev. xiii, 16; xiv, 9, 10), an infant is regenerated by the Holy Spirit, and incorporated into his holy church!"

8. They say that sinners are "justified by faith alone;" that is, by faith in their dogmas; which is manifestly false according to James ii, 24, 26, who affirms the contrary.

9. Some of them say that "all men will be saved," not omitting Judas; others, only "the elect" of the Calvin type.

10. Some unscripturally assert that there is a personal, black, IMMORTAL DEVIL, with horns, hoofs, and tail, who is the tormentor of "immortal souls" eternally in Hell; which, wherever it may be, is a furnace of material fire burning with brimstone; and that, at the last day, DEATHLESS souls will be raised from DEATH to judgment!

11. Others perversely say that there is no judgment for what they term "the saints," after death—Heb. ix, 27. That they are projected from the grave immortal, which is their judgment!

12. The clergy teach that the first day of the week is the Sabbath, and hallowed by the Mosaic Law!—a tradition worthy of the blind leaders of the blind.

13. Instead of preaching "goodwill among men," they set them by the ears; and teach them to destroy one another by war, in the name of "patriotism" and religion.

14. These being their premisses, they inculcate "*aspirit*," and preach "*a Jesus*" and "*a Gospel*," which the Apostles of Christ did not preach; and which, therefore, convicts them of being the ACCURSED HIERARCHY OF SATAN.—2 Cor. xi, 4: Gal. i, 6-9.

"CRY ALOUD, AND SPARE NOT!"—Isai. lviii, 1.

## OPPOSED TO ALL THESE GENTILE BLASPHEMIES

ARE THE FOLLOWING PRINCIPLES OF

"THE PATIENCE AND FAITH OF THE SAINTS."

THE Temple of Truth, built by Eternal Wisdom, is a system of doctrine, whose Seven Pillars are the "Unity of the Spirit," which consists of the One Body, One Spirit, One Hope of the Calling, One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism, One Deity and Father of all, through all, and in all "the faithful in Christ Jesus."—Eph. iv, 4. The *Brethren of Christ*, or CHRISTADELPHIANS (*Christou adelphoi*), who are really such, believe and maintain that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament teach:

1. That all things were made by "*the Spirit*" of the ETERNAL FATHER, which Spirit is styled by the Apostles "THE WORD OF THE DEITY."—John i, 1-5; Gen. i, 2; Rev. xix, 11, 13.

2. That the ETERNAL FATHER, "who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; *whom no man hath seen, nor can see*" (1 Tim. vi, 16), did, by his angel at the bush, reveal a Name to Moses, by which he chose to be known. This is a name

prophetic of a multitude, styled the "One Body," of which Christ is the Head; and is contained in the "*Memorial*," correctly rendered into English, "I WILL BE WHO I WILL BE." *I will be*, converted into a proper noun, gives the Hebrew name YAH, or YAH-WEH, commonly pronounced *Jehovah*.—Exod. iii, 13-15; vi, 3.

3. That by this same Spirit, or Power, the Father Spirit, prepared "*a body*" (Heb. x, 5) out of the substance of Mary; and named it before its formation, YAH-SHUA, or Yehoshua, HE SHALL BE, *the Saviour*: in Greek, *Jesous*, or JESUS: and that when about thirty years old, he was anointed with the same spirit and with power.—Luke i, 35; Acts x, 3.

4. That this Jesus Anointed was the ETERNAL INVISIBLE FATHER, *by his spirit*, manifested in the nature that sinned in Eden's Garden; that when nailed to the Cross, the Father forsook him in withdrawing his spirit from him (Matt. xxvii, 46); that when he died, his death was "the condemnation of sin in the flesh" (Rom. viii, 3); and that in so dying, he bare the sins of his brethren in his own body to the tree.—1 Pet. ii, 24.

5. That on the third day, he was brought to life again, and left the sepulchre; and that after this, he "*ascended*," in the twinkling of an eye, from the nature crucified, to a *powerful nature*, styled "spirit of holiness," which is the exact likeness of the Father's substance; and that forty days afterwards, he was "*taken up*" to the right hand of power. Thus, he was "*perfected*," or "*justified by spirit*," and "*received up into glory*."—Acts i, 9; 1 Tim. iii, 16; Heb. i, 3; Luke xiii, 32; 1 Cor. xv, 20, 52, 45; Rom. i, 4.

6. That he was delivered to death for the offences, and raised for the justification, of all who believe "*the things concerning the KINGDOM OF THE DEITY, and of the NAME of Jesus Christ*;" and being immersed on this belief, "walk not after the flesh," but "*patiently continue in well doing to the end*."—Rom iv, 24, 25; Acts viii, 12; Rom. ii, 4-7; viii, 1; Matt. xxviii, 19, 29; Mark xvi, 16.

7. That there will be a resurrection of just and unjust persons when Christ comes in power; that *all* bodies coming out of the earth are "earthly," or *natural*; and that of these, all whose account of themselves shall be deemed acceptable by Him, will "*be clothed upon, that MORTALITY may be swallowed up of life*."—Acts xxiv, 15; Matt. xvi, 27; 2 Cor. v, 4; 1 Cor. xv, 46, 47.

8. That *immortality* is deathlessness; or *life manifested through INCORRUPTIBLE BODY*. It is promised with glory and honor, to *none* but those who shall be able to "*stand in the judgment*;" and these are they only, who understand and walk in the truth. "Man who is in honor, and *understandeth not*, is like the beasts that perish."—Ps. i, 5, 6; xlix, 20.

9. That the just and unjust, or all that have been enlightened, must stand before the judgment seat of Christ, when every one shall give account of himself; and receive *through the body*, according to what he hath done, whether good or bad.—Rom. xiv, 10, 12; 2 Cor. v, 10.

10. That Christ comes as a thief. His political mission is to

regenerate and re-establish the Hebrew Nation and kingdom in the Holy Land ; to abolish all " the powers that be," temporal and spiritual ; and subject all nations to the saints ;" who are the glorified aggregate of the prophetic NAME.—Therefore *Hallelu-YAH*.

JOHN THOMAS, M.D.

---

## THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF JUDGMENT.

---

BY J. J. ANDREW, LONDON.

ALMOST the only passage in which the resurrection of one class at the beginning of the Millennium is founded, is contained in the 20th chapter of Revelations: " The rest of the dead lived not again, until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection."—verse 5. " Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection : on such the second death hath no power."—verse 6. Respecting the 5th verse, it should be known that, to say the least, it is of doubtful authority, for it is not to be found in two of the most ancient and reliable manuscripts—the Vatican and the Syriac. This of itself should lead all who place so much importance on it to re-consider the theory of which it is the corner-stone ; a theory which introduces into Scripture nothing but discord. But even if it be accepted as genuine, it does not afford sufficient support for affirming the resurrection of only one class. The usual way, and the only sound one, of harmonising apparent contradictions, is to take that view which is supported by the most emphatic and abundant testimony, and then to ascertain how those passages of less force and emphasis can be reconciled with it. (*See foot note, p. 31.*) If this mode be adopted with the verses under consideration, the only conclusion arrived at, will be that they cannot teach anything which would contradict the clear and abundant testimony already produced. There are difficulties in their interpretation at first sight, we freely admit, but let them be carefully examined with the context, and we are confident that all such difficulties will be satisfactorily cleared away.

The chapter opens with a declaration concerning the binding of Satan for a thousand years ; that is, the depriving the political and ecclesiastical manifestations of the adversary—sin in the flesh—of the power and authority which they at present possess. This event cannot be fully accomplished until the end of the storm-period, which is to precede the thousand years, because the punishments to be inflicted on the nations during that time of great trouble, is for the purpose of subduing them to the authority of the Messiah. Until this period is at an end, it cannot be said that " An angel laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil and Satan, and bound him a thousand years."—verse 2.

In the accomplishment of this result, the resurrected righteous are to take part, for David writes " Let the saints be joyful in glory ; let them

sing aloud upon their beds. Let the high praises of God be in their mouth, and a two-edged sword in their hand; *to execute vengeance upon the people*; to bind their kings with chains, and their nobles with fetters of iron; *to execute upon them the judgment written: this honor have all his saints.*”—Psalm cxlix, 5 to 9. Such being the case, it follows that the judgment of God's household must be long past, and the judgment of the nations at an end, when Satan is bound for a thousand years.

We see, therefore, that this chapter begins by describing *events which follow*, and not precede, *the resurrection of the dead in Christ at his advent*—events too, which cannot possibly take place until the resurrection, and the events immediately connected with it, are all over. When the existing rulers are deprived of their authority, it will be necessary for their places to be occupied by some other persons; and these, as we well know, are the immortalised saints. Very appropriately, therefore, the statement about Satan's binding, is followed by a description of these saints after they have assumed that "power over the nations" promised to all who overcome the lusts of this world. "And I saw thrones, and *they who 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."—verse 4. For these events to be fulfilled, the millennium must have actually commenced; consequently, the verses which immediately follow can only be viewed from this stand-point: we must imagine ourselves reading them during, or at the beginning of the thousand years. What then, is meant by the phrase "This is the first resurrection?" Is it not the state of things described in the preceding verse? An affirmative answer is the only logical one that can be given, because the word "this" necessitates an allusion to something which has just gone before. The previous part of the chapter says nothing whatever about the bringing forth of the dead from the grave; but, on the contrary, describes only results which are subsequent to that event. The word "resurrection," therefore, must denote the state of things during the thousand years, and not the raising of the dead to life. This was the period or condition which Paul referred to when he said "If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead."—(Philip iii, 11.)

His desire was not simply to be raised from the death-state, because he knew that this event of itself would not produce blessings; for, as he had himself declared, "there shall be a resurrection of the dead: both of the just and *unjust.*"—(Acts xxiv, 15.) His desire was to attain to that resurrection-state which succeeds the restoration of the dead to life and the judgment. It is in harmony with this use of the "resurrection," that Jesus says "They that have done good (shall come forth) *unto the resurrection of life*, and they that have done evil (shall come forth) *unto the resurrection of damnation.*"—(John v, 29.)

The "resurrection of life" to which the righteous are to come forth from their graves, is that state wherein they will enjoy immortality, but



the "resurrection of damnation" to which the unrighteous are to come forth from their graves, is merely that state of punishment which lasts until their final destruction. That this extended meaning of "resurrection" was well understood by the Jews of that day, is evident from the conversation between Jesus and the Sadducees on a future life, in the course of which the latter said "*In the resurrection*, whose wife of them is she?"—(Luke xx, 33.) To confine the meaning of the word in this sentence to the mere raising out of the graves is to reduce the question to an absurdity: but to view it as denoting the eternal state which results from the resurrection to life, is simply to interpret it in the most obvious manner. It is in precisely this sense that it is used in the Apocalypse in the passage under consideration: "This is the first resurrection." The resurrection-state is the sitting on thrones and reigning with Christ a thousand years.

Having now defined the meaning of the most important word in the above sentence, it will not be difficult to show what is signified by the one which precedes it. The word "first" is generally supposed to be confined to time, but this is a mistake; the original word comprehends both time and position or dignity, as will be seen by the following definition from *Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon*:

"*πρῶτος* (prôtos); first, foremost, of number or place; first, earliest of time; first prize, foremost, won; first of all, above all."

It is probably true that first in time is the primary meaning, but surely no one would assert that this excludes the use of the secondary meaning, when such is required. That the writers of the New Testament did frequently apply the secondary meaning—first in position—is proved by the following extracts: "And whosoever will be *chief* (prôtos) among you, let him be your servant."—(Matt. xx, 27.) "Herod on his birthday made a supper to his lords, high captains, and *chief* (prôtos) men of Galilee."—(Mark vi, 21.) "The high priests and the Scribes, and the *chief* (prôtos) of the people sought to destroy him."—(Luke 19, 47.) "The Jews stirred up the devout and honourable women, and the *chief* (prôtos) men of the city."—(Acts xiii, 50.) "And from thence to Philippi, which is the *chief* (prôtos, translated "first" in the margin) city of that part of Macedonia."—(Acts xvi, 12.) "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am *chief* (prôtos)."—(1 Tim., i, 15.) See also Acts xvii, 4; xxv, 2; xxviii, 7, 17.

In every one of these passages, the word which is translated "chief" is the same as that which is translated "first" in Rev. xx, 5, 6. Thus we have the authority of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Paul for the application of the secondary meaning of the word prôtos, rendered by our translators as "chief." Whether, therefore, it is used in the primary or secondary sense must be determined by the context.

As we have already ascertained that the word "resurrection" here denotes a state or condition, and also that there are two resurrection-states—one good and the other bad—it is not difficult to perceive that in the passage in question, prôtos means first in point of dignity or

importance, not of time; and should, therefore, be translated "chief" like the instances already quoted. A confirmation of this is to be found in the verse which follows: "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first (chief) resurrection: *on such, the second death hath no power.*" The "second death" is the consummation of the punishment to be inflicted on the unrighteous, and is, therefore, the conclusion of the resurrection-state of damnation. But those who come forth to the resurrection-state of life will not be subjected to the second death, and hence the state of things in which they have a part or portion is very appropriately called "the chief resurrection."

After what has already been said about the stand-point from which the first six verses in Rev. xx should be viewed, it will not be difficult to decide what is meant by the parenthetic sentence in the 5th verse: "But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished." If this were represented as being uttered previous to the appearing of the Messiah, it would prove that no one was to be brought to life until the end of the millennium; and if it were uttered after the resurrection of the righteous only, it would prove that the unrighteous would continue in the death-state for one thousand years longer. But, as we have already demonstrated, that there is to be a resurrection of two classes at the advent, and that the "first resurrection" signifies the immortality-state subsequent to the judgment, neither of these suppositions can be maintained. We must then survey it from the time described in the first four verses—that period when Satan is bound, and the thousand years reign has commenced. By this time, the unjust who have to appear at the judgment-seat of Christ, will have received through the body according to their bad deeds, and will, consequently, after suffering their many or few stripes, have been "punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power," which is the second death. Hence, they will be forgotten, and be taken no further account of, for they will have no more "a portion in anything that is done under the sun." Who then are "the rest of the dead who lived not until the thousand years were finished?" Are they not persons who have died subsequent to the second advent? This certainly appears to be the most obvious meaning. It seems to be for the purpose of shewing that no further resurrection of the dead to life will take place "until the thousand years were finished." And here we would ask whether the words "were *finished*" do not in themselves imply that the thousand years had already begun? Taking them into conjunction with the preceding part of the chapter, we know that such must be the case, because some of the events described pertain only to the millennial age. A remembrance of this fact is the key to a correct interpretation of the two verses just considered, and it affords, we believe, the best (if not the only) solution of the difficulties which arise from a superficial examination.

---

It is said by some that because the Apocalypse is the last revelation from God, it possesses more authority than any previous book, and that, consequently, its teaching in

---

SUNDAY MORNING AT THE CHRISTADELPHIAN SYNAGOGUE,  
BIRMINGHAM.—No. 3.

---

*From Phonetic Notes by brother JOHN BUTLER.*

---

ONCE more we find ourselves in the profitable company of those who, though they be dead, yet speak, that is, the servants of God who were authorised to make known God's mind. It is a very good thing for us that what they did make known has been preserved; for if that word had been destroyed, we should have found ourselves in a very different state of things from that in which we are placed this morning. Our being what we are is in great measure due to the influence of the Bible operating through a long line of ancestry. The superiority of our civilization is entirely owing to the circumstances that the word of God at an early time, was allowed free course in this country. The moral ideas radiating from the Bible, have circulated freely in the minds of the people, and in the long run, have tended to the development of a higher type than natively belongs to Britons. The ideas in a man's mind have much to do in determining the bent of his growth. People who are ignorant of the high principles of the word of God, speedily degenerate from a naturally high type, and their children present an exaggeration of their own inferiority, and where the process is uninterrupted, it ends in barbarism. This is illustrated in the

cases of nations that have gone down to the very bottom of the scale until they are just on the verge of equality with the brutes. Our forefathers were men who painted their bodies, and performed bloody religious rites; in the present stage of the world's history, the English nation stands in the van of civilization. She owes her position to the unconscious impregnation of Jewish ideas through many centuries. Now, what the Bible has done in a general way for our nation as a nation, it has done, in particular, for us as individuals. It has diverted our career from objectless existence into the channel of intelligent, and noble, and elevating purpose. It has arrested moral degeneracy, and given an upward bent to our growth. It has opened a way out of darkness, and sin, and wretchedness, and death, into a pathway that guides to light and life, and joy for ever. It has rescued us from the vanity of mistaken, and fruitless, and disappointing schemes, and given us, in Christ, a purpose of life that adequately engages every energy, and bears the glorious fruit of an undimmed and exhaustless future of life and love. Yet its highest result to us is still a problem. Success in the destiny to which it invites us is contingent on success in this preliminary stage of moral probation.

---

regard to the resurrection, has superseded that of former revelations. This is the reason they adduce for placing so much reliance upon Rev. xx, 6, to prove that only one class will be raised at the second advent. In doing so, however, they not only make one part of the Bible contradict another—which is never the case when a truth is revealed by degrees—but they actually introduce confusion into the Apocalypse itself. In proof of this, we need only refer to Rev. xi, 18, and Rev. xvi, 15, the fulfilment of which passages necessitates the restoration to life of the unjust at the second advent. The former shews it to be necessary, in order that they may be "judged," and the latter, that others may "see their shame."

It must conquer us now before it will glorify us then. It entirely depends upon the extent to which we submit ourselves to it, as to how thoroughly it will do this. It can take us up to God, but we must climb. Those who submit themselves much to the Bible's influence, will, gradually and insensibly, approach nearer and nearer the end to which it leads. Progress either upwards or downwards is for the time being, an unconscious process. You do not feel which way you are going. But after a lapse of time, if you stand and look back, you can see which way you have gone, whether you have become more worldly-minded, more selfish, more insensible to divine things, or more and more awake to the higher relations of being disclosed in the Bible. It is a very pleasant experience to feel that you are making progress, but you cannot make progress unless you submit yourself to that which will induce your progress, and the only way to make certain of our progress in relation to the truth is to be continual readers of the Word—to continually submit our minds to the action of those ideas that have been evolved by the spirit through the prophets and apostles. But of course, there is a limit of wisdom to this which must be observed. A man might shut himself off entirely from intercourse with other people, and become a private student in the sense of seclusion, but this would not be a favourable or a legitimate method of study. Such a man would certainly derive benefit, and become spiritually minded in certain directions, but the benefit would only be partial. Only one side of his mind would be trained, and the result would be defective, both to himself and others. God does not intend us to be monks or hermits. He never intended that man should be alone;—the very opposite—

His intention is to develop a family—a multitude whom no man can number. He therefore calls upon us to submit ourselves to those circumstances which have reference to His ultimate purpose. He asks us to mingle with the brethren and sisters, as well as study. This fact is conspicuously exemplified in the table; the very object of its institutions is to bring us together to unite us in a collective act of remembrance. This remembrance has many sides. The faith that we profess has not exclusive reference to Jesus. It has preponderating reference to him, but it also refers to ourselves. There are two things in the perfect law of God—"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and thy neighbour as thyself; on these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets;" these are the two crowning features of the divine will; therefore we must grow up to the two, and we should not be doing this if we shut ourselves up in a convent. It would be an agreeable thing to retire from the bustle of life, and settle in the quiet enjoyment of those consolations which are begotten by the Word, but it would be an ignoble and cowardly thing to do, because although there is much in the present state of things to check, to chill, and to blight, discourage and destroy; and much that we instinctively might desire to get away from, yet in escaping them, we should be running away from our duties. We must never expect in the present order of things, that society will or can be perfect; in fact, it is part of God's arrangement that it shall not be so. The predominance of evil is the universal law of human affairs in the sin state. Those who are God's must not shrink away and refuse the battle, but must contend. This contention extends to every aspect of

life. Evil reigns; weakness of nature besets us at every step in ourselves, and those with whom we are surrounded, and there is in all society a preponderating dead weight of indifference to divine things. Association in the truth is the aspect which more immediately affects us. It is here where we may be most damaged. We look for nothing in this world. We are apt to have too high ideas of what is attainable in the ecclesia. Christ gives a parable which has a bearing on this question. He likens the kingdom to a net cast into the sea, which draws all manner of fishes, both good and bad. Therefore, we must not come into the community drawn together by the preaching of the kingdom, with the idea that it is a perfect thing, that each person in it is really the son of God. There could be no more blissful state than that in which every man and woman should have a supreme sense of God, and with whom his law should be paramount. But such a state of things might not be good for us at present. We might, perhaps, get too much in love with mere persons and associations, and forget our present position in relation to eternal law. Yet we must take care not to be disheartened in relation to the truth, because we find all things are not to our mind. What we must do is to pluck up a good courage, and move neither to the right hand nor to the left, but be steadfast, always doing what we ought to be doing, whatever others may be saying, thinking, or doing. Never mind other people. Wherever their influence is calculated to dishearten and discourage—forebear—endure; mix kindness with resolution: this is God's will. We ought not to take notice of everything; we ought not to speak of every weakness we see, because the flesh is a weak thing at best. Let things slide,

unless there is a breach compromising the authority of Christ, or dishonouring and weakening to the truth. Where a man openly disobeys Christ, or corrupts the faith, that would be a thing to take notice of; a thing that we could not countenance, and be guiltless. But even then we are not to act as judges; and say "You are a miserable sinner, not fit for our company." What we have to do is this: for our own sakes, and as a matter of individual duty, we say "You must step aside from us, please, because we consider that we should be doing wrong if we were to continue our connection with you, in your present condition." That would be all we could do; but then there are a thousand little weaknesses and faults that do not amount to deliberate or intended violation of Christ's law—the mere ebullition of weakness, which the individual is himself sorry for. If you take him to task, you destroy his sorrow and enkindle resentment, and evil is done. The best thing is to forbear: this is the lesson of the apostle: "Forbear one another in love, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you." This view of the matter is always brought out by Paul in his letters—that if we ourselves were to be measured by the standard we may be disposed to apply to others, we should be found greatly wanting. We have to be forgiven much and must forgive. There are many derelictions of duty—oversights, faults, offences, it may be—that God is pleased to pass by, at our request through Christ; and we have to cultivate a similar disposition toward those who err through weakness. Be kindly and forbearing to everybody but yourself. Be very merciless with yourself. Judge yourself by the highest standard. Allow

no excuse for your own deficiency. Ever afflict your soul and press higher. If everyone did this,—but that is coming back to that which I said could not be,—we should have a very delightful community. Let us judge ourselves; others we must greatly leave alone, except under the special circumstances already hinted at. We are not to be indifferent about the truth. Some people say that because Christ says "Judge not," therefore, we are not to trouble ourselves as to who is in the truth, and who is not. This is a misapplication of his word. The position of a man in relation to the truth, is just what we are to judge. We are not to judge who of those having the truth are really God's, but we are to try the spirits whether they be of God, for many false prophets have gone out into the world. We are "to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered unto the saints." We are not, for one moment, to give way to those who would corrupt the truth. Here we are to withstand delinquency. This is quite another thing. The principles laid down in the apostolic exhortation apply only to those who receive the faith, who believe the truth, and reject the fables. With those who reject the truth, we are not in association; but as to those who receive it, we are not to say that such and such are not of God's; this is the place for our charity. Where there is a profession of obedience, and an external consistency; we are to throw a broad mantle over all. Think the best and act the kindest; take no notice of all weaknesses you see—forget things. This is our duty. It is a misfortune to our own selves if we have that feverish tendency to be critical which some exhibit—that unhappy nervousness about other people's failings. It destroys happiness. No man can grow spiritually who is in a continual state of acrimony. He cannot evince that kindness of deportment which ought to characterise the intercourse of brethren and sisters, certainly not to the individual against whom the bitterness is harboured. The latter sees the coldness and is repelled, and made cold in return. He mentions it to another; the other is involved in the heat, and thus the evil spreads. If there is a grievous departure from the way of truth, we must speak to a brother about it, but let us speak about it privately. Don't report the matter. If there is no departure from the way of truth, but merely the exhibition of constitutional weakness, be patient; take no notice. Instead of this, you go to another, and say "Why So and

So has been behaving shamefully, hasn't he?" "How," says the other, "what is it?" and then you let off your story, which, if ever so trifling in its origin in your mind, makes a deep impression upon the mind of the other—an impression, it may be, not warranted by the original facts, but inevitably created by your representation. If you feel a thing strongly, you express it strongly, and the other having only your strong expressions to go by, naturally conceives a vivid and overdrawn picture of the matter. The result is that when he is thrown in contact with the man against whom you have been speaking, there is a coldness. Others hear of it and catch the cold, and there is a general brewing of bad feeling, all through next to nothing at all. It is as Solomon says, "A little matter kindleth a great fire;" "A tale-bearer separateth friends." Tale-bearers ought to be kept down. They ought not to be listened to. It is their duty to go to the person themselves. This is Christ's rule, and there are a lot of little rules, which if they were observed, would cause a much better state of things to prevail. If brethren are trying to do their best, encourage them. Do not repeat things. Let us do our duty. All these things are hinted at in what Peter says in the chapter read: "Wherefore, laying aside all malice and all guile, and hypocrisies, and envies and all evil speaking, as new-born babes, desire the sincere milk of the Word, that ye may grow thereby." Now, this is very beautiful. When a person is full of unfriendly gossip—under the dominion of cantankerous feelings, which burn in his own bosom, and spread wherever he goes, how can the Word have a place in his heart? It is impossible. There is no more fatal thing than the fermentation of roots of bitterness, and Paul puts brethren on their guard. But such spring up, and many are hurt by them. Peter says "Put these things away, and let your mind, as a new-born babe, desire the milk of the word." We shall have a strong relish for spiritual things indeed, if this is the case. A new-born babe has an unquenchable affinity for its mother's breast; nothing short of what it gets from its mother will make it grow. Peter says this is how we ought to be in relation to the Word. If this is our state, we cannot be permanently hurt. The mind will soon get back to its tranquillity and purity. A man who is under the control of the Word gets quickly over little disturbances; they are quite

transient and accidental, and soon go off; but if the mind is not under the control of the Word, it is the other way. The serenity is accidental; the malignity and unhappiness of the fleshly mind is chronic. True liberty and happiness that will not

grow old are only to be found in connection with the things that are of God. They are a well-spring of everlasting life, from which we are invited now to drink deeply.

### VISIT TO WHITBY, SCARBOROUGH, AND SWANSEA.

By arrangement on the part of friends of the truth, in the several localities mentioned, the Editor, at the close of the old year, visited Whitby, Scarborough and Swansea, in the order of enumeration.

At Whitby, as our readers have been made aware, the ground had been prepared by occasional visits on the part of Mr. Dealtry, extending over a period of four years. A considerable number had become persuaded, through his lectures and private tuition, of the utter falsity of orthodox religion, and of the verity of the truth, in the matter of human mortality, and the purpose of God to abolish the kingdoms of men and establish a kingdom of His own, by means of His Son. With this, however, they had imbibed Mr. Dealtry's view that Jesus is the son of Joseph, and not the Son of God, except in the sense of a special anointing by the spirit; and had therefore, entirely failed to apprehend "the things concerning the name of Jesus Christ." This defect had been substantially remedied by brother Shuttleworth (late of Halifax), who was introduced to them through a brother of his acquaintance having connections at Whitby. He had succeeded in disabusing their minds of the fatal persuasion to which they had been led, and leading them to a right conviction; but the house had not been set in order on the new basis. This was now done in conversation, re-immersion, and organisation as an ecclesia. For particulars, we refer the reader to the intelligence from Whitby. The ecclesia is not yet large or spiritually robust, but there appears to be a right disposition, which with time and diligent application, will doubtless lead them to solid attainment in Christ. It is gratifying to think of the truth being planted so favourably in a new field, on the east coast. May the truth accomplish in Whitby the mission which God has associated with it everywhere, and in the failure of which, it had better not be known; may it purify a people to God, who shall become living witnesses, and living sacrifices to His

praise; consecrating themselves to His service, bestowing their affection on the high calling, and adorning the doctrine of God in ever-abounding good works. It is one of the encouragements of the time, that the truth is making new conquests every day, and more and more effecting the good work designed, in separating to Christ a peculiar people, zealous of good works. There are discouragements, as there have ever been; but these will not cast down. Such things must needs be. They are a needful admixture in the cup which, when too sweet, is apt to make a sickly stomach.

The brethren made arrangements for five lectures, of which there is nothing noteworthy to report. They were delivered to small audiences (numbering from 50 to 60), in a room that in its better days, had been a commercial room, but was now apparently used as a school. The public places were occupied with the several vanities incident to the Christmas season; and the brethren had consequently no choice. It is highly meritorious to cheerfully make the best of a bad job.

The next place was Scarborough. Here the Editor imagined the door was impregably sealed, on account, first, of the fewness and poverty of those in the place holding the truth; and second, the high gentility of the inhabitants. The event, however, agreeably disappointed expectation. The brethren, three in number, including that long-tried friend of the truth, brother C. Walker, spontaneously engaged one of the public halls, and issued placards announcing a lecture on "The Coming of the Lord to Judge His People and Rule the World; and the Signs indicating the near Approach of that Event." They were not hopeful as to the result; but did what they did as an act of duty. Others, capable in most cases, of forming a correct estimate of such matters, assured them that the attendance would be small—an anticipation in which they readily joined, from the fact that they had

preached the truth in the open places of the town and suburbs, till hooted off the streets. However, when the night of lecture came, all were surprised to find a large and decidedly fashionable audience. There would be from four to six hundred people present, filling the place. For two hours there was rivetted attention, the lecturer contriving to make the most of the opportunity by putting as much as he could into one discourse, without gorging the hearers. At the close, several elderly and educated people came forward and expressed a strong desire to have the subject followed up in further lectures. A friend writes that a decidedly good impression was made. A goodly number of the *Lectures* (which were advertised immediately afterwards by the brethren) have since been bought by persons who were in attendance. The result of the meeting provoked the suggestion that a mild announcement was better in advertising a meeting than a strong one; but this inference (which seemed plausible at the time) was upset by the case of

SWANSEA.—Here the placards set forth that the object of the lecturer would be to prove that the truth of Christ was “untaught and unknown in ordinary places of worship.” The brethren had, fortunately, by application to the mayor, secured the gratuitous use of the Town Hall for five nights. The first lecture (“The state of Christendom considered in the light of apostolic prediction”) was on a Sunday night, and the place was full to the doors, many being unable to find seats, and some being unable to get in. The Town Hall is divided into two courts, one used in the administration of the criminal law, and the other for *Nisi Prius*, or purely civil causes. It was the latter of the two that was placed at the disposal of the truth for the time being. It is not a very large place; it will not seat more than three hundred people. Just at the time the lectures took place, there was a great deal of Fenian excitement in the town, on account of the discovery of local conspiracy to upset the constituted authority. This gave a colour and an effect to an incident, which would otherwise have passed off as a perfectly harmless ebullition of Irish temper. At the close of the lecture, an Irishman in the audience gave vent to his feelings, which had been slowly rising to fever heat, under the exposures and denunciations directed against the Romish church, in connection with all Protestant denomina-

tions. In a hoarse lugubrious voice, and strong Irish accent, he shouted at the top of his voice, that he would prove in “Haibroo, Ghrake, and Lahtin,” that the lecturer was speaking blasphemy. He wanted to know who the lecturer was. He had been accustomed to think that everybody was either Catholic or Protestant, or infidel, but here was somebody that was neither. This interference created confusion. The chairman obtained a momentary quiet, and formally closed the meeting, upon which the Hibernian disturber, who (small-made, dark-complexioned, dirty, poorly-clad, and ugly), looked more like costermonger slang than the “Haibroo, Ghrake, and Lahtan” that he boasted of twenty times at least, broke, into a paroxysm of declamation. Several tried to stop him, but this only created disorder, and the audience broke up in rather an unquiet way, the Irishman threatening that there would be a riot next evening. Next day, the mayor called upon the brethren to whom the hall had been given, and informed them that he had received several letters, calling attention to the occurrence of the night before, and advising him to withdraw the sanction that had been extended, from fear of a disturbance. The writers, he said, were influential, and he did not feel justified, in his official capacity, in taking the responsibility of continuing the use of the hall under the circumstances. He added other remarks, which appear elsewhere. This was what the brethren feared, and for the moment, they were cast down. On application to the Music Hall, however—a much larger building—it was found that, fortunately, it was disengaged during the whole of the nights for which the lectures were advertised. An engagement was at once effected, and placards issued announcing the change. The result was a much larger audience than could have been accommodated in the Town Hall. It was announced by telegraph throughout the kingdom, on Tuesday morning, that a Fenian plot to blow up the Swansea Town Hall had been discovered, in consequence of which, special constables had been called out to protect the corporation property. The latter statement was correct; but as to the former, it is impossible to say whether there was any more foundation for it than arose out of the proceedings above recorded. If there was such a plot, it is possible that it might have been carried out, had the use of the Town Hall been allowed for that night, so



that the mayoral interdiction may have been a providential screen from harm. The following notice of the proceedings appeared in a local paper, *The Cambria Daily Leader*, published at Cardiff, but circulated in Swansea.

"A THEOLOGICAL AGITATOR.—Placards have been issued in the town, announcing that a Mr. R. Roberts purposed delivering a series of lectures, which are stated to be immensely important and interesting to all seekers after the truth. The mayor of Swansea inadvertently was induced to give the use of the Town Hall on Sunday last to this remarkable "evangelist," who has the modesty to publish that the topics to be embraced in his lecture of last evening were "The New Testament doctrine of eternal life subversive of popular views of immortality and a future state." He offers a strong inducement by stating that there are no collections, adding the words of the apostle of the Gentiles, "I seek not yours, but you." On Sunday last, an angry discussion took place at the Town Hall, owing to the absurd attacks that he made on all the ordinary doctrines of Christianity as generally believed by all bodies of Christians. The mayor declined granting the use of the hall on subsequent evenings, as a breach of the peace was almost feared on Sunday, and as his worship was not aware of the doctrines of this new light."

To this the following reply was inserted: "TO THE EDITOR OF THE CAMBRIA DAILY LEADER. SIR—Presuming it is your desire, as an English journalist, to deal fairly with all matters which you think it worth while to report in your columns, I make bold to ask permission to offer a few comments on a paragraph appearing in your issue of to day, headed 'A Theological Agitator.' Were it not that its inaccuracies amount to misrepresentations, I would not trouble you. The mayor is stated to have been 'inadvertently induced to give the use of the Town Hall on Sunday last, to the agitator in question.' This is a mis-statement in three particulars. First, the hall was not granted to whom your reporter styles 'this remarkable evangelist;' it was given to two of the burgesses of Swansea—gentlemen of integrity and good standing in the town, who requested 'the agitator' to come and lecture therein. Second, there was no inadvertence on the part of the mayor. The mayor, on being applied to, interrogated the applicants as to the nature

and object of the lectures, and as to the 'unique doctrine' to be promulgated, of which your reporter says 'he was not aware.' Having satisfied himself on the points of inquiry, he granted the request made. Third, there was no 'inducement,' but simply a straightforward, undisguised application, and an open statement of the objects contemplated.

Your reporter hints that on the Mayor becoming 'aware of the unique doctrines' set forth, he was so horrified that he instantly withdrew his permission for the further use of the hall. Now, so far was this from being the case, that the Mayor expressed his great regret at being compelled to discontinue the use of the hall in deference to other people's views; and stated that so far as he was concerned, he would have been glad to have continued it, or to have placed any other building at our disposal, had he been personally able to do so.

Your reporter says there was 'angry discussion' at the hall on Sunday night. Now this creates the impression on the reader, first, that there was regular discussion, and second, that the lecturer took part in it. Now the fact is, there was no discussion at all, unless the ebullition of Irish rowdiness is to be called discussion; for all that took place was that, at the close of the meeting, a bellicose Hibernian, said to be in training for priestly orders, desired permission to address the meeting, and on being refused by the chairman, after the meeting had been formally closed, he let loose an abusive tongue, and created temporary confusion in the dispersing audience. Is this to be called 'discussion,' and is a lecturer to be made responsible for a mere freak of rowdiness to which any meeting is exposed? I ask you, Mr. Editor, to throw over me the shield of fair play. The meeting itself was decorous throughout in the highest degree, and was dispersing in an orderly manner, when interfered with by the individual in question, who vainly endeavoured at subsequent meetings to repeat his annoyances. It is true attacks were made 'on all the ordinary doctrines of Christianity, as generally believed by all bodies of Christians.' Your reporter calls them 'absurd' attacks. He ought to know his business sufficiently to refrain from expression of opinion in recording facts. But there is no doubt it is in these 'attacks' there is to be found the secret of the pressure brought to bear upon the worthy Mayor. He next morning received from

'influential' people, who were not at the meeting, letters imploring him to suspend the license he had granted, on the absurd plea that there was likely to be a disturbance. It is a poor compliment to the people of Swansea, to say that free discussion is likely to lead to a riot; and that the only way to preserve the peace is to gag free speech by shutting the door of utterance. This is what a few timid people in Swansea said in substance to the Mayor, and the Mayor (so far to be excused in these times of Fenian excitement), yielded to the pressure, but modified his action in the matter, by an assurance of personal aversion to the course he was obliged to take. He locked the door, and in the name of the people of Swansea, drove free speech into the street, there to be trampled and bruised and killed by the mob. Fortunately, there was another place to be had for paying for, and the friends of the truth and free speech were liberal enough to pay for the truth having a fair hearing, and the result must have chagrined the narrow souls who thought to quench the light of free discussion. The Music Hall has been filled every night, and a greater number have had an opportunity of listening to the truth, than would have been the case had the timorous foes of free speech allowed the Mayor's good sense and liberal sentiments to rule. For this we have not to thank them, though grateful for the boon.

The placards, with all the inducements thereon exhibited, of free admission and philanthropic solicitude, let me tell your reporter, are not to be put to my credit, as he does in so scornful a mood. These are the doings of men in Swansea, of whom Swansea ought to be proud.—I am, &c ,

ROBERT ROBERTS."

At the first meeting in the Music Hall, there would be from 600 to 800 people present, including the adversary who interfered with the Sunday night meeting. With the exception of an occasional interpolation by this individual, and the temporary bits of disorder, caused by the orderly part of the audience trying to bring the disorderly individual in question to proper behaviour, the meeting passed off quietly. On the second night, it was computed by the brethren that from 800 to 1000 people would be present; this was the quietest and most successful meeting of the series. The attention of the audience was secured without a break for an hour and a

half, while the New Testament doctrine of life everlasting was expounded, to the demolition of popular superstitions about heaven and hell. The devil made a snort or two, but did not succeed in disturbing the meeting to a material extent. On Wednesday, however, things turned out differently. The devil came with reinforcements from "ould Ireland" and the slums of Swansea, and at a very early stage of the meeting, made his bellicose temper and strength manifest. The exertions of the well-disposed were this time unavailing to keep him quiet, and the result was that the lecture as an effort to persuade people of the truth, was doubtless frustrated. Every few sentences were interrupted. Sometimes the interruption amounted to positive uproar. At one stage a policeman—sent for—entered the place, and took the leader of the disorder into charge, and amid much confusion, removed him in custody. But about a quarter of an hour later, the Irish invincible re-entered the hall, with a rush and a bound, and was received with a shout of applause by his abettors, and counter demonstrations from those who viewed these disorderly proceedings with disfavor, who constituted at least two-thirds of the audience. It was now impossible to obtain perfect quiet. The Editor, however, adhered to his task till it was finished, and then left the platform. What followed, is described in the following notice from another paper than that already quoted from.

"All the rules of common courtesy and honourable debate seemed to have been set aside on Wednesday evening, of which we happened to be eye-witnesses. To say nothing of the frequent interruptions which the lecturer experienced by the whistling, shouting, hisses, and other misdemeanour exhibited by some persons who ought to have known better, just previous to the close of his address, a slovenly, dirty-looking, and obtrusive Irishman, who we understand had appeared on the platform on a preceding evening, to dispute the facts adduced by Mr. Roberts, arrived in the building, which was the signal for a boisterous declamation, and, when he was incited, to a repetition of his buffoonery. This necessarily annoyed the speaker, and prevented his observations being heard, and many were the expressions of disapprobation from the orderly and common-sense portion of those present. The row having subsided, Mr. Roberts proceeded to bring his exposition to a close, which he soon did, and without further interruption. He had

no sooner done so than the Hibernian enthusiast referred to, got on the platform indecorously, and haranged the audience, his remarks being unheard through the cheering of his supporters, and the scene was now more in keeping with an electioneering row, than that of professedly civilised people assembled to hear the Word of God expounded and discussed. The gas was suddenly turned off, and the candidate for oratorical honours, with the audience, enveloped in darkness; people stumbled over the iron piping and woodwork which strewed the floor—indeed, it was a difficult matter to obtain egress at all; chairs were indiscriminately hurled, benches and other articles disposed of in similar style, and there was nothing but confusion and uproar, it being remarkable that some persons were not seriously injured.”—*Swansea and Glamorgan Herald*, January 11.

To prevent a recurrence of this disorder at the last meeting, a charge (6d.) was made for admission. This had the effect of thinning down the audience to about 130 people, who listened for an hour-and-a-half without interruption, beyond such as arose in the early part of the meeting, from the door-thumping and window-rattling by which the excluded rowdies manifested their displeasure.

In the next issue of the *Cambrian*, (the organ of all that is “high” in religion and politics in Swansea and the neighbourhood) there appeared the following letter from one of the clerical rulers of local darkness in high places:—

SIR—I shall feel obliged by your affording me space in your columns to enter my solemn protest against the permission this week accorded Mr. R. Roberts, of Birmingham, to propagate his *infidel sentiments* in the Music Hall. The avowed purpose of the lecturer has been to prove that “the truth proclaimed by Jesus Christ and his apostles is *untaught and unknown* in ordinary places of worship; in other words, to deny the divine and apostolic character of that simple gospel message, which is habitually proclaimed throughout the length and breadth of our land, alike by the Church of England, and by all denominations of Christian Dissenters.

Who the parties may be that are directly responsible for sanctioning such a use of one of our public buildings, I know not. Suffice it to say, either they are *professors of Christianity*, or they are not. If the latter, their consistency is unim-

peachable; if the former, their responsibility is indeed terrific.

It is a cause for much thankfulness that our chief magistrate, on his attention being called to the *blasphemous character* of Mr. Roberts’s lectures, as described by the *placarded announcements*, forbade any further use of the Town Hall; and that the doors within which Her Majesty’s representatives periodically administer justice, with the *fullest possible recognition of the national Christianity*, were thus effectually closed against an open enemy to that “true profession of the gospel” which the Crown is sworn to “maintain.” Yet, to every christian mind, it must be matter for the very deepest regret, that the acting authorities of the Music Hall came to terms with Mr. Roberts in his emergency, and so secured, to such as desired it, the opportunity of hearing a fellow worm attempt to *refute his God*.

Now, I would ask, are there none possessing control over the Music Hall, who have received the message of faithful ministers. “not as the word of men, but, as it is in truth, the *Word of God*,” and who can, consequently, recognize in Mr. Roberts’ sweeping condemnation of what is thought “in ordinary places of worship,” a defiance of him who said to his ambassadors “He that despiseth you despiseth me?” If there be any thus minded *who have a controlling power*, let me beg of them to make their voices heard. Let our townsmen hear their protest against what has already taken place *without their individual sanction*. Let them do their utmost, in God’s strength, to prevent the recurrence of so *frightful a scandal*. Let them stand firm against the insidious fallacy which mistakes *consistency for persecution*, and which fails to discern between a wrongful attack upon the liberty of another, and a straightforward tenacity touching talents of one’s own. God forbid that I should ask any Christian to wander from his own proper sphere of influence for the purpose of *personally molesting* a teacher of falsehood; but I do ask Christian proprietors of the Music Hall to remember that their property in the said building is a talent for which they must give account—that a Christian’s property is not his own, but the Lord’s, that bought him—and that, consequently, such property must be sternly secured, *so far as individual influence can secure it*, against invasion by Antichrist in any shape or form, and against the *wicked, demoralizing*

influence of one who calmly tells us that "the heaven and hell of popular belief" are founded on fiction.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

J. M. SANGAR,

Senior Curate of Swansea

4, *Stockwell Villas*,  
Jan. 9th, 1868.

To this letter the Editor sent the following reply, which was refused insertion, but appeared in a rival paper (*The Cambria Daily Leader*) a few days afterwards:—

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE CAMBRIA DAILY LEADER. SIR,—In a letter which appeared on the 17th instant, signed "J. M. Sangar, Senior Curate of Swansea:" the following expressions occur, in reference to myself and the lectures recently delivered in the Music Hall, Swansea: 'infidel sentiments,' 'blasphemous character of Mr. Roberts's lectures,' 'attempt to refute his God,' 'defiance of Him,' 'a frightful scandal,' 'anti-christ,' 'wicked and demoralising influence,' &c. I hope you will consider the accusations involved in these expressions sufficiently grave to justify you in affording me an opportunity of rebutting them as publicly as they have been made, and employing equal freedom of speech with reference to the pretensions appearing on the face of Mr. Sangar's letter.

My sentiments are not 'infidel.' I heartily believe in God, and the Bible as the Word of God. And the labours which have called forth Mr. Sangar's denunciations, are prompted with a view to exalt the Bible as the only standard of a man's faith and conduct. It is true I 'deny the divine and apostolic character' of what is 'habitually proclaimed throughout the length and breadth of our land, alike by the Church of England and by all denominations of Christian Dissenters;" but this denial is not the result of a disbelief in the Bible, but the very opposite. Looking into the Bible, I am enabled to see, and am prepared, before a properly-constituted assembly, to prove, that the doctrines which Mr. Sangar styles 'the simple Gospel of Christ,' are neither divine nor apostolic, but on the contrary, are Pagan in their origin, and subversive of all that was ever taught by the apostles; and that consequently, the preaching that takes place from Sunday to Sunday in a thousand churches and chapels, is powerless to effect

the salvation of men and women. Believing this, I do all in my power to rouse the dormant perceptions of the people, so that they may, if possible, throw off the benumbing influence exercised over them by the class to which Mr. Sangar belongs; and read for themselves the holy oracles in which divine truth was communicated to men, centuries before the present ecclesiastical system existed.

For giving me facility to do this, your clerical correspondent pours vials of wrath upon the heads of certain individuals in Swansea, and alleges a 'terrific' responsibility to rest upon their shoulders. One can quite understand Mr. Sangar's wrath. He belongs to a class who have a vested interest in the maintenance of orthodox superstitions. If the people were to become enlightened, he would find his occupation gone. If they knew the Bible, they would abandon the churches and chapels to the clergy and ministers, and seek in a new and scriptural order of things, the means of that misunderstood salvation which has been offered to mortal men. But this need not be looked for, for the scriptures which predicted the uprising and success of the present system of theological imposture (2 Peter ii, 1, 2; 2 Timothy iv, 3, 4; Acts xx, 22, 30; 2 Thess. ii, 7, 11; Rev. xvii. 1, 6), also foretel its triumphant existence till the advent of Jesus Christ, who will sweep away all refuges of lies, and cause the light of unknown truth to scintillate with electrical brilliancy to the ends of the earth.

I will accredit your correspondent with some slight degree of righteous indignation. I will assume that he regards the principles recently advocated in the Music Hall as totally at variance with Christian truth. I will take it that he really believes me to be as utterly wicked and infidel as he alleges, and therefore extend to him some forbearance. But while treating his individual delinquencies thus kindly, I will not shrink to expose the fallacies of his letter.

'The chief magistrate of Swansea' will not thank him for the compliment he pays him. From all I hear of that gentleman, I believe he is more liberal and enlightened than to act as the theological supervisor of Swansea. As Mayor of the town, it is no part of his duty to decide the polemical issues that may arise among the burgesses. We imagine that there are in Swansea, as everywhere else, Dissenters as well as Churchmen, Baptists as well as Baby Sprinklers, Methodists as well as Rationa

istic Unitarians. What would Mr. Sangar say if the Mayor were to fulminate an official proclamation declaring the Dissenters to be of God, and refusing to countenance the opening of the churches, and pronouncing all others blasphemers, but the particular sect of Dissenters in favour of whom he might pronounce? This is exactly what Mr. Sangar credits the Mayor with having done in the particular instance under consideration. He says that 'on his attention being called to the blasphemous character of Mr. Roberts's lectures, he forbade his making any further use of the Town Hall.' Let me tell Mr. Sangar that this is as utterly false as I believe all his doctrines to be. The statement is a pure invention. I do not say he invented it—probably he was indebted to the over-zealous newspaper scribe, who, in noticing the lectures, allowed his imagination to run riot, and substituted an interpretation for a fact. The Mayor, in discontinuing the use of the Town Hall, was totally uninfluenced by the nature of the lectures. He stated his reason to be that he had received letters from influential people, pointing out the probability of a disturbance from the fact of an Irishman having interfered with the meeting; and he said that in these times of Fenian excitement, it would scarcely be prudent in his official position to go in the face of such a warning. To this he added that he was personally sorry at having to take such a course, appearing as it did, to be an interference with the right of free discussion; and that if he had had a room in the town in his own power, he would gladly have placed it at our disposal. Mr. Sangar has therefore to thank the Mayor for nothing, for what he did had nothing to do with 'the fullest possible recognition of our national Christianity.' It was simply a step taken under protest for the preservation of the public peace against Fenian disturbance.

Mr. Sangar represents the lectures as an attempt to refute God. Did he hear the lectures? If he did, he is dishonest in making such a statement; for in every sentence I uttered, I endeavoured to magnify God by procuring attention to what he has promised. I said nothing on my own responsibility; I advanced everything on testimony adduced from the Bible. I make bold to say that in any single one of these lectures, I quoted more scripture than Mr. Sangar does in 120 sermons. If Mr. Sangar was not present, he has brought himself under Solomon's lash: 'He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it

is folly and shame unto him.'

Mr. Sangar appeals to the Music Hall proprietors, to prevent the recurrence of what he terms 'a frightful scandal.' In this he identifies himself with the persecuting hierarchy that once occupied the seat of power in this country as it now does in Rome. For what is it that he pronounces 'a frightful scandal?' I simply stood upon a platform in the Music Hall, and read copiously from the Word of God during all the evenings I was so employed. Have I not as much right to do this as Mr. Sangar has to ascend a pulpit, and 'drearly disquisitionise upon a mutilated sentence of Scripture?' Mr. Sangar virtually says, No. He has a right but I have not. How is this? Is he infallible? If he is, why tolerate the Dissenters? Why not get the chief magistrate to shut up the Unitarian chapels? But probably Mr. Sangar will not be so foolish as to pretend to be infallible. If not, upon what principle will he stifle the public discussion of religious questions? Is the right of private judgment to be sacrificed at the shrine of a dominant orthodoxy? Are we to take it as a matter of course that the majority is in the right, and that a traditional faith is divine? Are we not in full and unchallenged possession of the right to think as we please and do as we please, in the ventilation of our conscientious convictions? Is any man or set of men to set himself up as the judge of his fellows? Virtually, Mr. Sangar says Yes, to all these questions. Swansea may be thankful that it is not under the power of his craft; if it were, there would be an end to that precious religious liberty which was bought so dearly by the sword of Cromwell. Conventicles would be prohibited; dissenting places of worship shut up by law. 'Anti-christ'—that is, whoever happened to differ from the lords of the parish and pew—would be expatriated. The town would be under the benumbing rule of the continual *regime* where 'the Crown is sworn to maintain' the dogmas of the Mother of Harlots. Mr. Sangar says he would not proceed to the extremity of personal molestation. Probably this may be his mind now; but history teaches us how unsatiable is the lust of power when once it begins to be gratified. If Mr. Sangar had power to shut up the public buildings, it would not be long before he would restrict private rights, and shut up heretics in prison for Christ's sake. The Man of Sin at Rome is the embodiment of Mr.

Sangar's principles, and a specimen of what Mr. Sangar would soon be at, if he had it all his own way. But, thank God, the day is passed for this in England—Swansea can hear the truth. Hundreds of people came to listen to it two weeks ago, who, if Mr. Sangar had ruled, would have had to stay at home. And doubtless, when the lecturer next finds it convenient to visit Swansea, a similar number and a similar success will be realised.

Mr. Sangar wonders who was responsible for the Music Hall being placed at the disposal of "Anti-Christ." We state for his enlightenment that the friends of the truth, at whose invitation the lecturer visited Swansea, on receiving the Mayor's interdiction, went straight to Mr. Jones, the keeper of the hall in question, and obtained from him at once permission to use the hall for four nights. Mr. Sangar had better call upon Mr. Jones and give him the benefit of a lecture on the awful crime of prostituting "one's talent." And if the recreant hall-keeper should prove impervious to his saintly influence, let him summon a meeting of the proprietors, and get them to tell Mr. Jones to behave better in future; perhaps his words will have more effect upon them, though we suspect his audience would be limited to that sickly tribe whom he described, as "those who have received the message of faithful ministers" by whom he means, as hinted in the sequence of his sentence, those who recognise the clergy as Christ's ambassadors. We should not fancy that this class is very large in Swansea. Who can be so deluded as to imagine the clergy the ambassadors of Christ? They are no more ambassadors of Christ than are the merchants and solicitors of the town. They went of their own accord, or at the maternal beck "to grind divinity of other days" in institutions of human foundation, and there acquired the blasphemous title which I daresay Mr. Sangar frequently prefixes to his name, or, at least, suffers other people to do. Upon what scriptural ground can a college-breeding make a man a successor to the apostles? Were there ever such a class as successors of the apostles in the official sense understood by those who use this phrase? Christ sent the apostles to deliver a message to men, and empowered them to attest the divinity of their word. But we never read of successors in this work. A man can only succeed them in the sense of understanding what they taught, and doing what he can without fee or reward, to disseminate a

knowledge of that teaching. Clerical successors of the apostles are an imposture. Christ did not send the clergy. His commission includes every one who understands His truth, and among them there are no distinctions. The clergy are best described in the following language from Jeremiah :—'I have not sent these prophets, yet they ran. I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied. If they had stood in my counsel and had *caused my people to hear MY WORDS*, then they should have turned them from their evil way, and from the evil of their doing. Behold, I am against the prophets, saith the Lord, that smooth their tongues and say, he saith.'—Jeremiah xxiii, 21, 30, 31. This is the exact position of the clergy and ministers of all denominations. They pretend to have been called and sent of God, when they are not, and they steal the word of God from the people by misrepresenting (it may be unwittingly) what the word of God really contains, substituting Pagan fiction for the truth of Christ, and when the truth of Christ is preached, denouncing it as "blasphemy" and "infidel sentiments."

If Mr. Sangar is in earnest, let him adopt the British and not the Papal method of shutting the mouth of heresy; meet me in open discussion before a Swansea audience, upon any or all of the propositions which formed the subjects of the recent lectures, and I will suit myself to his time and arrangements. If he is not prepared for this, let him for ever hold his tongue.—I am, &c.,

ROBERT ROBERTS.

Birmingham, Jan. 21, 1868.

Brother Randles writes that the matter has excited great attention, and that the brethren are using the agitation to advantage by selling the *Lectures*, which they have advertised for sale in the local papers. Many are giving their attention to the truth, and some are deeply interested. There is an ecclesia of ten souls in Swansea. May the number be greatly multiplied by the addition of such as shall be saved.

On the last night of the Editor's sojourn there was a tea meeting of all the friends of the truth in Swansea and Mumbles, at which, by mediation, a misunderstanding on a point of 'church government,' causing division in the Mumbles ecclesia, was removed, and a cordial re-union effected.

## WHO WAS THE FATHER OF JESUS CHRIST?

MR. DEALTRY'S REPLY AND THE EDITOR'S REJOINER.

DEAR SIR.—This, I fear, will reach you rather late in the month. I have been from home, and, therefore, have only now been able to give the attention your strictures on my last communication require.

It appears to me only reasonable to believe that if the apostles held the doctrine of the miraculous conception, it would have occupied as prominent a position in their preaching and teaching as it does now in the preaching and teaching of Roman Catholic and Protestant bishops and priests. Who can cite Peter, Paul, or any of the apostles in proof of the miraculous conception? Did not Paul, in his final and solemn charge to the elders of the church at Ephesus, affirm that he had kept back nothing that was profitable to them, and shunned not to declare unto them "all the counsel of God." But *when* and *where* did he declare unto them the miraculous conception? It is a doctrine of *great antiquity*: more so than you will admit. It was a prominent one in the religion of *ancient Babylon*; just as it is in that of *modern Babylon*. Dr. Cowan, in his *Babylon the Great* says "Though the mother (*Semiramis*) derived her glory from the child, in the course of time, she eclipsed the son. There was no intention to worship her at first; but gradually Semiramis was more thought of than Nimrod. *The Son's birth was boldly declared to be miraculous, and Semiramis was called the "Virgin Mother."*

I pass now to your comments. You commence by pointing to "the lameness of my definition of Christ's 'divine sonship.'" "The fallacy of this is apparent from the fact that the sonship of Christ was proclaimed *while he was yet in the flesh.*" Jesus was NEVER proclaimed the Son of God until he arose from the bosom of the baptismal water. The positive ignorance of *all* that he was the Christ—the Son of God—until his immersion by John, renders it incredible that his *title* and *office* could have been announced at his *birth*. The Christ is called *the Son of God* for two reasons: first, because this title is equivalent to that of Messiah, and was so understood by the Jews. Compare Mark i, 1, Luke iv, 4, and xxii, 67, 70. "If thou be the Christ tell us." "Art thou then the Son of God?" "Jesus, of the house of David, was anointed as no prophet or king before him had ever been. "Thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy companions." "For it hath pleased the Father that in him all fulness should dwell." It is for this reason that the Royal Prince of David's house is styled "*the Son of God.*"—(Matt. xvi, 16, 5.) Second, he is called by this title because he was the

first raised from the dead to an immortal life. It was not, then, on account of an extraordinary display of divine power in bringing Jesus into existence, or as you say, "preternaturally begotten of a virgin," for this is a fiction, but because—unlike any other man—he had received the spirit without measure. You affirm that the genealogies of Matthew and Luke sustain your view, and, therefore, overthrow mine. You say "it does not say 'and Joseph begat Jesus.' It ought to have done so on Mr. Dealtry's hypothesis." You surely did not suppose that Matthew, after introducing Mary as the wife of Joseph, would consider it necessary to say "And Joseph begat Jesus." If he had not introduced the wife at all, he might have used that form of speech. But as he names the parents together, it would have been obviously improper and unnecessary. Joseph being styled the "husband of Mary," the conclusion is that he was the father of her child. We are (considering that they were a virtuous couple) bound to this belief, unless we are distinctly informed to the contrary. I will here consider your remark "How will Mr. Dealtry reconcile with his theory the prediction of Isaiah, "Behold a virgin," &c. Do you mean to say that this language of Isaiah, vii, 14, was strictly and literally predictive of the birth of Jesus Christ? The fourteenth verse says "and shall call his name Immanuel." Was the Son of Mary called so? If so, when and where? The history tells us he was named Jesus. The prophecy does not intimate that he was to be called by the *meaning* of Immanuel, but shall call his NAME IMMANUEL." As Jesus was never so styled, this is the first and direct proof that the prophecy did not refer to him. Again—5 and 16 verses—let me ask what new time of plenty dawned upon Judea when he began to know how to refuse the evil and choose the good? What opposing country became desolate when he grew into boyhood? I will quote the passage: "For before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land shall become desolate, by whose two kings thou art distressed."—(Bishop Lowth.) What application had this to Jesus and his times? Two kings, Rezin and Pekah, made war against Ahaz, king of Judah. Jehovah sent Isaiah to inform Ahaz, that they should be defeated, and to desire Ahaz to ask for a sign in proof. Ahaz declined asking a sign. Then follows the passage in question, that the Almighty would himself give a sign, namely, that within the time, that a young woman, now a virgin, should conceive and bring forth a child, and that

child should arrive at such an age as to distinguish between good and evil, that is within a few years (compare chapters viii, and ix) the enemies of Judah should be destroyed. Now observe the peculiarity of this sign. It was the custom in the East for youths that were never married always to marry virgins, and widowers, however young, always to marry widows. Isaiah must have been an old man, having begun to prophesy in the reign of the grandfather of Ahaz, and probably a widower. The young woman is called a *prophetess* (Isaiah viii, 3), meaning a person who devoted herself to retirement and study, and, consequently, to a single life. There was, therefore, so great a peculiarity in this marriage as justly to entitle it to be considered as an extraordinary sign. The child was to be called *Immanuel*, denoting the presence of God in effecting the liberation of the Jews. This liberation was to be effected before he should be old enough to distinguish good from evil; but, by the time he arrived at that age, he should eat butter and honey, i.e. live in abundance on the richest food. How could all this be a sign to King Ahaz, if it was not fulfilled until hundreds of years after his death? I cannot imagine a stronger internal mark of forgery than the interpretation of *Immanuel* in the 23rd verse of the first chapter of Matthew. Matthew was a Jew. He wrote his gospel specifically for the use of the Jews, and, as is generally believed, in the Hebrew language. But the author of this chapter thinks it necessary to give the interpretation of a Hebrew word. He found no interpretation of the word in Isaiah, and, therefore, gives its meaning himself, lest it should be misunderstood. What credibility should we give to a tale that an Englishman, writing to unlettered Englishmen, and having occasion to mention an English name, thought it necessary for their information that the meaning of the name should be translated into French? You say "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 gifts, and titles of Joseph." Your failure to prove Mary to be of the house of David, shatters into fragments your whole theory. You deny the only channel through which Jesus could inherit "the lineage and rights, and titles of Joseph," by isolating "Joseph from all connection with Christ's paternity." Matthew's genealogical table is dead against you, and Luke's more so. You affirm "Luke's genealogy is not the genealogy of Joseph, but of Heli, Mary's father and Joseph's father-in-law." Your cool assumption that Mary, the daughter of Heli, was Joseph's wife, is quite edifying! Nothing that "Immortal-Soulists" hazard, without a tittle of proof, goes beyond you. In opposition, however, to your assertion that Joseph was Heli's son-in-law, I affirm he

was his grandson, Heli's daughter being Joseph's mother; that Luke's genealogy is that of Joseph, through Heli upwards to David and Abraham; whilst Matthew's is the descent of Joseph downwards from Abraham and David through Jacob; the one joining the paternal and the other the maternal pedigrees of Joseph. In Jesus, therefore, as the eldest son of Joseph ("we have found him of whom Moses and the law, and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph") terminate the two lines from David through Solomon and Nathan. Hence Jesus has a strong and clear title to the crown of David, as far as blood can give it. I should paraphrase the 23rd verse of chap. iii of Luke thus: "And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age, being (as was the custom to register) the son of Joseph, who was the grandson of Heli." No extension of the parenthesis will help you out of your difficulty. It is doing violence to the text to include more in the parenthesis than "as was supposed." The Greek word rendered "supposed" is *enomizeto*. It only occurs twice in the New Testament, once in Acts xvi, 13, "where prayer was wont to be made, and once here translated *supposed*. Luke himself uses it on both occasions, and it is much more probable that he used it in both instances in the same sense, than that he meant one thing in one text, and something quite different in the other. When we reason with opponents upon the state of the dead, and they advocate on their side "to depart and be with Christ," we reply "Paul never wrote it so. Do not avail yourselves of a mistranslation; do justice to Paul." I say, then, be equally just to Luke. Do not expose yourself to a *tu quoque* challenge. Let the word *enomizeto* be rendered according to Luke's meaning in Acts xvi, 13, or translate it "as was allowed by law." Bishop Pearce states it means "as was the custom to enter in the public registers." It was not the custom to enrol any but blood sons. If Joseph registered Jesus (which it is affirmed he did) then he enrolled him as his son. If Jesus had only been an "adopted son," or a "reputed son," he would not have been registered. Joseph could not have placed on the roll an adopted son; and he would not have registered a lie by recording Jesus as his son, when he knew that he was not. The fact of Joseph registering Jesus is of itself sufficient proof that he was his son. No other forms of the verb *nomizo* met with in other texts, touch the question. You remark "the words 'which was the Son,' that precede 'of Heli' in the common version, are not in the original." You are partly right and partly wrong. The relative pronoun *tau* (who or which) is in the original, and tells with deadly effect on your theory. It stands in construction with



*Joseph*, and not with *Jesus*. In order to make it answer your purpose, you are compelled to mutilate and mistranslate. "Was the son" is not *expressed*, but must be *understood*, in order to make sense. I would remind you that the apostles foretold a departure from the faith. The multitudes baptized in apostolic times held my faith on this question, and not yours. Is not the dogma of the miraculous conception a part of the "strong delusion?" I believe it is. I will answer your other comments in my next.—I remain, sincerely yours,  
CHARLES DEALTRY.

Dec. 17th, 1867.

#### REPLY TO MR. DEALTRY'S LETTER.

WE thought it better to have the whole of Mr. Dealtry's reply, before attempting to deal with any part of it, so that the subject might be brought to a broad, prompt, and final issue, instead of straggling unconnectedly over several months. It is now before the reader\* and we shall endeavour in as brief a manner as possible, to pass in review the several new points raised, and show the entire fallacy of the arguments by which Mr. Dealtry seeks to fortify the lamentable proposition that Jesus was a mere son of Adam.

We notice, in passing, that he has not attempted to deal with testimony cited in our last, to show the great difference between Jesus, as the Son of God, and all other and previous messengers whom God made use of in his dealing with Israel. This is one of the main points in the argument. It is not exactly the citadel, but it is one of the principal outworks, which an enemy must carry, before an assault can be successful. Mr. Dealtry makes Jesus a mere man. He thus puts him on a level with all other men, and excludes any rational explanation of Christ's own claim to a heavenly origin, and his declaration that he was the Son of God. The testimony on the point was quoted in December. Mr. Dealtry's theory creates a difficulty which is insurmountable. If Christ was a mere man, how is it that he was sinless? Was any other man ever known or heard of without sin? Experience says "No;" and the Bible says "There is not a man that liveth and sinneth not." "If any man say he has no sin, he is a liar, and deceiveth himself." How, then, are we to explain the fact that Jesus was "holy, harmless, undefiled, WITHOUT SIN?" The testimony which Mr. Dealtry would throw overboard, explains it, because it reveals the source of Christ's high capacity and impulse in a divine direction, in a divine paternity. This explains everything. The clay of fallen human nature, in the hands of the Divine

Potter, was fashioned into the likeness of the divine; that by the instrumentality thus established, a door of escape from the pit might be opened for this doomed race. The principles involved in this arrangement will afterwards engage attention. But admit that Jesus was the son of Joseph, and then it is not true that "God hath concluded all under sin;" it is not true that "all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God;" for Jesus is an exception: he was sinless, and yet a mere man; and if Jesus was sinless any other man might have been sinless; and Christ's being the Messiah was a mere accident; every man his own Saviour, and Christ's name (JEHOVAH shall save by an Anointed) a great fallacy! This is the conclusion to which Mr. Dealtry's premisses lead.

The flimsiness of the ground upon which he seeks to establish these premisses will appear at every step. We shall follow him *seriatim*. He says if the apostles held the doctrine of the miraculous conception, it would have been as prominent in their teaching as it is in the religious writing of the present day. So it is. Nothing is more prominent in all their writings than that Jesus is the Son of God, and every time this proposition is affirmed, the miraculous conception is proclaimed; for the divine sonship of Christ is a myth without it. Mr. Dealtry would seem to argue that because the phrase "miraculous conception," or some literal equivalent, is not made use of, they did not believe that Jesus was the Son of God in that way. Apply this to cases of ordinary paternity, and the fallacy will be apparent. We say such a man is son to So-and-so; we do not go further. The rest is implied—maternity is understood. The means are always involved in the expressed result. It is sufficient to say that Jesus is the Son of God. The iteration of this statement is virtually a repetition and prominent setting forth of the miraculous conception; for it involves it. Jesus could not be the Son of God without it. Mr. Dealtry will doubtless reply that other men who have not been miraculously conceived, are called sons of God. But the answer is that they acquire this title from Christ, and possess it only in prospect of being made like him. "We are all the children of God through faith in Christ Jesus" (Gal. iii, 26). By union with him, they are legally covered with his name, and incorporated with his relationship. They are not adopted till the resurrection.—(Romans viii, 23; Luke xx, 36). They are only sons by virtue of connection with him who was primitively and *par excellence* the SON OF GOD. The relation had its origin in him, and in judging of what constituted that relationship, it will not do to go to those who have only a borrowed title; and say that because that they are mere men; therefore Jesus was. We therefore repeat that if the

\* We have been obliged for want of space to keep over Mr. Dealtry's second letter, till next month.

sonship of Christ had reference to his origin, every proclamation that Jesus is the Son of God, is a proclamation that God was his father, and not Joseph. This point stands or falls with the question of the sonship. Let it be determined in what the sonship of Christ consisted, and then every assertion of it is a tacit affirmation of whatever it involved. It is not open to Mr. Dealtry to say that the apostles are silent on the question. They are far from silent. The sonship of Christ, whatever it may mean, is one of the most conspicuous features of their testimony; and if that sonship has its basis in a preternatural origin, that preternatural origin is one of their incessant protestations. Mr. Dealtry says the sonship is the anointing. In this, he does not go farther than assertion. He produces no authority for such a definition, but contents himself with begging the question. We have already (in the Dec. No.) remarked on the utter inadmissibility of such a suggestion. No amount of explanation would ever reconcile the prominent and vital assertion that Christ, in the days of his flesh, was Son of God, with the idea that he was simply a good man, filled with the Spirit. So simple and common a matter (for the history of Israel has furnished many such) would not have been put forward in such an equivocal shape, and made the subject of saving faith.

Mr. Dealtry challenges quotation from Paul, who declared the whole counsel of God, in proof of the miraculous conception. In the first place, we possess but a fragment of the speeches to which he refers, when he said he had declared the whole counsel of God. What we have, however, taken in conjunction with his letters, furnish the proof Mr. Dealtry desires. The very first thing recorded of him is that after his conversion "Straightway he preached Christ in the synagogue, that HE IS THE SON OF GOD."—(Act ix, 20.) If it was believed at the time by any considerable section of professed disciples that Jesus was the son of Joseph (which Mr. Dealtry contends was the case), this conclusively shews the side of the question Paul took. To say that he simply preached that Jesus, the son of Joseph, was raised from the dead, and that this is what he meant by preaching that Christ was the Son of God, is to play with words. The resurrection of a son of Joseph is one thing; the declaration that such a man is the Son of God, quite another. The propositions are not interchangeable. Christ was the Son of God before his resurrection. This was abundantly proved on the last occasion. A crowning proof is furnished in the incident recorded in connection with the cured blind man, who was cast out of the synagogue for confessing Jesus. "Jesus heard that they had cast him out, and when he had found him, he

said unto him "Dost thou believe on the SON OF GOD? He answered and said, "Who is he, Lord, that I might believe on him? And Jesus said unto him 'Thou hast both seen him, and it is HE THAT TALKETH WITH THEE.'"—(John ix, 35-37.) When Paul, therefore, straightway preached that Christ was the Son of God, he proclaimed something that was a fact previous to Christ's resurrection. Did he simply preach that the son of Joseph, a righteous man, was filled with the Holy Spirit? The suggestion seems absurd. He brought before their notice a man whose origin was direct from God, and, therefore, who was Son of God, as declared by his resurrection. This is in accordance with the testimony of portions of the word, which Mr. Dealtry has to throw overboard bodily in order at all to make out his case; and he accepts this violent alternative, on what appears, on examination, most insufficient grounds.

Paul's letters, more than Paul's speeches, which are scarcely preserved, furnish conclusive evidence of the miraculous conception. In Gal. iv, 4, he says "When the fullness of time was come, God sent forth his SON, MADE OF A WOMAN, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." Mr. Dealtry tries to escape the force of this by citing the language of Job, "Man that is born of a woman is of few days, and full of trouble." As a mere matter of words, there is a coincidence, but the subject and nature of the allusions are as different as possible. In Job's use of the words, one can see the poetical association of weakness of origin with ephemerality of nature; but there is no poetry in Paul's words. His is the language of fact and logic. His subject, in the scripture in question, neither suggests nor admits of Job's use of the phrase. He is stating the mode of deliverance adopted by God with reference to those who, under the law, were in hopeless condemnation. He says he sent forth HIS SON (not that he adopted a son of Joseph); and, indicating the method of the sending, he adds "*made of a woman*." This agrees with Luke, Matthew, and Isaiah, who say that for this very purpose, he begot a son of his own by a virgin of the house of David, overshadowing her with the creative power of the Holy Spirit. It is very significant that Paul should have inserted the words "*made of a woman*" in such a connection. Mr. Dealtry may get over them to his own satisfaction, but he is bound at least to recognize their wonderful agreement with the theory which he seeks to overturn. They are not the only words in which Paul, in declaring the whole counsel of God, affirms the divine sonship of Jesus. He says (Rom. viii, 2) "What the law could not do, in that it was weak *through the*

*flesh*, God (hath done in) sending His own SON in the likeness of sinful flesh." Here the sonship of Christ is placed in contrast to the weakness of the flesh. Mr. Dealtry's theory destroys the contrast, since it makes Jesus part and parcel of that flesh which Paul says the weakness of, made salvation impossible. Jesus was the Son of God in his *sending forth*, and not merely at some stage of his life, as Mr. Dealtry would have it. He was Son of God by constitution. How else are we to understand Paul's other words: "THOUGH HE WERE A SON, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered."—(Heb. v, 8.) Did he not learn obedience before he was thirty? Did the Father not pronounce himself "well-pleased" with him at that age, viz., at his baptism, which was part and parcel of his obedience? and what was the basis of this approval, publicly proclaimed, if not his obedience which he had learned? This obedience he learned "*though he were a son.*" Therefore he was a son in the first instance, instead of only becoming one in some recondite sense by the anointing of the spirit at his baptism. He was a son, because of the direct procreation of the Father by Mary, without human intervention. This explains Paul's other words, in which, declaring the counsel of God, he virtually affirms the miraculous conception, viz., those in which he quotes Psalm xl, 6, 8. "When he cometh into the world, he saith 'Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a *body hast thou prepared me* \* \* \* \* \* Lo, I come to do thy will, O God.' He taketh away the first that he may establish the second, by the which will, we are sanctified *by the offering of THE BODY OF JESUS CHRIST* once for all." All this is intelligible in view of the miraculous conception. The sacrifices under the law were incapable of taking away sin (verse 4), because the sin of a human being could never be punished in an animal. Sin requires the death of the sinner; the law admits of no substitution. It fastens on the offender and destroys him, and that which commits him to destruction holds him in destruction. The only remedy in the case was the one that has been adopted, and that was for God to manifest himself in the nature under condemnation, and meeting the full requirements of the law in death, vanquish it in a resurrection necessitated (on account of sinlessness) by its own operation. This plan was foreshadowed in the words of the Spirit through David. "Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not." As an ultimate arrangement, sacrifices were worthless. They were merely part and parcel of a provisional order of things, established intermediately, to teach preparatory lessons, and pointing, allegorically, to the real remedy in contemplation. As a final means (which ignorance was apt to regard then) "in them thou hast no

pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come." The spirit was to accomplish the real work, and to enable it to do this, "a body hast thou prepared me." The body required to be *sin's flesh*, that is, the nature of Adam, which by reason of sin, was under condemnation. This was one ingredient in the preparation. "He took not on him the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham." "He was made sin." "He was sent forth in the likeness of sinful flesh." But had the body been a mere product of Adamic procreation, it would not have been servicable for the purpose. A mere human being would have been a sinner. Had Jesus been the natural son of Joseph, he would not have been the body prepared; because as the son of Joseph, he would not have been sinless, and though he might have "died for our sins," he could not, as a sinner, have risen again, for that which kept all the children of Adam in bondage would have held him, and the scheme of salvation would have been a failure.—It is in resurrection after suffering where the success is achieved. (1 Cor. xv, 17.) This success, as between God and man, is limited to Christ, but he is invested with power and authority, as a mediator, to operate towards all who come unto God by him, and to dispense the results of his victory to all who receive them by faith. He is their judge and life-giver—the resurrection and the life. Being begotten by the spirit, Jesus was a prepared body; for by this means he was made capable of sinlessness. He received a stamp and capacity of mind which qualified him for greater accomplishments than were possible in the polluted channel of merely Adamic generation; and was thus qualified to be the Saviour of the world.

Mr. Dealtry cites the mythological Semiramis of Babylon, in discountenance of the miraculous conception. He says the doctrine dates back into antiquity, and is therefore to be suspected. This is not worth much. The misapplication of truth in times of ignorance, does not destroy it. The ancients believed that the righteous became gods after death. Is it therefore untrue that it is the destiny of the righteous to become elohim, after the death state is at an end? The heathen fable was the truth in distortion. The Babylonians believed Nimrod to have been miraculously conceived; is it therefore untrue that the true captain of salvation—the seed of *the woman*—who was promised from the earliest times, and whose tradition was misapplied to Nimrod, was "sent forth made of a woman?" There is an ingredient of truth in fables sometimes. Mr. Dealtry lays stress on the circumstance that Jesus was not officially proclaimed Son of God till his immersion in Jordan. But this is inconsistent with the testimony of John the Baptist, who said to his disciples "after me cometh a man who is preferred before me, for

he was before me, and I knew him not, but THAT HE SHOULD BE MADE MANIFEST to Israel, *therefore am I come baptising with water.* \* \* \* He that sent me to baptise with water, the same said unto me, *upon whom thou shalt see the spirit descending, and remaining on him,* the same is he that baptiseth with the Holy Spirit, *and I saw and bare record, that THIS IS THE SON OF GOD.*"—(John i, 30, 34.) The immersion of Christ was therefore merely his official introduction to Israel—*his manifestation*, not his making; the descent of the Holy Spirit was his *identification* as the Son of God—not his constitution. He was the Son of God before, having been begotten by the power of the Highest, according to the testimony of Luke, which Mr. Dealtry in vain endeavours to get rid of.

Then, Mr. Dealtry asks "Is it not strange that there was such positive ignorance of the fact that he was the Son of God, if it was announced at his birth?" The answer is that the ignorance was not so positive as Mr. Dealtry assumes. John the Baptist knew there was such a man, though he was unacquainted with him personally. He said "*there standeth one among you WHOM YE KNOW NOT* \* \* \* whose shoe latchet I am not worthy to unloose." If it be thought a wonder that John should not know him, being his cousin, we have only to remember that John was brought up in the desert from childhood, (Luke i, 80,) and probably never had the opportunity of seeing Jesus, who lived in another part of the country. As to the people not knowing him, it shows they were mistaken in supposing him to be the son of Joseph. As Jesus said to them afterwards "Ye judge after the flesh."—(Jno. viii, 15.) "But," enquires Mr. Dealtry, "if it was announced at his birth, why should they be ignorant?" When Mr. Dealtry asks this, he forgets that the announcement was not made with the publicity which it has since attained in the wide-spread diffusion of the scriptures of the New Testament, nor at a time when there were the facilities for propagating news, that now exist. We are apt to judge the incidents of the time in the light of the full knowledge we ourselves possess, and with reference to modern experience in the circulation of intelligence. Thirty years had elapsed from the birth of Christ to the baptism in the Jordan. This was long enough to have effaced in great part, the impression made at the time of his birth. The child Jesus grew up as an ordinary child, under the care of his parents; and presenting nothing remarkable to the notice of neighbours, the tradition of his birth, if it ever got beyond his family, would soon sink into forgetfulness. Popular interest feeds on marvel; and when marvel ceased, the attention would flag and die, and Jesus would grow up unnoticed, as the carpenter's

son. It is highly improbable that his divine paternity was a matter of common report. It was precisely a matter of that description that would be kept private. "Mary kept all these things and pondered them in her heart." It is a question if Joseph and Mary understood the matter fully. It is testified of them in the very narrative which Mr. Dealtry says was written to countenance, by a lie, the story of the miraculous conception, and in which, therefore, the matter ought to have been represented as well understood throughout, "that Joseph and his mother marvelled at those things that were spoken of him."—(Luke ii, 33.) The lapse of thirty years would greatly tend to involve in haze the mysterious and feebly-comprehended occurrences of his birth, and made the public manifestation of his true character by immersion, by the visible effusion of the Holy Spirit, a necessity and an appropriate introduction of him to Israel at full age. Mr. Dealtry's version is, that he was the son of Joseph from his birth to 30, and at that age became the Son of God by the anointing of the Spirit! This is merely a version. He can shew nothing in proof of it. It is his theory of the facts. He can quote no testimony that Jesus thus and then became Son of God. He says it is so; and to prop up his unattested theory, he throws overboard the narratives of Matthew and Luke, which, if one or two scholars opine to reject, an overwhelming majority consider genuine, and which, if one or two M.S.S. (mutilated to suit the carnal doctrines of the Josephite school) are without, a preponderating number possess? He gives two reasons for Jesus being styled the Son of God. First, he says "Son of God" was equivalent to "the Messiah." True, but how came this to be the case? The answer is, because the Messiah was to be a son of God. Can Mr. Dealtry's theory furnish an answer. "It was so understood by the Jews," he adds, viz., that the two terms were equivalent. This does not help the matter. The reason which made them interchangeable among the Jews, destroys Mr. Dealtry's theory. Although the Jews considered Jesus to be son of Joseph, yet as to the Messiah of their own expectation, they looked for him to be "the Son of the Blessed," (Mark xiv, 61) and that he should "continue for ever." The "Messiah" and the "Son of God" were interchangeable, because one was to be the other. The second reason why Mr. Dealtry alleges Jesus to have been styled Son of God, is the fact that he was the first to rise from the dead immortal. This is utterly excluded by the fact that he was called the Son of God before his resurrection, as already shewn.

Mr. Dealtry's answer to our remarks on the genealogies calls for no reply. He cannot account for Matthew introducing Joseph as *the husband of Mary*, and not as the *father*

of Jesus. He simply says that Matthew having done the one, it was unnecessary to do the other. This is not satisfactory. The truth admits of a complete solution. It was only by the legal union of his mother with Joseph in marriage, that Jesus could acquire the rights and titles of Joseph's first-born, and Matthew is careful to show that this was accomplished. Mr. Dealtry enquires why the miraculous conception, if a fact, was not placed above suspicion by happening before instead of after the marriage? The answer is fatal to Mr. Dealtry's view. If it had been a fiction, no doubt the inventors would have framed it in accordance with Mr. Dealtry's suggestion; but it was no fiction. If Christ's birth had happened out of wedlock, he would not have been Joseph's son, and would therefore have lacked one of the qualifications of the Messiahship, but occurring after Mary had become "one flesh" with Joseph, he had all the advantage of a direct paternity, without the hopeless defilement that would have come with a purely Adamic descent.

Mr. Dealtry objects to the application of Isaiah's prophecy—"A virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel")—to Christ, and contends that it pointed to Isaiah's own son.—"Mahershalalhashbaz." His first reason is that Jesus was not called Emmanuel. If this is a good reason against Christ, it is a good reason against Mahershalalhashbaz, for he was not called Emmanuel. But, says Mr. Dealtry, endorsing Bishop Lowth's explanation, the use of the name in reference to the child was to "denote the presence of God in effecting the liberation of the Jews." According to this, he applies the name "Emmanuel" on the principle of a recognised import, or significance in the events to which the child stood related. If this is sound in the case of Mahershalalhashbaz, why is it to be refused in the case of Jesus? Oh, says Mr. Dealtry, the prophecy does not intimate that he was to be called the meaning of the word Immanuel, but "shall call his name Immanuel." If this is to rob Jesus of the name, does it not equally bar its applicability to the child to which Mr. Dealtry applies it? But more; if this is a sound principle as applied to Immanuel, can it be unsound in reference to other names? Mr. Dealtry says that because Jesus was called Jesus, and not Immanuel, this prophecy does not apply to him. Was Jesus ever called "Wonderful Counsellor, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace?" There is a prophecy (Isaiah ix, 6), that his name shall be called these things; but because these names were only realised in meaning and not in personal denomination, Mr. Dealtry's argument would compel us to dismiss this passage from Isaiah from the list of Messianic predictions. That he is not prepared for this is evident from his quoting the passage in the

foregoing letters. The same remarks apply to "The BRANCH," "David," "Michael," and other names which only express doctrinal truth concerning Christ, but were not denominatively applied to him. "Immanuel" is as much a name of Christ as "Jesus;" for all names are his that define the truth about him. He, and he alone, is "God with us." "The word was made flesh and dwelt among us."—(John i, 14.) "Without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness, God manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels," &c.—(1 Tim. iii, 16.)

But how, asks Mr. Dealtry, was the birth of Christ a sign to Ahaz? In seeking an answer to this question, it must be kept in view that Ahaz did not want a sign, and declined to ask one, and that this was not given at his request. The birth of Emmanuel by a virgin, was a sign volunteered by Deity. This is important, because it suggests that a wider scope would be given to it than would have pertained to a sign requested for private uses. The circumstance of the moment to which it had relation was a confederacy between Israel and the Syrians, to destroy Judah. This was the peril which elicited the divine assurance that the enemies of Judah should not prevail, of which the sign given was the birth of Immanuel. Now, taking the comprehensive view of this which is justified by the fact that it was a divine pledge, we can see that it goes beyond the days of Ahaz, and extends to all the perils that should beset the house of David. The birth of Immanuel is the guarantee that the house of David shall be delivered from all its enemies and triumph to the ends of the earth. The assurance of this event served the purpose of the moment, for before Christ was even born, "the land which Ahaz abhorred was forsaken of both her kings." When the virgin Mary "brought forth her firstborn son," Rezin and Pekah were rotting in the dust. But while thus answering the purpose of the moment, in affording a basis for the assurance that Pekah and Rezin should not succeed in their plot against Jerusalem, it furnished a general pledge for all time that God would manifest himself in a son of David, and in him, be with Israel for the taking away of their sins and the destruction of their enemies. The sequel of the prophecy gives it this comprehensive bearing. Days of evil are predicted, (verse 17) future to the time of Ahaz, when, through the vast depopulation of the land, there would be abundance of field produce for the few survivors. The triumph of Assyria, not only over Damascus and Samaria (the sources of Judah is then immediate danger) but over Judah itself, is foretold; "He shall pass through Judah; he shall overflow and go over; he shall reach even to the neck; and the stretching out of his wings shall fill the breadth of thy land, O Immanuel" (Isaiah viii, 8.) Then a confederacy of nations

against Judah is contemplated in the indefinite future. "Associate yourselves, O ye people, and ye shall be broken to pieces; and give ear *all ye of far countries*; gird yourselves, and ye shall be broken in pieces; take counsel together, and *it shall come to nought*; speak the word, and *it shall not stand*: for GOD IS WITH US." Here the birth of Immanuel (God with us) is distinctly associated with the final triumph of Israel over every hostile combination. That this is the scope of the prediction becomes more and more evident with every verse in the prophecy which begins at the beginning of chap. vii and extends to the end of chap. ix. Immediately after the verse last quoted, (viz, in verse 10), the prophet is warned not to participate in the panic which then prevailed with regard to the hostile alliance of Ephraim and Syria. He is instructed to fear Jehovah, and not the enemy, who will come to nought, and there is coupled with this injunction, a prophetic reason which directly lays hold on the days of Christ: "He (Jehovah) shall be for a sanctuary; but (in the first instance) for a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel, for a gin and a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and many of them shall stumble and fall, and be broken, and be snared and be taken." Now, in Jesus (whose very name intimates the part Jehovah played in his mission), Jehovah is a sanctuary of refuge, both in relation to present individual wants and the future salvation of Israel; but in the first aspect of his manifestation, he became a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence. His appearance among them was the occasion of the greatest catastrophe that ever befel the nation. "They rejected him and were destroyed. "They stumbled at that stumbling-stone." (Rom. ix, 32.) "They fell upon that stone, and were broken." The sequel to this stumbling-stone effect of Immanuel's manifestation, is indicated in the prophecy thus: "Bind up the testimony, seal the law among my disciples; and I will wait upon the Lord, who hideth his face from the house of Jacob, and I will look for him. Behold I and the children whom the Lord hath given me, are for signs and for wonders," &c. In this, we have depicted the confirmation of the promises in the death of Christ, and their establishment as a living testimony in the persons of those believing the gospel, through the preaching of the apostles; and, furthermore, the withdrawal of Christ to the presence of the Father, and the relation of Christ's brethren to the Jews, as signs, if they could but read them. There is no speculation in these applications of the prophecy, for almost every part of it is quoted in this way in the New Testament, (Heb. ii, 13; 1 Peter ii, 8.) Then follows the dreary interregnum of the times of the Gentiles, culminating in the

breaking in of joy upon the nation, through the supernatural breaking of the power of the enemy: "For every battle of the warrior is with confused noise and garments rolled in blood, but THIS shall be with burning and fuel of fire. FOR UNTO US A CHILD IS BORN (here is the final application of the Immanuel prophecy), UNTO US A SON IS GIVEN, and the government shall be upon his shoulder, and his name shall be called WONDERFUL COUNSELLOR, the MIGHTY GOD, the EVERLASTING FATHER, the PRINCE OF PEACE. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this."

Then the prophecy reverts to the immediate danger to Judah from Rezin and Pekah's designs, shewing that the scope of the sign of Immanuel with which it opens, extended to the days of the Messiah, who alone could answer to the name, and who, assuredly, has been born of a virgin.

After the sign of Emmanuel, having reference to God's general and ultimate purpose with the house of David, there is introduced by a "moreover" (chap. viii, 1)—the sign of Mahershalalhashbaz, whose name imported ruin upon Ephraim and Syria, who were confederate against Judah. This child was purely an omen of evil. His birth guaranteed destruction of Judah's then active enemies, but did not, like the other, bring with him a pledge of Judah's triumph over all future perils. He brought no indication of God being with them. His name ("In making speed to the spoil, he hasteneth to the prey") was purely a token of strife and rapine, to be directed first against Syria and Ephraim, then against Judah, and afterwards to be turned back from the house of David, on account of Immanuel, "the child born, and the son given, whose name ('God with us') who should be called Wonderful, &c." Rationalism confounds Immanuel with Mahershalalhashbaz, and Mr. Dealtry follows it in the mistake, from a natural desire to get rid of so potent a testimony to the miraculous conception, as is contained in the words applied to Immanuel. The effort is unavailing. The two are distinct. Israel's son was a pledge of calamity; Immanuel is the "dayspring from on high"—the intervention of the Almighty—the arm of the Lord—God manifest in the flesh, for the great purpose which is the only joy of men—the purpose to take away the sin of the world, extirpate the evils, physical and political—to which it has given birth, and fill the earth with glory.

As to Mr. Dealtry's comment on the translation of Emmanuel, as given in the alleged

spurious part of Matthew, there is really nothing in it when closely scanned. The basis of it is the traditional assumption that Matthew wrote his gospel in the Hebrew. There is no evidence of this. It is possible he may have written his first M.S. in Hebrew; but the copy from which we get our translation, is in Greek, which shows that he must have written his complete and final narrative in that language; or at any rate, that he sanctioned and edited a translation into the language which was most prevalent at the time, even among the Jews, which would account for the explanation of the Hebrew term "Immanuel;" because Matthew, knowing that his gospel would, with the spread of the truth among the Gentiles, get into the hands of people not understanding the applicability of Immanuel to Jesus, apart from its meaning, would most naturally insert the explanatory remark which Mr. Dealtry rather rashly affirms to be evidence of its forgery.

The genealogies furnish Mr. Dealtry with further matter of remark, and involve him more deeply than ever in the mire. He denies that the genealogy of Luke is that of Christ through Mary, affirming it to be Joseph's line on the maternal side, and that Matthew's genealogy is Joseph's, in the line of his father. Of Mary he makes nothing. He declares the attempt to prove her to be of the house of David, a failure. For the purpose of his argument, Mary is a stranger, and not of the house of David at all. It is in Joseph that the genealogical purity centres. He is of David, by father and mother, but not so Jesus. The genealogies are given to prove the genuineness of Joseph's descent. It is in him that the two lines of David end. Christ's purity is broken by the intervention of a stranger, Christ is here compared with Joseph. One would now almost imagine that Joseph was to be the Messiah. Has it never occurred to Mr. Dealtry that if it was important for Joseph to be of pure Davidian descent, it was no less so for his son, who was to be heir to the throne; and that if it was necessary for Joseph to have father and mother both descended from David, it surely was as much so for Jesus who was to be the true bearer of the Davidian glory? It would really seem that the exigencies of his theory have made

him lose his bearings, and landed him at the shrine of Joseph instead of "great David's greater son."

But he says "you only allege, and do not prove—that Luke's genealogy is that of Mary." And what does he do? He alleges that it is the genealogy of Joseph; he does nothing more. He asserts that his view is right. It may be said that one assertion is as good as another. In the abstract this is true, but where collateral facts are brought to bear, it makes a difference. Now, the collateral fact in this case is that the New Testament alleges Jesus to have been born of Mary, without Joseph, an allegation which is borne out by every subsequent allusion to the origin of Jesus, and therefore if Jesus is a pure descendant of David, Mary must have been of the house of David. Hence, *prima facie*, one of the two genealogies must be that of Mary. It is for Mr. Dealtry to prove that it is Joseph's; the onus lies upon him. He asserts it is so; further he cannot go; and further the other side cannot go upon the exclusive merits of the genealogies. The point must abide the determination of the wider and more general question whether Jesus was the Son of God or the Son of Joseph. The evidence on this question is so conclusive, that all minor questions, such as that raised on the genealogy, must fall in, and take rank under the great conclusion, that "great is the mystery of Godliness, *God manifest in the flesh.*"

As to Mr. Dealtry's remarks on Luke's parenthesis and the subject of registration, we let them pass with the remark that supposing he were right, (which we do not admit for one moment), it would not in the slightest degree determine the general question in his favour, for the simple reason that in the eye of the law, Jesus was, to all intents and purposes, the son of Joseph, and, as a matter of fact, through Mary, was the son of Joseph, and therefore could be registered and described as such without in the smallest degree compromising the fact that he was the son of God. Mr. Dealtry's theory recognises only one of these facts; the truth recognises and accounts for both.

The subject will conclude in our next.

EDITOR.

## ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

### THE OBEDIENCE OF THE TRUTH— PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES IN THE WAY, DIFFICULTIES DOCTRINAL.

#### 1.—*The Individual Isolation caused by the Truth.*

W.O. writes "I think I must be drifting surely—if slowly—to *Christadelphianism.*"

What still hinders? Some few scripture difficulties, the which if I could see through satisfactorily, the remainder in the way of reducing faith to practice, would probably disappear. To refer to the latter first. If I fully embraced 'the doctrine of the kingdom,' I must relinquish connection with old religious associations entirely, that is, not only as regards myself, which would be a

comparatively easy matter, but as regards my family. Religious life of any sort cannot well be sustained but in assembling together, and it would not, in any case, be the difficulty of two meeting together who were not agreed, but that there would be no second person to meet with. Naturally of a secluded temperament, I quite think the loss to myself in no meeting would be far less than to many; but how could I allow the "offspring" to imbibe sentiments and teaching interwoven with so much error for the small portion of good they would obtain from orthodox teaching? The alternative appears to be to teach them myself at home. This I cannot feel qualified for by a very long way, and were it attempted, I feel it must result in failure, and should feel condemned in depriving them of the modicum of good which they would obtain in the old paths. This is my practical difficulty."

Doubtless our correspondent's difficulty is great, but there is a solution for it in the first principle which must regulate a man in every relation and circumstance of life, viz., find out what is right to be done, and leave the difficulties to take care of themselves. Assuming our correspondent to have committed himself to the truth, there would be no haziness about duty in the case. Personal dissociation from the apostasy, in all its branches, is the first step devolving upon a man who receives the truth. He cannot please God and remain in fellowship with a system which is a negation of His truth in every particular. If he elects to listen to the invitation contained in the truth to men and women, to become the servants of Christ, that they may be heirs of the glory he has purchased with his own blood, he must accept the responsibility attached to this position of privilege. He must become a witness for the truth of Christ, and a slave to the interests of Christ, so far as they exist in the world at the present time in the fortunes of the truth and the welfare of his brethren and sisters. He must "come out" from associations of every kind that are inimical to these interests. He must "have no fellowship" with any whose workings or influence are detrimental to the work of Christ. It becomes sin to him to say "God speed," in any shape or form to men who (unwittingly or not) are enemies of the great gospel that Christ has committed to the hands of all his servants, as a charge to be faithfully kept and defended. Hence he must give up "old associations;" he must leave the churches and chapels; for there is no greater hindrance to the truth than these refuges of a pretended gospel, and no bitterer enemies to the gospel of Christ than those who preach therein for hire, and those who are zealously affected by their means. To do this will often land a man in our correspondent's difficulty; he must sometimes stand alone. Never mind; bravely

accept the alternative. Perhaps you will not be always alone. Your courage may embolden others. God may give you good company when He has proved you; but, whether or not, be faithful. Wash your hands of all complicity with a system of fables, which holds itself out to the world as the truth. If need be, stand as a solitary witness to the promises of God, and you will have a sweet recompense in the record written above, against the time when "God will judge the secrets of men by Christ Jesus." The present generation will follow its successors to the tomb. Our wisdom is to choose that which will not be taken away.

## 2.—THE FAMILY DISADVANTAGES OF THE TRUTH.

But the children! Well, our duty is plain. It is an apostolic injunction (and the dictate of common sense) to "bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," (Eph. vi, 4.) Now, this cannot be done if they are allowed to run in "the old paths," mentioned by our correspondent, namely going to church and chapel, and attending the Sunday School of orthodox institutions. While they do this, they imbibe sentiments which effectually prevent the truth from entering in, and make it a difficult thing afterwards to introduce it. They contract early prejudices for men and things connected with the apostasy, which help to implant the fables deeply. Their young affections entwine themselves around objects which afterwards prove snares and obstacles in the way, and all the more powerful, because they enlist the religious feelings. Our best opportunity of discharging the parental duty is gone before we know. The nurture and admonition of the Lord involve instruction as to our constitution and position before God, and his purpose towards us as declared by his servants, the prophets and apostles. This it is impossible to communicate to children, while their minds are daily undergoing that powerful inoculation of error which takes place in a young mind among large numbers in circumstances of respectability. If we would discharge the duty apostolically enjoined, we must withdraw them from "the old paths," which are the paths of darkness. But our correspondent says "I cannot teach them." Perhaps not to his own satisfaction; but that he is absolutely incapable of imparting any instruction to them, no one will believe who reads his letter. He can teach them a little, and if he can only do this imperfectly, it is better to teach them the truth blunderingly than allow them to be educated smartly in error. A chapter read every Sunday, and a few simple questions on those simple historical occurrences on which so great a part of the truth hinges, will do them more good in the way of genuine



enlightenment, than all the Sunday School tuition they would get in ten years. Mixing with strange children in such an exercise would, no doubt, be beneficial, but, if this cannot be had at first, make the best of the circumstances. A brave attempt to do right in the matter might lead to an extension of operations beyond the family circle. But, why deprive them, says our correspondent, of "the modicum of good" they get in the orthodox channel? The answer is, because of the preponderance of evil that comes along with it, and because the good they get is to be had at the secular day school without the evil.

It cannot be denied that the case depicted by our correspondent's letter is one of drawback and disadvantage; and the only counsel that can be given in the circumstance, is to face the difficulty with a deliberate resolution that come what will, the right will be the guide, the duty to God be done. It may be that such a course, with prayer, will evoke the blessing of the Almighty, and lead to happier circumstances even now.

#### THE PROMINENCE OF THE CROSS IN THE EPISTLES.

Our correspondent next proceeds to "doctrinal difficulties," which he enumerates thus:

"To enumerate my doctrinal difficulties, let me specify

1.—My old one, which I have not yet quite seen my way through. The prominence (in the epistles) given to the death of Christ and faith in him. Did it not seem to be the *absorbing* subject with Paul? 'I determined to know nothing among you, save Jesus Christ and him crucified.'—(1 Cor. ii, 2.) This may apply especially to the Corinthians and Greeks, but how about similar prominence to the same subject in Philippians i, 18; iii, 18; iii, 9. The faith of Christ not the faith of the promises, nor of the kingdom; the gospel of Christ, i, 27; And, to return to Corinthians, "We preach Christ crucified" (1 Cor. i, 23); Christ is the *foundation* of the building, and no other. (1 Cor. iii, 3), and the chief corner stone (Eph. ii, 20), and the head stone.—(Ps. cxviii, 22.) Also, the *object* of faith.—(Gal. iii, 26; Eph. iii, 12; Gal. ii, 20; Rom. iii, 22.)"

To one thoroughly acquainted with the truth, it will seem strange that the New Testament prominence of the cross should be felt a difficulty in the way of receiving "the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ." We venture to predict that with progress, our correspondent himself will view it in this light. One can quite understand it, nevertheless. Orthodox preaching consists in the iteration of the fact that Christ died, and though the fact is wrested from its scriptural signifi-

cance, yet the mere prominence of the fact gives an appearance of agreement between Paul and orthodoxy in the matter, but it is a mere appearance. There is no real agreement. Paul speaks about Christ crucified, and orthodoxy speaks about Christ crucified. There is an identity of words, and an identity of idea so far as the surface of the history goes, but here the identity ends. Paul "preached the kingdom of God, and those things that concern our Lord Jesus Christ."—(Acts xviii, 31.) In doing this, he preached Christ crucified. To preach "Christ crucified" is to proclaim two things. It is to proclaim that Jesus of Nazareth is the "Christ the king of Israel," and, therefore, to proclaim "the things concerning the kingdom of God;" and, (2nd) that this anointed king of Israel was crucified on account of the death reigning through Adam. Orthodoxy only preaches the crucifixion; it says nothing about the Christship of the man crucified. It knows nothing of the kingdom of God, and even the crucifixion it misunderstands and misrepresents. It gives it a pagan dress. It says it was the *endurance of torment* by the eternal God at the hands of the eternal God, that immortal souls might escape decreed eternal torment, which is a perversion and mystification of the whole matter. It was the sustaining of the *consequence of sin* (death—the deprivation of life) by a man who, being sinless, could survive the vindication of the law in a resurrection which would have been impossible with a sinner; and it was the provision, thus, of a name by the assumption of which (through faith and obedience) we (condemned and perishing children of Adam) acquire a title to life, otherwise beyond our reach.

But—says our correspondent—you don't make enough of the death of Christ. This is a mistake on his part. The death and resurrection of Christ constitute the foundation-stone of the whole scheme of salvation. But for these, the promises would have been void, and eternal life an impossibility. Salvation is entirely of Christ. By a beautiful figure of speech, we are "washed from our sins in his own blood;" we are "redeemed unto God by him, out of every tribe and tongue, and people, and nation," and the heart enlarged by a full enlightenment in the matter, instinctively responds to the Apocalyptic ascription, in which it hopes to be privileged to participate; "worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and strength, and honour, and glory and blessing." Why, then, it may be asked, do you not give it greater prominence? The answer is, that the presentation of a subject is entirely governed by circumstances. Among those who are captured by the truth, the sacrificial and priestly aspects of Christ's work and position, will have the highest and

holiest place; but as to those outside, it entirely depends upon their attitude to the truth as to which phase of it is pressed upon them. Paul had a good reason for holding up the death of Christ among the Corinthians; because they were surrounded by a system of philosophy which made a future life an affair of "virtue." The Platonists taught the immortality of the soul, and a happy disembodiment to those who lived righteously, according to philosophic conceptions. Paul taught the mortality of man under the divine law, and Christ, crucified and raised, as the only possible means of future immortality. Paul and "the wisdom of this world," as exemplified in the doctrine of the Grecians, were at direct issue on the point that brought the death of Christ into prominence. In the circumstances of the Corinthians, it was the most natural declaration of his attitude to say that among them he would know nothing; but (1.) "Jesus Christ AND (2.) him crucified;" that is, he would know nothing but "the things concerning the kingdom of God (symbolised by the name Jesus Christ), and the things concerning his name," as a means of salvation. He refused to recognise "philosophy and vain deceit," that imported "virtue" into the question, as determining a man's future destiny. He adhered rigidly to the truth of God, which had for its centre and foundation, the fact that Christ had died and risen again; but distinctly included the proclamation that Christ who had thus died, was the king of Israel, and future ruler of the world. The orthodox method of construing the passages in question, excludes the kingdom of God, and sets the Bible against itself. It makes Paul in his letters, teach that what he preached in his evangelistic journeyings, was unnecessary.—(Acts xx, 25; xxviii, 32).

W. O. lays stress on the pronoun "him" as occurring in the passages alluding to Christ as an object of faith, apparently with the intention of favouring the orthodox practice of exalting the personality of Christ over his mission, in the aspect in which he is to be grasped by individual faith. Experience of the scriptures will show that this is a mistake—not that the personality of Christ can be too vividly realised or too strongly cherished, by the affections, but our love of Christ as a person must always be based on a knowledge of him as the manifestation of the divine purpose. He comes before men styling himself **THE TRUTH**, and the man who does not comprehend the truth, is not prepared to offer acceptable love. Christ will not accept love except on his own premisses, and these premisses are the truth concerning him. Men must believe the gospel before they can be saved, and the gospel is made up of the facts about himself, in his first and second appearances, or "the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ." In ignorance of these, love is of no

value. A faith that lays hold of "him," but ignores the truth, is not a faith that will be of any avail. The "him" used in the epistles, must always be read as expressive of the truth of which he is the embodiment. To read it in the personal sense as distinct from the doctrinal, is to fall into the mistake of the young man who came to Christ with personal admiration, but doctrinal ignorance. Styling him "Good Master," which Christ refused to receive on the basis on which it was tendered; "Why callest thou me good?" he said, "there is none but one, that is God." Orthodoxy would dissociate the personal from the doctrinal, and, as in the other case, put the Bible against itself. No system of interpretation can be right that excludes any part of God's arrangements. Everything that he does is perfect. Nothing must be underrated; every part of the truth must receive effect. The whole of the gospel must be taken in. Christ as the truth is a far lovelier personage than Christ as a mere ideal of moral beauty. Christ as the centre piece of "the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ," is a much grander and more palpable object of personal love than the sickly "Jesus" of orthodox superstition.

#### THE DIFFICULTY OF DIVIDING THE SCATTERED TRIBES OF ISRAEL; AND THE PRIESTHOOD OF THE FUTURE AGE.

Our correspondent proceeds:—"Now, respecting the "Coming Age," Ezek. xlv, 22, appears to me to stand forcibly in the way of the correctness of your explanation of the last eight chapters of the prophet. Apart from the apparent impossibility to rightly separate the *mixed-up* tribes of Israel and the *literal* sons of Zadok, how is the fact of regulations of marriage among the priests (immortal) to be reconciled with the teaching of Christ, that in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage?—(Matt. xxii, 30.) It is almost too bad to trouble you with such questions, seeing how full your hands must be, but I think they comprise the chief of my difficulties."

God's purpose to restore Israel "according to their tribes," being admitted, it is easy to have faith in his ability to accomplish the superhuman task of "rightly separating the mixed-up tribes." With God nothing is impossible.—As to the priests, all the priests of the future age will not be immortal. There is a class who are to have "charge of the house" (Ezek. xl, 45; xlv, 14), whose duty it will be to slay the sacrifices and perform all the services of the sanctuary, and stand between the people and a higher order of priests, styled "the sons of Zadok," which are to have charge of the altar.—(Ezek. xl, 46; xlv, 15.) The former are the descendants of the Levites,

who led Israel to idolatry in ancient times, (Ezek. xlv. 10), and who are excluded from the higher functions of priesthood; the latter point to a specific class of the Levites who were obedient, and whose presence in the new temple argues their resurrection and immortalization. The "regulations as to marriage" apply to the first class, and not to the second. They appear to apply to the

second on a first reading, but closer attention will show that verses 15 and 16 of chap. xlv. which introduce the sons of Zadok, are in the nature of a parenthesis or interpolation in the discourse on the duties of the inferior order of priests. Verse 17 resumes the subject of verse 15. This being kept sight of, the difficulty disappears.

## INTELLIGENCE.

**ABERDEEN.**—Brother Gill announces the immersion at this place, on the 4th instant, of the wife of brother JAMES GRANT, of Tomintoul.

**BARNSTAPLE.**—Brother D. Atkins, of Bradford, near this place, reports the immersion of DANIEL RODGERS, of Barnstaple, who has been led to the truth through contact with brother Atkins, who followed up conversational efforts with book lending. He says the truth has at last begun to take root in the neighbourhood, and that he has hope of one or two becoming obedient at an early period.

**BIRMINGHAM.**—Since the issue of the January No., there have been four immersions, particulars being as follow: ELIZABETH REED (31), wife of brother Reed, formerly neutral; THOMAS GIBBS (43), police clerk, brought up in the Church of England; nearly persuaded to join the Church of Rome, from which he was hindered by final inability to receive the doctrine of transubstantiation; afterwards a Primitive Methodist, and finally a Wesleyan Reformer; all the time in search of the truth, but never satisfied till now; MARY BLAKEMORE (26), domestic servant, brought up in the Church of England; JANE DEAN (14), daughter of brother and sister Dean, who, notwithstanding her extreme youth, has given diligent heed to the truth for two years, and, before her immersion, made a more intelligent profession of her faith than many adults who take the same step. There are about eighteen brethren capable of engaging in exhortation to profit; but hitherto for want of method, their number has operated to keep them back, and their services have been repressed. An arrangement has now been adopted by which their talents will be brought into exercise for the general profit. A plan has been agreed to by which particular brethren engage to speak on particular Sundays. The quarterly tea meeting was held on

January 13th, when amongst other business transacted, it was resolved to have an extra weekly collection in the morning, toward the expenses of Dr. Thomas's visit to this country; and also to place a box in the hall to receive the contributions of interested strangers, who desire to cooperate in the matter. Three collections have taken place with the following result, first, 15s.2d; second, 18s.10d.; third 15s. The quarterly report shewed the following figures:—increase by immersion during the quarter, 5; by removal 1; decrease by removal 2; total number by corrected list, 94; visits during the month, 8; largest number at the table, 73; smallest, 45; average, 68. Largest contribution at the table, £2 7s; smallest, £1 8s.; total amount for the quarter, £24 11s. 7½d.

**EDINBURGH.**—The labours of the brethren in the public proclamation of the truth still go on; and, all things considered, the attendance is satisfactory. There have been two additions to the ecclesia since last report. The first is that of Mrs. DEWAR, belonging to the United Presbyterians, who was added to the brethren on the 12th instant. The other case is that of ROBERT FAIRGREAVE, brother to our brother GEORGE FAIRGREAVE, (of Dewarton, Pathhead, a few miles from Edinburgh), who, on a confession of his faith, was immersed on Sunday the 19th instant.

**GLASGOW.**—Brother Clark reports the addition to the ecclesia, by immersion, of WILLIAM CADROW, about thirty years of age, (formerly connected with the Established Church,) who was immersed Sunday, January 26th.

**HALIFAX.**—Brother Richard Whitworth, reports a double accession to the number of the ecclesia by the immersion of JAMES BRIGGS, of Sowerby, and his wife EMMA, which took place on Sunday, January 26th.

NOTTINGHAM.—Brother Phelps announces an addition to the ecclesia in the person of JOHN HARRISON, wholesale grocer, who it appears has been acquainted with the truth for several years, and was immersed three years ago, upon an intelligent apprehension of the faith, though only now joined to the ecclesia. The Sunday evening lectures continue to be well attended.

WHITBY.—Brother Shuttleworth announces the following immersions: WILLIAM SLADE (33), mariner; ELIZABETH SLADE (33), wife of the same; WILLIAM FOWLER (65), jet manufacturer, and his wife, CATHERINE FOWLER; GEORGE HARLAND (28), jet manufacturer; Mrs. MARY ROBINSON (33). Four of these had been previously immersed on the basis of Mr. Dealtry's error. Brother Shuttleworth announces good meetings and favourable prospects for the truth. A proclamation issued by the ecclesia we have no room for this month.

#### CANADA.

GUELPH.—Brother H. L. Drake, writing January 12th, says that since his letter, the following have been added to the ecclesia. JOHN HARRIS (65), farmer; WILLIAM CRICHTON (40), farmer—both formerly connected with the "Morisonians;"

Mrs. MARIA VYE (24), formerly Methodist; BENJAMIN HOWELL, jun. (19), moulder. Others, says Brother Drake, are interested, and some are expected to become obedient. The brethren have rented the Old Masonic Hall, a room capable of accommodating 160 persons, and, at the date of writing, were about to commence a series of lectures, with the fortnightly assistance of brother J. Evans.

#### NEW ZEALAND.

GREEN ISLAND, OTAGO.—Brother J. Brown, of Abbotsford, Green Island, writes under date, November 17th, to say that through the assistance of brother Murray, of Port Chalmers, he, and the brethren with him, saw some time ago the invalidity of their first immersion, which was based upon the repudiation of the doctrine of judgment and other errors; and were re-immersed upon a full apprehension of "the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ." Since that time, they have had a good many additions, and now number 25; J. Graham and D. White not included, "who," says Brother Brown, "we hold are not in the faith." He adds that the truth is unpopular in that part of the world, but that the brethren are unitedly doing their best to advance it, with the result of causing many to look into it.

### THE PROPOSED ENLARGEMENT OF THE AMBASSADOR.

It was not to be expected that everyone professing the truth, would coincide with this proposal. There are many causes to prevent such a thing. Some know the truth, without realising the position to which it calls them as its agents, preachers, advocates, servants, or whatever other word may express the idea of total subsergency to its propagation. Others but faintly realise this, and are not in sympathy with a thorough policy in the matter, but prefer that milder form of attachment which leaves one at liberty to prosecute other objects and pursue other pleasures, and generally to be a citizen of "respectable" society. Others receive the truth in part, and are in favor of that so-called liberal policy which practically makes it a matter of indifference whether the truth is held or not, and makes the contention for it an impossibility. Such individuals, one and

all, are likely to look with disfavor on a proposal, the adoption of which would tend to give the agitation for a pure and consecrated faith, greater power and effect than it now has. In one or two cases, they have expressed their disfavor, and we give the cause of the truth the benefit of their dissent, knowing that good will be done in the right quarters by the irrational opposition they offer. One of them writes in the following excited strain:—"You act like a madman. Your tendencies are in the worst direction. What new folly is this you aspire to? To live 'off' preaching and printing your peculiar ideas. By the first love you had for the truth, and the virgin hatred we all once had for hirelings, cease to ape the clergy. Work fairly and honestly for your bread, and give the truth for nothing. How can you denounce those you seek to imitate? You

have not the calm dignity to be a great father in the church, so that you never will be one I fear. Take then your place, and comport yourself as becometh the gospel you profess."

So much as there is of mere denunciation in the foregoing we pass by with the simple remark that the writer's undoubtedly sincere impression that we are mad and bad, is one of those moral hallucinations which have, from time out of date, been created by moral antagonism. Difference of view, principle and policy, lead to this kind of misunderstanding. The ancient Pharisees, who thought themselves a very circumspect and excellent order of men, were of the opinion that Jesus was beside himself; and the "most noble Festus," (doubtless a sensible Roman in his way) formed the same idea of Paul. It is natural for minds of narrow scope, to condemn proceedings having their impulse in a state of mind beyond their own experience. If they call the master of the house Beelzebub, one must not be surprised if he incur the same obliquity in attempting to pursue the part of a servant.

So much as there is of argument in the letter aforesaid, it is easy to answer. The writer very much misapprehends the nature and origin of Christadelphian hostility to clerical hirelingism, if he imagines that it arises from the simple circumstance that the clergy are supported in their efforts to confer a supposed spiritual benefit. The objection to their practice, is, first: that the supposed gospel has been made a trade of, by which a man may acquire a stated income, in a settled place, for a stipulated amount of sermonising; 2nd, the service of the supposed gospel is made use of to support absurd personal pretensions and titles, creating a distinct and separate and unscriptural caste among professors of the truth; and third, that they do not preach the gospel at all. If they were men who, in the judgment of full age, and from an intelligent appreciation of the truth, and a disinterested desire to serve the supreme interests of God and man, gave themselves up to continued voluntary exertion in this behalf—their acceptance of temporal co-operation from those who might sympathise with their efforts, so far from being reprehensible, would be in accordance with the dictates both of common sense and apostolic precept. The truth cannot be brought under the attention of men without active personal agency. In theory, it is in every man's possession who has a Bible;

but as a matter of fact, it does not get into his head or heart, until his attention is arrested by external means, and his notice drawn to what the Bible contains. Experience is the proof of this. The truth prospers in proportion as there is an effective agitation of it. Where there is no one to call attention to it by mouth or pen, through the power of the apostacy, it remains unnoticed; although in the Bible. If, then, it be to the advantage of men, and according to the will of God, that they should know the truth, it is clearly a good thing and a dutiful policy, to set in motion every agency that will conduce to this result. This is the common sense view of the matter. It must be left to wisdom and experience to apply it in any given case. There is nothing to exclude any arrangement which the friends of truth, in love, may voluntarily devise, in the highest interests of men. The apostolic side of the question is coincident with the dictates of good sense.—(1 Cor. ix, 7-15.) We admit the liability of such an arrangement to be abused. The uprise of the clerical system has shown it. But abuse is no argument against use. Lawful co-operation among the friends of truth to discharge a common duty in a given way, is not to be cried down because a pretended gospel is upheld by an ignorant compact of many people, and because an order of men has arisen in connection with it, who put forth unscriptural pretensions and assume blasphemous titles. To hate the clerical system is good, but it is possible to hate the evil and not to love the good. Anticlericalism is a very convenient cry for the selfish democrat who wants to be let alone, and would rather not be troubled in his genteel pursuits and enjoyments. "Don't ape the clergy!" he shouts, when Christ's work is being done, and a greater service is proposed in its behalf. A very specious piece of hypocrisy, that will not deceive men, honestly and earnestly set for the defence of the gospel. If a prospectus were issued for a literary magazine, there would be no cry from this class, of "Don't ape the clergy." One might fag himself to death in writing and collecting matter of merely secular interest, and he would be patted on the back by such, and considered a highly respectable and useful member of society, and the more money he made at it, the better. If to this, he added the accomplishment of scientific lectures at one or more institutes, his respectability would be all the more complete, and his acquaintance so much

more to be prized and cultivated. But because the ink-dipped pen describes for the printer, characters representing—not the ephemeral trash of the passing hour, but matters of eternal moment, and because the vocalisation of the platform is dedicated to the sacred interests involved in the oracles of God, instead of the mere amusement or “instruction” of the audience, then there is a cry of “work honestly for your bread! don’t ape the clergy.” By their fruits such are known. The service of the flesh is with them legitimate, because they are of the flesh. The service of the truth is madness and badness, because they are not of the truth, though they make a profession of it. Such had better hold their peace. We are deaf to their counsels and entreaties. Where would the truth have been had their advice been followed in the past? We have to thank God for the courage of a man who, for the truth’s sake, years gone by, exchanged the temporal certainties of his profession, for the risks of publishing the truth, orally and by the press. But for him, humanly speaking, we should have been in ignorance of the truth. Yet this man, the class in question have all along condemned, and with him, the policy that has given us the bread of life. “Hireling!” is their cry, while all the time, they are themselves the most abject of hirelings—even hirelings to the old man of the flesh, whom they serve in divers ways—considered respectable and legitimate by this present evil world, as per Psalm cxlix, 18. Their zeal for “first love,” “honest work” will not mislead those who have their eyes open.

We append similar ebullitions of antagonism:—“I have come to the conclusion to withdraw my support as a subscriber to the *Ambassador*. I do this on the ground that it is utterly unfit for the purpose it is intended for. Instead of being a periodical devoted to the exposition and defence of the ‘things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ,’ it is devoted to the most abusive, and insulting, and sarcastical language, towards brethren and certain churches, which do not swallow everything that comes in the shape of doctrine from your lips, or because they do not fall before thee, as it were, so that you may walk over them, acknowledging thee as a great master, from whom comes forth only the words of truth, righteousness, and sound doctrine, subduing their own minds, and be led entirely by thy most masterly wisdom.”

Another writes:—“ . . . In reply

to brother Coombe and such like, I have to say that I already ‘repent’ of the hastily-written note I sent you last; but my regret is that I said so little in it; but had I known that you would print it, you would have had some more of the truth for once for the pages of your magazine. \* \* \*

\* \* \* You have no doubt good talents, but you have shown yourself utterly unfit for the editor of a publication in defence of the truth; and however some may laud you to your own delusion, I have not the slightest doubt you will ‘live to regret’ that ever you were pushed into such a dangerous position.”

Another writes to say that those with whom he is associated, are of the same mind they were some eighteen months ago, viz., that the *Ambassador* would be better reduced than enlarged—and, accordingly, they have reduced their order. The letter contains an unkind cut about “loaves and fishes.” It is not a question of loaves and fishes. We are offered employment as soon as the Bankruptcy Court closes; and accepting that offer we should be better off than we should probably be by charging 8d. for the *Ambassador*. But then we should have to give up the *Ambassador* and the service of the truth; and this we should not feel justified in doing, if we can swim at all by continuing the *Ambassador*.

Another writes to discontinue the *Ambassador*, observing that the mode of conducting it, especially in the matter of the Dowieites, “indicates, *phrenologically considered*, a very low and deficient organization!” Perhaps this correspondent would like to hear the definition of one of the first phrenologists of the day. It may afford him a key to matters that now appear cloudy: “You are full of sympathy; are very much interested in whatever excites your kindness; you can be positively enthusiastic in a benevolent enterprise. Veneration is rather large, and with large conscientiousness, gives you a tendency to value things that are divine. You have very large hope. You are constantly scheming, planning, projecting something new, and you are sure you are going to succeed. You have no faculty for contriving bargains; it bothers you to look after money matters. You are spirited in resistance; are prone to overcome obstacles in your way; but you are not cruel. You are fond of discussion; but your strongest motive is to advance ideas that appear to you to be important. Your conscientiousness and self-esteem, acting together,

incline you take responsibility, and guide other people. You are sensitive to the opinions of others, but are not so much stimulated by ambition as by a desire to advance principles that you think are right." We add no more, as this is a sufficient set off to the opinion of our correspondent

We have many letters, of an encouraging character, to hand since last month; but we let the matter rest for the present, satisfied of the duty and the feasibility of

the proposal put forward. It may be that the return of Jesus will supersede all arrangements for the future. God grant that the year may be lightened with the glory of his appearing; but we know neither the day nor the hour. We are in the epoch of his coming; but we know not the course of events in detail. Our duty meanwhile is to labour with all diligence, and be found of him as busily employed in his service, as if we thought him a thousand years off.

EDITOR.

### VISIT OF DR. THOMAS.

A SISTER would rejoice to see Dr. Thomas brought to this country for a period, and will contribute £5 to the expenses, and double the amount if necessary.

AN INTERESTED STRANGER requests his name to be put down for 10s. for the same purpose.

Bro. DEW, of Innerleithen, writes as follows:—"We feel very glad in the prospect of a visit from that veteran mariner, our esteemed and venerable brother Dr. Thomas, who has so bravely weathered the storm on a tempestuous Gentile sea, for many years. He is a profound adept in spiritual navigation. Under God, we are indebted to him, for what we as spiritual mariners now possess; he as it were constructed a life-boat, and set out to a stormy sea, with the prospect of nothing but tempestuous weather before him, in order, if happily he might be the means of saving some of this wicked and perverse generation, from a greater storm that we expect will soon burst forth on the Gentiles; when our God shall come, and shall not keep silence; when a fire shall devour before him, and be very tempestuous round about him. The Dr., by his mighty eloquence in the truth, succeeded in inducing a few here and there to enter the life-boat along with him, that they might be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation; but in process of time long subsequent to this, however, a mutiny arose among the crew, among some of them at least, who attempted to put the benevolent and brave man who constructed the life-boat, overboard. Ah, the flesh is always jealous of its honor; Korah, Dathan and Abiram envied the honour put upon Moses and Aaron by Jehovah, and said to them Ye take too much upon you; perhaps it was a spirit somewhat akin to this that actuated these mutineers against the Dr. Be this as it may, we rejoice in the thought that they did not succeed; for greater is *he* that is *for him* than all they that are against him; therefore the veteran mariner is brave and valiant as ever, because he is of the people that do know their God; therefore he is

strong and does exploits. These people, however, do not now sail in the same boat with the Dr. As *pirates*, they have constructed a leaky skiff of their own, that we fear will never weather the storm and get safe into port, although, at present, all seeming tranquil and serene with them. There are breakers ahead, and having in a certain sense cast aside the true rudder and compass, for their own opinions as their guide to the haven of peace, they are at the mercy of the winds and waves of Gentilism, as children liable to be tossed to and fro with every wind of doctrine. Prospectively speaking, their vessel is ill-fated, and we fear is doomed to founder and perish, when divinely tempestuous weather sets in. They are like the man who built his house upon the sand and not upon the rock, that was higher than himself. But being wise in their own conceits, they think not so, and this only makes them more the objects of our commiseration and pity. We write not concerning them in a sensorious self-sufficient spirit; we write faithfully and withal in a spirit of fear and trembling, and not with a view to make our voice be heard on high, lest at last we should be cast away, though now in the *more excellent way* than those we speak of; neither do we speak with a double-heart and lips of flattery concerning Dr. Thomas. For the truth's sake, we love and esteem him very highly indeed, for as we have said already, by the grace of God under him, we are what we are. Truly it may be said of him, as Paul said of himself: "the grace that was bestowed upon me was not in vain, for I laboured more abundantly than they all, yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me." In conclusion, then, we say sincerely and through gratitude for what we have received, God speed his visit to us, and according to our humble ability, we shall do what in us lies to further it, that the Mighty God of Jacob, in whom he puts his trust, may bring him in safety across the mighty deep."

In a second letter, bro. Dew says:—"I

write to inform you that we, as a fragmentary section of Christadelphia, have unanimously resolved from this time to lay by what is put into our fellowship fund in behalf of Dr. Thomas, should he deign to pay us a visit; we cannot guarantee a great sum, as the dullness of trade is affecting us, as it will do brethren I dare say elsewhere. But we will honestly and cheerfully do what we can, for assuredly we deem it a high honor to be permitted to take part in this labour of love, however humble that part may be, were it no more than casting in the widow's mite; and so I believe that by the conjoint cheerful offerings of the faithful, a handsome sum will be raised for the honourable purpose contemplated; where there is a will there is a way; where the will is strong, the obstacles that appeared like mountains dwindle into molehills before the invincible will.

BRO. J. W. MOORE, Devonport, writes:—"I am requested by the brethren in this locality to inform you of their desire to join in inviting Dr. Thomas to visit this country during this apparently eventful year, and they desire to state their intention to assist with pecuniary means to the best of their abilities.

BRO. GILLIES, of Beith, is glad at the prospect of a visit from the Dr., and thinks the commonest gratitude entitles him to a hearty welcome and an ample provision for his wants. "We are indebted," says bro. Gillies, "to him for our life and ought to provide for his." He approves of a fund out of which to pay all travelling expenses.

The object of providing a general fund is to equalise the burden among the ecclesias. Without arrangement, it might happen that an ecclesia of four might have to pay for a 300 miles ride, while one of 60 might have to send the Dr. only 50 miles. By providing a general fund, inequality will be obviated, and every place left at liberty to invite the Dr. without reference to the distance he may have to traverse to get to them. But, of course, local expenses would be borne by the parties desiring a visit. The general fund would only be applied to actual travelling expenses.—EDITOR.

BROther W. Graham, of Leeds, writes—"Our small ecclesia in Leeds, is very much delighted to hear through the *Ambassador*, of the probability of a visit from Dr. Thomas, of America, and we all of us unitedly beg most cordially to join the ecclesia of Birmingham in giving him an invitation to come amongst us; and for the furtherance of this object, we will, to our utmost, render that pecuniary aid which will enable him to come amongst us free of any loss on his part. We hope this laudable enterprise may be accomplished."

BROther D. Ramsay, of Galston, writes to intimate his endorsement of the invitation to Dr. Thomas, and his willingness to bear a share of the burden connected with it.

BROther J. J. Andrew writes—"I was very glad to see in this month's *Ambassador* the suggestion that Dr. Thomas should be invited to visit this country this year, for I have long wished to see him on this side of the Atlantic, knowing as I do, that but for his works, I should (humanly speaking) have still been ignorant of the way of salvation. I am naturally desirous of seeing and hearing one to whom we all owe so much. So many important political events have occurred since he was last in Great Britain, that I feel sure another visit from him during the year, would be very servicable to the truth. It will therefore afford me much pleasure to contribute towards the expenses, and I have no doubt the other brethren in London will be equally willing to co-operate in the matter."

BROther Paterson, of Edinburgh, says the proposal for a general invitation is concurred in by the the ecclesia there; but they also think an individual invitation ought to proceed from Edinburgh on account of the Doctor's personal connection with the ecclesia in that city, in former times. They will take their share in the general burden of expense, but reserve the consideration of the manner of appropriating it.

BROther D. Clement, of Mumbles, writes:—"I am requested by the Mumbles ecclesia to state in the *Ambassador*, that it is intended to invite Dr. Thomas to Great Britain. We hope that all the friends of the truth in the kingdom will respond to your suggestion in respect to raising funds for that purpose. Nothing could give us greater pleasure than to have the opportunity of promoting the truth by contributing our part to such a desirable and we believe (to all lovers of the truth) pleasant duty. And as the times of the Gentiles are fast coming to a close, we would hope that his visit to our island may be the means of a few more good and honest hearts finding the precious jewel (the truth,) before the time of believing the gospel comes to a close, and oh! may the cry go through the land, "Repent for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." If the doctor starts on his lecturing tour from Birmingham, I hope you will induce him to give the priority to those few places that are in South Wales, for I am sure no part of the kingdom will more heartily welcome him than Mumbles and Swansea. I mention this, because if he visits Swansea the last, I am afraid we should have only the fag-end of his labours, that is, he would be worn out before he came this way, which would be a pity, as I think that the deep felt interest at Swansea calls for special attention from the friends of the truth. There is a large open field for labour in Swansea. May God send labourers.



---

 NOTES.
 

---

By the bounty of friends who wish the *Ambassador* well, the Editor is this month enabled to yield to a pressure of matter, and present the readers with ten extra pages.

THE ROMAN QUESTION.—Three days ago, there came to hand a pamphlet of sixteen pages, bearing the following title: "THE ROMAN QUESTION; or the fall of the Papacy, the death-knell of Protestant sectarianism, a paper read before the Association of Christadelphians or Brethren of Christ, meeting on Sundays, at 10.30 a.m., at Odd Fellows' Hall, Washington Street, Hoboken, N.J., by JOHN THOMAS, M.D." The pamphlet reviews the incidents of the recent Garibaldian invasion of the Roman States, pointing out their bearing on the approaching crisis, and defining the attitude of Christ's brethren to the apostacy. The authorship is a guarantee of excellence in the first degree. The price will be 3d. per copy. We shall write for a supply.

Correspondents whose queries, after so long delay, are yet unanswered, are entreated to be patient. If the Editor were able to give his whole time to the work, the *Ambassador* would be conducted in a more prompt, methodical, and business-like manner; but having to devote a large portion of time and energy to temporalities, he is obliged to content himself with a somewhat irregular and slipshod style of management, doing the best he can, in the hope of better times.

"REDUCED TO THE UTMOST NEED."—Brother Haining, of Auchinlech, writes on behalf of brother Charles Smith, of Girvan, who is advanced in years and infirmity, and "reduced to the utmost need, on account of want of work." He has a wife equally infirm and helpless with himself. He was for many years a Campbellite, but renounced that connection for truth and the obedience thereof seven years ago, since which Brother Haining says he has shewn himself an intelligent, consistent brother. The brethren in Auchinlech and Cumnock have

relieved him from time to time, "but every other source of supply being at the present cut off," they thought it best to bring the case under the notice of the brethren at large. Brother Haining adds "We have no other interest in the matter than our duty, in ministering to the wants of a needy brother." Trusting the brethren will remember their duty to those who are in need, we commend the facts to their consideration.

BOOK LOANS.—AN OPPORTUNITY OF DOING GOOD.—Brother Shuttleworth, of Whitby, writes as follows:—Brethren and sisters, who have odd numbers of *Ambassador*, or pamphlets, books, tracts, leaflets, &c., upon the truth, lying idle upon the shelf, or who may have scant facilities for circulating them, are hereby apprised that they may do great service to the truth, by forwarding the same to my address, "F. R. Shuttleworth, 8, Gray Street, Whitby," as I have offered, through the medium of a London weekly, called *Religious Opinion*, to lend books, pamphlets, &c., upon the truth, to any desiring to read them, and I find myself hard taxed, after a month's drain, to meet the increasing demand of enquirers after it upon this footing. That good will result, there can be little doubt, inasmuch as the observations of borrowers, upon what they have had loaned, brings me into direct correspondence with persons otherwise unknown, and beyond the immediate circle of personal labours. The following extracts from letters received to-day may illustrate:

"In July and August Nos. of *Ambassador* (old ones) is a very interesting article or two. Could you send me a new copy? or I will keep the present one, and send postage stamps."—(London.)

"Many thanks for the perusal of your two pamphlets; their contents have brought peace and consolation to my mind; you now know my taste, therefore, you can send me anything you think well."—(Nottinghamshire.)

# THE AMBASSADOR

## Of the Coming Age.

---

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

---

---

No. 45.

MARCH, 1868.

Vol. V.

---

---

### THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF JUDGMENT.

---

BY J. J. ANDREW, LONDON.

---

It is now our duty to examine that much discussed chapter, the 15th of 1 Corinthians—a chapter which, when taken by itself and viewed superficially, appears to contradict some of the conclusions to which we have already arrived; but, bearing in mind the fundamental axiom, that no one part of God's revelation can contradict another part, we shall be quite safe in asserting that any such discrepancies must be apparent, not real.

In reading this chapter, it is necessary to notice: 1—that the apostle is not giving a comprehensive exposition of the whole subject of the *Resurrection and Judgment*; 2nd—that he only deals with the resurrection of *one class*—the righteous; 3—that the judgment is not mentioned, but is, nevertheless, understood; because it is incredible to suppose that Paul would teach anything in one epistle which would contradict what he had written in another.

He begins his argument by asking how it was that some members of the Corinthian church denied the resurrection of the dead, and proceeds to shew that if they be right, their hopes of eternal life are entirely useless. If the dead rise not, says he, then Christ was not raised from the dead; and if this be the case, then, not only are all who profess the “one faith” still in their sins, but all who have died professing the same faith are perished. He then deals with the question as to the nature of the resurrection body, and, in so doing, illustrates his remarks

by referring to a grain of seed, shewing that the death of a human being is no more an impediment to his restoration to life, than is the death of a seed to its springing up, and producing grain. If the seed is to reproduce itself, it must first die, and if, after this, God is able to re-animate it, is He not equally able to bring to life the righteous who have died? The placing of the seed in the ground is often interpreted as applying to the committal of the body to the grave, and the springing-up of the blade to the coming-forth from the grave at the resurrection. From this it is inferred that, just as the blade differs from the seed which was sown, so does the resurrected body of the righteous differ from the body which was buried—the latter being mortal, and the former immortal. But is this, we are led to ask, a correct analogy? Does the sowing of the seed represent the burial of the body? If it does, what does the dying of the seed illustrate? The body has no death to undergo after burial, and surely it will not be said that it refers to the mouldering away of the dead body? This is not necessary to its resurrection; for if so, what is to be done with any who die within so short a period of the second advent, that their bodies will not have the requisite time to become incorporated with the dust of the ground? The seed dies after it is put into the ground, but the body dies before that event. This is the defect in the analogy—a discrepancy which some may think lightly of, and reply to by saying that a parable is generally given on account of its leading points, and, therefore, it is impossible to carry out all the details. But can we term the death of the seed in this parable an unimportant detail? Death is the very subject on which the apostle is discoursing; and so indignant does he become at anyone shewing so much incredulity of the power of God to raise the dead, as to ask what sort of a body they will possess when resurrected, that he exclaims, "Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened *except it die.*"—(Verse 36.) He then gives as an illustration the case of a grain, shewing that a seed which is sown is not the same as that which will hereafter exist; and between the two events, it must undergo death. If the death of the seed be not a prominent or essential point, what is the parable intended to teach? On this supposition, the statement just quoted, that a seed is not quickened except it die, has no force in it; to omit, therefore, to apply it to the subject under examination is to deprive the illustration of all its pith. This being so, and the death of the seed being analogous to the death of the man, it follows that the sowing of the seed must be applicable to some event in the lifetime of the individual. What then does this sowing consist of? A solution to this question is to be found in Paul's epistle to the Galatians: "Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap. For 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."—(Gal. vi, 7, 8.) From this we learn that the sowing process extends over the whole probationary career—from immersion to death. He that gives way to the lusts of the flesh in this life shall, after the resurrection and judgment, suffer that corruption to which all human

flesh is inevitably subject; but he that brings forth the fruits of the spirit in his daily conduct, shall, at the day of judgment, be endowed with spirit life, by being transformed from mortal nature to immortal. To realize this "corruption," or this "life everlasting" is, as we have already seen, "to receive through the body according to that which has been done, whether good or bad:" and the time for accomplishing this is at the judgment. There it is that a righteous man receives a body corresponding with his good deeds, while an unrighteous man is compelled to retain a body corresponding with his evil deeds.

The springing-up of the blade is not even mentioned by the apostle; but, on the contrary, he says "God giveth to every seed *his own body*," whether wheat or some other grain. When, therefore, he says "So also is the resurrection of the dead; it is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption," what are we to understand by it? The raising of the wheat is not fully accomplished until its "own body" has been given to it, and this does not take place until the corn is full-grown. Consequently, the springing forth of the blade bears no analogy to the bestowal of an immortal body on the dead; it only exhibits the process of raising, not the full consummation. The good seed raises good wheat, but the bad seed raises bad wheat. So it is with the disciples of Christ. The children of the kingdom, in whom the gospel has taken a firm root, are raised to incorruptibility at the day of judgment; but the children of the wicked one, in whom the gospel has not taken sufficient root, are raised to corruption."

Perhaps it will be said that this is a strained interpretation of the word "raised," because, when used in reference to the resurrection of the dead, it always refers to the coming forth from the grave. It is true that it is frequently used to describe the raising of the dead to life—a process which does not require much time; but this does not prevent its being applied to a more lengthy process. In the narrative of Paul's labours at Antioch, it is used to describe the stirring up of a tumultuous mob: "But the Jews stirred up the devout and honourable women, and the chief men of the city, and *raised* persecution against Paul and Barnabas, and expelled them out of their coasts."—(Acts xiii, 50.) And in writing to the Romans, Paul applies it to the elevation of Pharaoh to the throne of Egypt. "For the scripture saith unto Pharaoh, even for this same purpose have I *raised* thee up, that I might show my favour in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth."—(Rom. ix, 17.) In neither of these passages is the event described so instantaneous as that of raising anyone from the sleep of death; and precisely the same word is used, not in English only, but also in the Greek—the meaning of which is defined as follows: *εγειρω* (*egeirō*): "to awaken, wake up, rouse, stir, stir up, raise from the dead, raise or erect a building."—*Liddell and Scott's Lexicon*.

There is nothing in this definition to exclude the comprehensive application of the word "raise;" but on the contrary, we see that one of its meanings gives authority for such a use. To "raise or erect a building," comprehends the whole process, from the time when it first

sprouts, to the full development of the ear. When the blade appears, it is merely in the process of *raising*, and it cannot be said to be *raised* until the corn is ripe. Thus it is with the resurrection of a righteous man: the body comes forth from the grave in a mortal condition, when it may be said to be in the process of *raising*; then it is brought before the judgment-seat to give an account to the Judge, and upon approval it is transformed into an incorruptible body. At this stage the process of *raising* is complete, and it can then be said that it is *raised*.

The full consummation of the process necessitates a change, because "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption."—(verse 50.) The apostle then proceeds to show how "flesh and blood" is to be fitted for inheriting an incorruptible kingdom. "Behold, I show you a mystery: we (all in Christ) shall not all sleep, but *we* (the righteous, whether asleep or awake at the advent) *shall all be changed*, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump."—(verses 51, 52.) Then follows a summary of the results in both cases, in which the word "raised" is used in the same comprehensive sense as in the passages already noticed; "For the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed."—(verse 52.) From the fact that Paul here speaks of the living only being changed, it is contended by some that the dead will not undergo the same change; but this is illogical, because in the preceding verse he had actually declared that "We shall all (whether living or dead) be changed." The mode of bestowing immortality on these two classes differs: in the case of the dead, they have first to be brought to life, and then (after approved at the judgment-seat,) changed—the whole of which process is comprised in the phrase "raised incorruptible;" but the living have, of course, only to be changed from mortality to immortality. Having thus summarised the results with reference to the former, by saying "they shall be raised incorruptible," it was necessary to add something respecting the latter, and this he does by saying "we shall be changed." But his doing so is no proof that the dead will not have to undergo the same change as the living; for he continues, "So when this *corruptible* shall have put on incorruption, and this *mortal* shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, "death is swallowed up in victory."—(verse 54.) While the bodies of the dead are mingled in the dust of the earth, they are in a state of actual corruption, but they must be brought forth from hades before they are entitled to the name "corruptible," in order that they may appear before the judgment-seat in the same condition as the living; and when the Judge has signified his approval, they will be changed from corruption to incorruption. Then it is that Paul will realise his desire "to be clothed upon with our house, which is from heaven \* \* \* that mortality might be swallowed up of life." Then it is that his promise to the Philippians will be fulfilled: "The Lord Jesus Christ shall *change our vile body*, that it may be fashioned like unto his own glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself."—(Philip iii,

21.) Then it is—and not at the restoration to life, for that of itself is of no use without immortality—that those who were once dead will be able to say “O death, where is thy sting—O grave where is thy victory?”—(1 Cor. xv, 55.)

If this could be uttered by the righteous immediately after emerging from the grave, then their destiny would be already fixed, the judgment would be forestalled, and their appearance before the Judge would be reduced to a mere empty ceremony—and thus the abundant and unequivocal testimony of scripture concerning this important event, would be completely nullified. To contend therefore for such a mode of restoring the dead to life, is very little better than saying that the righteous enter on their reward at death.

---

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

---

CHAPTER VII, VERSES 9 TO 17.

From the imperfect histories of the various religious parties during the sealing period, it is somewhat difficult to ascertain where that class existed referred to as the sealed ones, for it is quite evident from the Apocalypse that at this crisis a people of the true faith was in existence. There is little doubt, however, that the Donatists, a very numerous body in Roman Africa, were the very people foreshadowed in this chapter as the servants to be sealed. They were very strict, and intensely opposed to the so-called Catholics, denouncing their immersions as invalid, their sacraments a piece of profanity, and their consecrations, unctions, and ordinations as of no avail. Consequently they would have nothing to do with these worldly-minded nullifiers of the truth, refusing *in toto* all fellowship with them; for, said they, the true church had ceased to exist in all other parts of the world. They maintained that an ecclesia of Christ should be composed of just and holy men, and that when any who lurked in it manifested themselves to be wicked, the brethren should put them away. When urged to study the peace of the church and form an alliance with the Catholics, they denounced the unscriptural nature of the alliance which had recently taken place between that apostate body and the state, and asked the question “What hath the emperor to do with the church?” and believing that friendship with the world is enmity against God, they further asked “What have Christians to do with kings, or what have bishops to do at court?” That they were a very numerous body is proved from the fact that there was scarcely a city or town in Roman Africa in which there was not an ecclesia of these believers; and at a conference held at Carthage, A.D. 411, there were present 279 of their bishops with not more than 286 bishops of the Catholics. They suffered much persecution from the Constantine family; Constantine himself decreeing,

A.D. 316, that they should lose their conventicles, their shepherds be banished, and some of them punished with death. But when Julian obtained the throne, he expelled the Catholic bishops from court, recalled the Donatists from exile in A.D. 362, and bid them enjoy the rights and privileges which their persecutors had wrested from them. When, however, the Apostacy had recovered its position, persecution revived: the Emperor Gratian published several edicts against their peace, and in A.D. 377, deprived them of their conventicles and prohibited their assemblies—an amount of severity which is in itself a testimony on their behalf. At this time their efficiency began to decline, caused doubtless by the sanguinary tyranny of their oppressors, and probably because their mission as the angel-sealers was nearly completed. In the beginning of the Fourth Century, the Emperor Honorius adopted violent measures against them; fining some, putting others to death, and banishing their pastors. But under the protection of the Vandals who invaded Roman Africa, A.D. 427, they revived and multiplied, and flourished for 104 years. In 534, they lost the benefit of these protectors in consequence of their power being overturned, and then they were again exposed to the malignity of their enemies. Nevertheless they remained a separate body until the close of the Sixth Century, when Pope Gregory used various methods for suppressing them. After this, but few traces of them under the name of Donatists are to be found in history. The testimony against the Catholic Apostacy remained, but it became known by other names.

After these things—the things comprised under the sealing process—I saw and behold a great multitude, which no one was competent to compute—a proof in itself that the hundred and forty-four thousand is not the real, but only the representative, number of the redeemed—who had been gathered together out of every nation, and tribe, and people, and tongues. They had been standing before the throne and before the Lamb, at the judgment-seat of Christ—an event subsequent to the resurrection and Second Advent, and described by Paul as “our gathering together unto our Lord Jesus Christ” at his appearing and his kingdom. They were clothed in white robes—the garments of salvation—and had palms in their hands; a circumstance which indicated that the event belongs to that epoch when the resurrected righteous shall celebrate, in the age to come, their first Feast of Tabernacles, for palm-bearing is an incident in the celebration of that festival both in type and antitype.

Under the Mosaic Law this feast was for the purpose of celebrating the ingathering of the fruit of Israel's land, and it lasted seven days. The same feast is to be celebrated in the Millennial Age, when the twelve tribes of the fleshly Israel are restored to their own land; for in that land only can it be lawfully celebrated. There is, however, this difference between its past and future celebrations, that whereas in the past it was confined to the Jewish Nation, in the future, the Gentile nations generally are to come up yearly to Jerusalem to participate in the rejoicings connected with it. Before this takes place, the judgments written will all have been executed, and consequently the saints will have begun to rest from the labours connected with them. When they so rest, it will be because they have obtained the victory over the kingdoms of this world, and have transformed them into the kingdom of Christ and of God.

The multitude who had palms in their hands, themselves the first fruits unto God and the Lamb, are the goodly trees, the palm trees, the fig trees, and the willows of the brook; the Trees of Righteousness whose leaves are unfading, to be planted on either side of the pure river of water of life; and constituting altogether a great forest of evergreens filling the earth with their perfume to the honour and glory of God. But before they could figure thus as stately palm trees, they had first to drink of the brook by the way. Like the Captain of their Salvation, who was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, they must first be weeping willows, or a community of sufferers, for it is only through much tribulation that they can obtain a crown of life. Having obtained this incorruptible crown, they can then exalt their heads as lofty palms.

And this palm-bearing multitude vociferated with a loud voice, saying, "The Salvation be ascribed to him who sits upon the throne of our Deity and to the Lamb." And all the angels stood in the circle of the throne and of the elders, and of the four living ones; and they fell before the throne upon their face, and did homage to the Deity; saying, "So let it be! The blessing, and the glory, and the wisdom, and the thanksgiving, and the honour, and the power, and the majesty, be to our Deity for the cycles of the cycles! So let it be!"

And one from among the elders was speaking, saying to me, "These who have been clothed with white robes, who are they and whence come they?" And I answered him, "Sire, thou hast known," for inasmuch as the elders are the representatives of the whole community of the redeemed, he was one of those clothed in white robes, and therefore knew experimentally who they were and whence they came. Hence he answered and said to me, "These are they who came out of the great tribulation—the tribulation which precedes the resurrection—and washed their robes, and made their robes white in the blood of the Lamb;" which circumstances are themselves a proof that the palm-bearers had been a suffering community in their former state. "On account of this, continued he, they are before the throne of the Deity, and they shall minister to Him day and night in His temple; and He that is sitting upon the throne shall pitch His tent over them. They shall hunger no more, neither shall they thirst anymore, neither shall the sun smite them, nor any heat. Because the Lamb in the very midst of the throne shall tend them, and lead them to living fountains of waters, and the Deity shall wipe away every tear from their eyes."

It will thus be seen that this chapter presents two great epochs, with a long intervening period of tribulation extending from the one to the other; the first being the sealing epoch, A.D. 335, and the second, the epoch of the celebration of the ingathering of the world's first fruits, by the joyful observance of the first Feast of the Tabernacles in the first year of the Millennial Feast. It must not be supposed however that there is no sealing of the Deity's servants during this long interval. The sealing proceeds in all generations subsequent to the special seal period, A.D. 335, and continues until he whom God has appointed to be the judge of quick and dead comes forth to take account of the members of his household.

J. J. A.



## THE PROVIDENCE OF GOD ;

### HIS OVERSIGHT AND GUIDANCE IN THE AFFAIRS OF MEN.

THAT the defence of this plainly-taught doctrine of the scripture should be necessary among the brethren of Christ, seems singular and strange: but so it is. Some deny that God interferes with, or in any way directs, the course of human events, either nationally, socially, or individually; some perhaps acknowledge the interposition in the affairs of nations, but deny it in individual cases. They affirm that all things, since the days of the apostles, have been left to chance and the course of nature, and that the Lord never stoops to notice such trifles as private affairs and transactions among His people; although we are taught in the Word that these small transactions form the life of which we are called to give account in the day of judgment.

The national phase of the subject, being more easily recognized and understood, will occupy our attention first. We wish to trace the Lord's operations in mundane affairs, apart from miraculous manifestations, without outward and visible sign; for, say the objectors, the days of miracles and spiritual gifts have long since passed away. But could we possibly believe, that the opening of the seven seals, the blowing of the seven trumpets, the outpouring of the seven vials upon the nations of the earth—turning their ways upside down, contrary to their own will and devising—could possibly have been effected, without the most scrutinizing supervision and direction on the part of Deity? Undoubtedly not. The study of the Apocalypse alone is sufficient to shew the Lord's wonderful dealings with the peoples of the earth. Job tells us how that Jehovah "maketh the judges fools, and leadeth counsellors away spoiled;" "He poureth contempt upon princes, and weakeneth the strength of the mighty;" "He increaseth the nations and destroyeth them; He enlargeth the nations and straighteneth again." These passages shew, in unmistakable terms, the utter powerlessness and dependence of earth's great ones, and the mighty communities of peoples over which they rule; how they are regarded but as a drop in a bucket, and "dust of the balance," in the hands of Him who holds the scale of destinies. Isaiah also informs us that "it is He that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants are as grasshoppers." It is "He that bringeth the princes to nothing, and maketh the judges of the earth as vanity." "All flesh is grass; the grass withereth, the flower fadeth, *because* the Spirit of the Lord bloweth upon it." This conviction was most forcibly impressed upon the mind of Nebuchadnezzar, when the glory of his reign suffered a blight by the Spirit of God blowing upon it: its beauty turned quickly into ashes, and he was forced to acknowledge that "the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever He will." The boundaries of their habitation also being appointed, and their times determined upon by the Lord, as Paul told the Athenians in his address on Mars' Hill. The various changes which have taken place in the

boundaries of the nations having been but the necessary working of God's plan, for the developing of the four great empires that have arisen successively, and their fragmental division into ten kingdoms, in the latter days. The manner or method by which these changes have been wrought, has not been by what men call "miraculous" interpositions; the effects are seen, but the hand is invisible; the work is carried on in silence, like the growth of a tree, or the diffusion of light, or the ebbing and flowing of earth's tidal waters: these, however, being reckoned as merely natural phenomena. But, natural laws are inactive without a motive power: if the power is withheld, the law ceases to act. The doctrine of the Lord's directing interposition in the affairs of men, threads the labyrinth of testimonies from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Revelations. It is the pillar of support, the groundwork upon which the whole is constructed; the filling-up of every interval, the connecting of every link. Nations are composed of individuals, and national results spring from individual efforts. Plentiful illustrations from the scriptures we draw of these silent, unseen operations in the affairs of individuals. The Lord's exercise of this invisible influence upon the minds of individual men and women, has been the basis of all political combinations and social arrangements among men. The sale of Joseph into the hands of the Egyptians is one of the many instances of this kind: no evidence of miraculous operation is set forth; yet Joseph expressly told his brethren that it was not they who had sent him thither, but God who had sent him there to preserve life; the Lord having used the hatred and malice of his brethren for his exaltation, and their preservation and settlement in the land of Egypt, for a certain definite period. This period having run its allotted time, another individual was prepared by the invisible hand of Jehovah, to lay the foundation of another great revolution in Israelitish movements; the babe Moses, by a *seeming coincidence* of circumstances, falls into the hands of Pharaoh's daughter, at whose expense he is nourished and brought up by his own mother, and his childish mind filled with thoughts of sincere attachment to his Hebrew kinsmen, and fully prepared to cast in his fortunes with the people of God for their deliverance from the land of bondage, when the time appointed had arrived. By means of another set of circumstances, Ruth and Naomi were bereaved of their husbands in the land of Moab; and Naomi, acknowledging the hand of God in all her afflictions, said the "Almighty hath dealt very bitterly with me; I went out full, and the Lord brought me home again empty." Here we have an open acknowledgment on the part of Naomi, that the Lord had directed the current of her affairs, in removing, by death, her husband and two sons, and bringing her back to the land of her kindred; all these very natural occurrences, directed by the Almighty for the purpose of bringing together two parties, Ruth and Boaz, who were ordained to be progenitors of the Messiah. On another occasion, a Jewish maiden, named Esther, was elevated to the Persian throne, at a time of great emergency and distress among her kindred, and was instrumental in

saving them from a general massacre, even at the peril of her own life. By the exercise of faith, however, she recognized the hand of God in the circumstances that surrounded her, and, trusting in Him for deliverance, passed the ordeal in safety, and rescued her people; having been instructed by her uncle Mordecai, that in all probability "she had come to the kingdom for such a time as this." When the days of Judah's captivity in Babylon were drawing to a close, it is recorded that God *stirred up the spirit of Cyrus* to make proclamation for the rebuilding of Jerusalem; but, something else was necessary for the furtherance of the matter; for if the people should remain disheartened and dispirited as they had been, by long years of bondage and oppression, nothing could have been accomplished; but we are told that "all those whose *spirit God had raised*," went up to build the city. These, and many more such illustrations, in the Old Testament scriptures, prove this doctrine to have been fully recognized in the days of old, beside numberless testimonies plainly testifying its truth; and also, those of God's ancient people, who were faithful, acknowledged His guiding hand in every event of life, over which they had no control. This was one of the lessons which Moses taught the Jewish people, when they should have settled in the enjoyment of quietness and plenty in the land of Canaan, that they were to acknowledge the providence of Jehovah, in giving them power to obtain wealth, and to conquer their enemies; they were, by no means, to arrogate the power to themselves in self-reliance upon their own strength, as is shewn in Deut. viii. This beautiful lesson is also taught most clearly by Job, and by David in the Psalms. Job says that "He, Jehovah, breaketh down, and it cannot be built again; he shutteth up a man, and there can be no opening;" "When He giveth quietness, who then can make trouble, and when He hideth His face, who then can behold Him? whether it be done against a nation *or against a man only*." "His eyes are set upon the ways of man, and He seeth all His goings;" and, more especially, "He withdraweth not His eyes from the righteous." "His eyes are upon the righteous, and His ears are open unto their cry, and He delivereth them out of all their troubles."

To receive this doctrine in its fulness and power, and to surrender our minds without reservation or hindrance to its full force, is one of the greatest achievements of the Christian; and was also one of the first lessons which Jesus began to teach his disciples. He exhorted them to rely implicitly upon the unseen but ever present power of Jehovah; to look to Him for food and for raiment, and for all things necessary to existence in this life; he taught them both by word and by illustrations, or examples. On one occasion, when the little vessel, freighted with illustrious lives was tempest-tossed, and strained almost to rending, a thrill of faithless agony disturbed the disciples' breasts, lest the Father should forget His children, pass unnoticed their distress, and leave to the mercy of the angry billows, the helpless forms then caged in the little bark; but were their fears well founded? Oh no! the

Master arose, rebuked the winds and His faithless ones, gave repose to their souls and to the sea; taught them even in the hour of deepest trial and darkest prospects, to place full and complete confidence in Him who has promised, saying "I will never leave thee nor forsake thee." Jesus himself acting upon the great principle which he taught, when pressed by the pangs of hunger, and tempted by an adversary to distrust his Father's protecting care, and create bread for himself, refused to accept nourishment on terms of disobedience, knowing that "in due time he should reap if he fainted not." The feelings of nature being vanquished by the word, he replied to the tempter, "Man lives not by bread alone, but by every word of God." This perfect surrender of self-reliance, can, of course, only be serviceable to the Christian—those who occupy the intimate relation to the Deity of sons and daughters—for Jesus exhorted his disciples not to take the same thought and care about temporalities that the Gentiles did; for he says, *your Father knoweth that you have need of these things*; but "seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." Yes, we look to Him who measureth the waters in the hollow of His hand, and meteth out the heavens with a span, to give us our bread and our raiment, and a shelter from the storm, and whatever else His wisdom sees to be necessary for us; for, "every good and perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of a turning." But can we expect to "receive only good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil?"—assuredly not. Evil is the punishment of sin; inasmuch as all have sinned, we must receive a share of evil at the hand of God. Job again informs us that "affliction cometh not forth of the dust, neither doth trouble spring out of the ground." The afflictions of God's children by His invisible directions, work out for them a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory; for it is written, "behold, happy is the man whom God correcteth, therefore, despise not thou the chastening of the Almighty; for *He maketh sore and He bindeth up*; He woundeth, and His hands make whole." Again, the same author tells us that "if they be bound in fetters, and holden in cords of affliction, then He sheweth them their work and their transgressions that they have exceeded; He

openeth also their ear to discipline, and commandeth that they return from iniquity; If they obey and serve Him, they shall spend their days in prosperity and their years in pleasure." What do we need more than this to work conviction in our minds, that the unseen, though mighty hand of power, holds the destinies of His people in His grasp: to work and to will of His own good pleasure; for it is "for His pleasure they are and were created." Oh! how cheering and comforting the thought, that we have in heaven such an interest as this; how grand, how ennobling the principle of faith, of child-like confidence and trust, which this doctrine inculcates. To know, also, that the unseen current of our mortal existence, which is of vital importance in its bearing upon a future life, is not left to the mere limited, contracted foresight of human vision and understanding; that the trials that chasten our spirit, and open our ear to discipline, are sent and directed by Him who searches the hearts and tries the reins; that the blessings we enjoy day by day, are the fruits of His goodness and mercy and lovin-kindness. For, "Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him." Truly may we adopt these words, "in Him we live and move, and have our being." In Him we are everything; in ourselves, *nothing*; and though every friend should fail, and every brother turn back, yet to Him, who notes the sparrow's fall and the raven's cry for food, to Him, we are as the apple of His eye; and "the Eye that keeps Israel neither slumbers nor sleeps." Seeing, therefore, that we may occupy this endearing relationship to Jehovah, the God of Israel, *if we only have the full assurance of faith*, how earnestly should we strive to cultivate this fundamental element of the christian character; for, the only principle upon which we can hope to receive anything of the Lord, is to believe implicitly every word of promise He has caused to be uttered; as it is written, "According to your faith be it unto you." Again, "*Acknowledge Him in all thy ways, and He will direct thy paths.*" Yes, come to Him in the spirit of little children, kneeling at His footstool, crying, in "the spirit of adoption, Abba, Father;" and He will cause the star of hope to beam on thy pathway, even in the valley of the shadow of death. To believe and to ask are two essential acts on the part of those who wish to receive either direction in their ways, or merciful provision for their

necessities. Jesus said "Ask and it shall be given unto you; seek, and ye shall find;" or, "if ye being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father, which is in heaven, give good gifts to *those that ask Him?*"

But, some would ask, are all requests presented at the throne of grace, favourably answered? Assuredly not. The apostle James says "Ye ask and receive not, because ye ask amiss," for the gratification of lust. Petitions resulting solely from desire for fleshly indulgences, are discarded; but petitions for "grace to help in time of need," or extremity, if presented in faith, receive the most gracious attention.

Our Lord, having taught his disciples the importance of prayer, gave them an acceptable formula, containing legitimate subjects for prayer, although the prayers of saints, under diverse circumstances, must needs vary, according to their necessities, or the peculiar benefits for which they have occasion to be thankful; for, thanksgiving in prayer is quite as important as petitions for mercies. "Pray without ceasing, and in everything give thanks;" and again we are exhorted to "Be careful for nothing, but in everything, by prayer and supplication, and *thanksgiving*, let your *requests* be made known unto God" "casting all your care upon Him, for He careth for you." Another legitimate subject for prayer is presented in these words of our Lord: "Watch and pray, *that ye enter not into temptation.*" And who of us has not felt, in moments of temptation, the need of more than common spiritual force to withstand the wiles of the adversary? And Paul tells us that "We have not an high priest who cannot be touched with a feeling of our infirmities; therefore, let us come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in

*time of need*, or in a time when the enticements and allurements of the world without, appealing to the desires of the flesh and the mind within, threaten to prove too strong for us, and cause the paths of our feet to wander out of the way of understanding and of life. Yes, 'tis in moments of inward struggle—such as these—that our High Priest invites the prayer of faith, standing ever ready with bended ear and loving eye, to render aid, succour, and strength. Let not the doubting heart disdain to approach the living fountain, obey the injunctions laid down; the promise is sure, and the reward certain. One promise especially is clear and unmistakable in Cor. x: "For *God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will, with the temptation, also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it.*"

In conclusion, we would draw attention to the beautiful and touching prayers of David, as recorded in the Psalms; furnishing examples of the out-pouring of a burdened spirit in the depths of distress as well as of thanksgiving and joyfulness, in the day of relief and prosperity. The Spirit waxing strong in the bosom of the king as he contemplated the wonderful dealings of the Lord with His people and mankind at large, found utterance in the most enthusiastic songs of joy and praise: in which he frequently exclaims, "Oh! that men would praise the Lord for His goodness, and for his wonderful works to the children of men!" "Oh! give thanks unto the Lord, for He is good, for His mercy endureth for ever; *who remembereth us in our low estate*, for His mercy endureth for ever;" *who giveth food unto all flesh*, for His mercy endureth for ever." "Oh, give thanks unto the God of heaven, for His mercy endureth for ever."

EUSEBIA.

---

## SUNDAY MORNING AT THE CHRISTADELPHIAN SYNAGOGUE, BIRMINGHAM.—No. 4.

---

*From Shorthand Notes by brother JOHN BUTLER.*

---

1 JOHN, i.—We may be very thankful for the idea that is expressed in the first three verses of the chapter that has been read. It is an idea in which we have a direct and personal interest. It would not be written to Israel after the flesh, but to those in the

truth among the Asiatic Gentiles; and therefore, it is as much addressed to us as to those who received John's actual letter. It is important to recognise this, otherwise, we may fail to draw that consolation from it which we may do. Some may be prevented from doing full justice to themselves in the reading of the New Testament part of the word, by the idea that the things written by the apostles are confined, in their significance to those to whom these things were particularly addressed. This would be a great mistake. If such were the case, we should indeed have very little ground on which to build a hope; we in this remote island of the sea, living in this late period of the times of the Gentiles, would have no part or lot in the inheritance promised to Israel. But we have to recognise the fact, and be thankful for it, that God is no respecter of persons; and that in Christ Jesus, there is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free; and that therefore we stand in quite as privileged a position as any natural descendant of Abraham. This letter was written to Gentiles who had received the truth: we are Gentiles and have received the truth; and the only difference between us is this: they lived in the first century, in Asia Minor—we live in the nineteenth, in Great Britain; and that is no difference with God, for a thousand years are with Him as one day. There is no time with God; God is the same yesterday, to-day and for ever, from everlasting to everlasting—unchangeable. "That which was from the beginning," says this authorised messenger of Christ, "which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the word of life (for the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us); that which we have seen and heard, declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us; and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son, Jesus Christ." Now there are several very substantial and profitable ideas in these words. The first suggested to us is that we have not been personal witnesses of the facts upon which our faith is based. These facts may in a sentence be defined to be, the personal ministration of Jesus Christ in Judea, for 3½ years, his crucifixion by the Romans and his resurrection. Not that this is the beginning of the thing, for that was but the culmination, as we may say, in one sense, of the purpose that God had

announced from the beginning. But so far as we are concerned, and so far as the message of the apostles was concerned, this is the groundwork of the gospel—this constituted the subject matter of the "witness" which the apostles personally delivered. Their first duty, in execution of the commission to go into all the world, was to tell people about these things; because these things formed the basis of the invitation which they were authorised to give to all men to become the servants of Christ. John puts his testimony on this point in the very foreground. He says "*we have heard, we have seen with our eyes, we have looked upon, and our hands have handled*" that manifestation of divine life and love which he preached, for the faith of men to lay hold of. It is the same with Peter; he says "We have not followed cunningly devised fables." As he said before the tribunal of the Jews, "We cannot but speak the things we have seen and heard."—(Acts iv, 20.) That they had seen and heard them is evident from the fact that they submitted to persecution, and ultimately surrendered their lives for declaring that they had so seen and heard Jesus of Nazareth for forty days after he had been put to death. That fact is evidence to us that what they said was true. Men never go in the face of disadvantage and opposition, without a motive. The motive in this case was a conviction that certain *facts* were true. It was not, as in the case of the persecuted Puritans, a persuasion of certain doctrines. The boldness of the apostles, on the one hand, and the antagonism of the Jewish rulers on the other, turned upon a question of fact, viz., whether the crucified Jesus had risen. Upon the fact, doubtless, the apostles founded a doctrine, but it was the fact and not the doctrine, that was the cause of the dispute that cost them their lives. Hence their firmness is evidence of the fact, which they asserted, and the basis of our faith. Their subsequent proceedings and writings show too much sanity and discrimination to admit the suggestion that though sincere, they were hallucinated. It is as John puts it here; we have *seen*, and *heard*, and *handled*. It is no myth, but a reality. This Jesus Christ has risen from the dead and is a real living man, and commanded his apostles, and also asks us to tell people about him, that we may gather out a sect for him. People use the term "sect" in a reproachful sense; those who know the truth will see that instead of being a reproach, it is a

necessary expression of the position to which those are called who believe the truth. There can be no people of Christ without a sect. The brethren of Christ created by the truth—are a sect of the most distinct and tenacious order, a peculiar people, a sworn people, a warm and enthusiastic people, if you will, a narrow-minded people, in the sense that their minds are narrowed down to a distinct apprehension of and an uncompromising contention for *the things that are true about Jesus Christ*. We are such a sect here assembled this morning—Christ's sect, and though divided by a long distance of time, from the facts proclaimed by the apostles, yet with the intellectual means of grasping those facts as clearly and distinctly as those who listened to the personal ministrations of the apostles, we say to John and Paul, "Though dead, yet we hear your voice; we believe your testimony that Jesus Christ has risen from the dead, and that he was and is the resurrection and the life, and that he is the name of salvation given to men, by which they may be saved." And we are here this morning to realise and recognise the object which John here asserts to have been the very object of their declaring all these things. For we must ever remember their proceedings had an object. They did not go abroad to declare the resurrection of Christ simply because they privately knew it to be a fact, and wanted other people to know it as an interesting fact. They had a palpable and intelligible and very definite object in view, and it is upon that object that we must concentrate our attention, for our belief of their testimony, apart from the object they had in delivering the testimony, is altogether vain. We had better never know what they taught if we fail to realize the object they had in view in teaching what they taught. Here John declares that object: "*That ye may have fellowship with us, and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with His son Jesus Christ.*" Now what does this mean? It means something very much more than the technical fellowship known to the language by which we define our ecclesiastical relations in this present imperfect state. To have fellowship with, is to be a fellow of, in the sense of being identical in mind, faith, disposition, principle, practice, taste and intention, and also in nature and relation. To have fellowship with the apostles, is to stand in their position, and their position John defines to be one of fellowship with the Father and his son

Jesus Christ. To call men into this position is the object of the truth, but there are two stages in the attainment of it. The first relates to state of mind now, and the second to order of being at the full manifestation of the divine purpose. The first is the one we have more especially to concern ourselves with on the present occasion. John here says that a man has no fellowship with God if he walks in darkness. "If we say we have fellowship with him and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth." John is here addressing himself to those who believe the truth. He gives us to understand that a person who merely knows the truth intellectually—who merely believes there was such a man as Jesus Christ, and that he rose from the dead, and is theoretically offered as the salvation of God, but walks in unrighteousness, is none the better for his knowledge, and deceives himself, if he imagine he is a son of God. The mere knowledge of the truth will never secure for any one an entrance into the kingdom. The truth is but an agency; the gospel is but a means; and unless the end is realised, the means are a failure. Now the end proposed in the first instance is to give us fellowship with the Father. To do this, it must cause us to walk in the light John speaks of "God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all." We are not to read these terms darkness and light literally. There is nothing more conspicuous throughout the whole course of the scriptures than the metaphorical use of "light" and "darkness." In this use, "light" is not a brightness to be seen by the physical eye, but a state of enlightenment—an intellectual and moral light. So darkness is not the absence of the sun's rays, but it is the darkness referred to by Solomon, where he places darkness in antithesis to uprightness.—(Prov. ii, 1-10.) Now in God, as John says, there is no darkness at all. This is certainly true in every sense. God dwelleth in light to which no man can approach. He is the very source and focus of all the power we see abroad, and as such He doubtless is light. In fact it is not speculation; it is not opinion; it is a matter of declared fact that He dwelleth in the light, and the verity of this from what we may call a material point of view, is evident from a variety of circumstances, Moses, on Sinai, beheld the similitude of God; he did not behold the Father, for Jesus says "no man hath seen the Father at any time," and we are specially informed with regard to the Sinaitic occurrences, that they took the form of

angelic mediation.—(Acts vii, 38; Gal. iii, 19; Heb. ii, 2.) Yet, “the similitude of the Lord” Moses beheld. On the top of Mount Sinai he saw a representation of the Deity, no doubt in the person of one of the mighty angels of His power; and the fact to be noted is that there was brightness to be seen in connection with the manifestation, and the brightness was so great that when Moses came down from the mountain, the people could not look upon his face, and he had to put a veil over it. Take Jesus after the resurrection, Paul saw him, and his description is, that the light of his person was above the brightness of the sun, and felled them all to the earth; and had such an effect upon Paul that it formed scales upon his eyes. Again, take the angel who rolled the stone from the sepulchre of Jesus: his countenance was like lightning, and his clothes were white as snow, and a great light shone about him. Light and power are connected with the things that are of God. This we may be permitted to experience in due time. But the sense in which we are to realise it now, and walk in the light, is the intellectual and moral sense. God is wise, and holy, and righteous, and merciful in the method of His procedure. Of course, it is difficult for us to comprehend the operations of the divine mind. His thoughts are higher than ours. We can only see them in their effects. The mental attributes of Universal Power are manifest in His works, as well as declared in His word. We can see but a little, but we see enough to fill us with awe and adoration. We see the perfection of His works, the wisdom of His operations, the beneficence of His designs. Everything has a good purpose. The very winds that blow and cause so much devastation, are, in existing circumstances, a necessary purification of this planet as a habitation; the very thunder-storms that crash, and roar, and destroy, and frighten man and beast, are the means of that equilibrium rectification of mundane forces, which is essential to our existence; the evils to which we are subject—the pains we feel—are but the obverse of beneficent law; for if we were incapable of pain, we should be incapable of enjoyment, and exposed to many destructions. A child looks at the fire, and his little imagination is charmed by the dancing flames; and but for the sensation which God has associated with their action upon our organisation, the little thing would put his hand into the fire, and feeling no pain, would proceed in his folly till destroyed.

So with everything; if you go round the whole circle of nature, you will find beneficence the ultimate law of wisdom. Yet the rules of wisdom are never slackened to give beneficence a longer rope. Justice and righteousness hold the reins with unflinching hand. Their end is good, but they are never sacrificed or compromised for a presumed good. There is no clash in God’s work. The noiseless machinery of eternal and unvarying law, is perfect in all its parts. In this is disclosed the character of the Father. Righteousness, wisdom and goodness, are His supreme attributes. The practical use of this to us is simply this. Jesus says that we are to be holy as the Father is holy—and “Be ye perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect.” “Without holiness no man shall see God.” These are the words of Paul, and show us the high standard to which we are amenable. Now although it is true that we have an inferior nature, and one which, if left to itself, will inevitably gravitate to the earth; yet this is the case also—and it is of the utmost importance we should recognise it; because the recognition of it is a part of the means which will lead to our elevation to the divine nature, namely—that we are capable of being made different: that we are capable of becoming new men, and of approximating to divine things: that it is possible for us to be drawn up as well as drawn down. We have no impulse within ourselves to go up; it must come from without; but obtaining a lodgment from without, it becomes a power within. This power is the truth; this is the means of our elevation. They are placed in our hands, and we are responsible for the use or disuse of them. This, in fact, is the basis of our responsibility. If we are wise, we will appreciate and use them. We can only become the children of the light by dwelling in the light; we can only become holy by breathing the holy atmosphere of the scriptures; we can only become righteous by subjecting ourselves to those intellectual and moral impulses that induce righteousness; and these come from the scriptures. We have to walk in the counsel of God. If we walk in this counsel, and eschew the counsel of the world, we shall be blessed. “Blessed is the man,” says David, “that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful; but his delight is in the law of the Lord.” Here in this book, God shines upon us; His mind is brought to bear upon us; all His ways of looking at things are disclosed to



ns, and if we are ignorant of them, it is because we have not used the means He has given us of knowing them. There is scarcely a thing that God could say to us, but what He has said. Certainly, so far as principles are concerned, He could say no more. He could acquaint us with the political programme that lies between us and the coming of Christ; He could tell us the exact date of Christ's return, and such little things as these—mere facts; but so far as the great principles, that regulate our relation to God, are concerned, He has certainly told us everything he could possibly communicate; and in the telling of it He has—as always—acted upon the wisest principles. His definition of what He has done, is that He has given “here a little, and there a little, line upon line, precept upon precept.” In this He indicates the highest knowledge of our nature. We are so constituted that we could not take the truth in all at once. We could not effectually receive it in the form of a synopsis. A statement of our faith may be very useful for some purposes; but for a thorough acquaintance with the whole matter, it is necessary that it should be spread over a large area, and diffusely intermixed, as God has intermixed it, with the material of human history. It is spread over a surface of centuries, and interwoven with every incident of life. It is like a kaleidoscope: it is turned and turned and turned, assuming new shapes and colours at every move; and it is only by diligently following the track in which this continual evolution of divine thought has occurred, that we can get the benefit. This is our duty, our wisdom, and our life. What we have to do, is to walk in the light and have fellowship with the Father. This we do by having our minds assimilated to His—to look at things as He looks at them—to understand the past as He comprehends it, to realise the present as He looks at it; to view the future as He views it; and we can only do these by reading, reading, reading. It is not to be done as a mere logical feat; theoretical conviction is only the basis on which this training must take place. A mere demonstration of the truth would not have been so effective as God's plan. His plan is a line of history of 2 000 years, and around that string the interweavings of His mind in varying disclosures. Now there are many people that attain to a comprehension of the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, but do not put themselves in subjection to these means of divine

enlightenment; and therefore do not realise their relation to divine will. Their knowledge is a mere skeleton outline; it is the knowledge of the mere doctrinarian. It is a knowledge of that which is true, and is the indispensable framework of true spiritual attainment, but in their case it is naked and useless. Unfruitfulness is the inevitable result of such a condition. The foundation must be built on; the framework must be filled up; the bones must be covered with the living flesh of spiritual life. The truth is intended to make of us a certain kind of people. God does not want simply human beings in His kingdom. There are plenty of them at all times. There are on the face of the earth at the present time 1,200,000,000, but they are as nothing to Him—mere flesh—mere living creatures—nothing at all to Him in His eternal purposes, any more than a tree, or a rock, or a beast. They are all His handiwork, and in their places, have their purpose; but God's highest intention and enjoyments are connected with the development of independent intelligence in the creatures of His image. He taketh pleasure in the righteous. This is His highest pleasure. The flesh profiteth nothing: all the nations of the earth are nothing. They are counted to Him less than nothing, and vanity.—(Isaiah xl, 17.) Therefore we have to remember that human beings, (and we are all just that to begin with, without anything in our nature to commend us to the favour of God,) have no value as such. This is the continual sentiment of scripture; it is just the opposite of orthodoxy, which is continually preventing people from doing the right thing, and taking the right course, by telling them that the mere fact of being a human being, gives them a claim upon God's good purposes. We were taught in the days of our ignorance that a human being is worth countless worlds, whereas a human being as such is not worth the dust of which he is made. God wants something more than human beings; He wants those who, by the truth, are brought into fellowship with Himself, and have their minds fashioned after His, and His principles incorporated with their mental being. We have not only to know the things of the kingdom and the name, but we have to grow up into Christ, our living head in all things. We have to become like him. Was he a cold man? “Nay, verily,” he says “The zeal of thy house hath

eaten me up." He was continually at work. Even when a boy, 12 years of age, he had to say to misunderstanding relatives "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" Was he a placid indifferent man—indifferent to God, unexcited by deep principles—unconcerned at the wickedness of the world? Many a man may fancy himself a very legitimate and respectable and christian sort of a person, because he goes through the world without doing any harm, and does pretty well in business, and gets on pretty comfortably. He perhaps has managed to provide himself with a snug house, a nice garden, a thriving family, and is rather respected by his neighbours; and he thinks upon the whole the world is in a tolerably fair condition. He feels comfortable and enjoys himself, and cannot make anything of this great outcry about the world being wicked and miserably off, and badly governed. He thinks he is a good sort of man himself, and that the world on the whole is not so bad; and that the man who is always croaking about evil times, and preaching about judgment to come, and a millennium of righteousness, must be cracked. This gentleman we must leave alone. His complaisance shows whereabouts he is in the scale. Christ is our standard. What would his opinion of the existing order of things be? this is the way to look at it. The sleek well-to-do man of the flesh, with a comfortable balance at the banker's, and some good investments, is naturally contented. This only proves where he is in the scale of moral beings. Satisfaction depends upon capacity. Poor puss is very comfortable as she sits purring by the fire, and would laugh, if she could, at society, with its scientific exhibitions and social ceremonies, and wonder what pleasure in the world these two-legged creatures could find in such occupations. Go a little further down, and we see another animal grunting and snoring in the mire; and Jesus gives us to understand that there are human pigs. He says "Cast not your pearls before swine," that is, human swine. Now the gentleman I have been describing is one of them, though rather of a well conditioned and harmless order. It just comes to this, if we want to realise the standard to which God wishes His children to ascend, we must contemplate Jesus Christ and not take anybody's opinion or sentiments apart from Him. We shall hear people say that we are extreme, that we are fanatical, that we carry things too

far, because we try to be like him; but listen not to the voice of the serpent—listen continually, and all your lives, to the voice of wisdom, and there is some chance at least, of our entering the state in which all will be "holiness unto the Lord."—EDITOR.

1 Peter, iv.—The sufferings which afflict us may be divided into four classes. First, those which are common to all men, such as disease, poverty, &c.; second, the sufferings which are entailed by resisting the flesh; third, the sufferings which are entailed by the contradiction of sinners against our advocacy of the truth; and fourth, the sufferings entailed by those who persecute us. I do not mean those who contradict us, but those who by their influence and power, are able to imprison and punish us. The sufferings common to all men we cannot get quit of, any more than other persons; the sufferings entailed upon us by resisting the temptations of the flesh, are sufferings which we ought all to experience; and if we do not experience them, it implies that we cannot suffer with Jesus Christ—for he is an example to us, and he suffered very much from resisting the flesh. The temptation which is recorded after his forty days' separation from the habitation of man—his forty days' fasting—was a series of temptations by the flesh; and he resisted them all, and even others; for in his lifetime he had many similar temptations. There were also the trials he had to endure, from the contradiction of sinners—from those who opposed him in his teaching—for opposition entails decided suffering upon those who have the truth in their minds, and are desirous of promulgating it. The agonies he endured that culminated in the Garden of Gethsemane, arose from the civil law being brought to bear upon him. The sufferings connected with the crucifixion of the flesh we must take upon ourselves. If we regard iniquity in our hearts, the Lord will not hear us: as long as we walk after the flesh His ear is closed. There is nothing in the grossest forms of the lusts of the flesh, but what has its beginning in the vain thoughts and desires working in our own breasts—working even when there is no particular external temptation to draw them out. While we are young and have a life of promise before us, we look into the world, and see before us many objects, such as wealth, fame, glory, happiness in this life, all these things pass before our eyes like a panorama, and they are apt to engender the desire that we may reach the fame

the glory or the wealth we see. The desire leads to the effort to possess them, and this may bring success; but it will be at the cost of all that is lovely in the future. I have no doubt Jesus Christ, when he was in the desert, was by himself; that there was no personal devil near him; that nothing was exhibited to him; that he was not taken up to a mountain or a pinnacle of the temple, but that all passed before his mind's eye. He saw everything as in a dream. It was a temptation to him. When he was baptized he was endowed with a supernatural power, which drove him into the desert; but his mind still remained the mind of a man under training by experience, and he, doubtless, was taken into the desert for the purpose of reflecting on the future of his mission. If he had been a foolish son, he would have gone into the world. You never find a fool by himself, desirous of entering into his closet; but you will find a wise man always desirous of retiring by himself for reflection, so that he may be able in his mind to combat the desires which the flesh induces within him; that he may be able to design, from the wisdom he derives from the scriptures, how to regulate his future life, and dispose of the means which are put in his power, or the wealth, it may be, he has come into possession of, and the learning he has acquired from the scriptures. It is necessary for us all, much more for the young—those who have just taken up the cross as it were, and who have before them not a life of fame, and glory, and pleasure, but a life of suffering, such as Christ endured—to enter into their closets, to shut their doors, and hold communion with themselves and with God; otherwise, those temptations which arise out of the flesh—those dreams which are before them,

and every man has his dream of the future, even in this life—may overcome them, to their condemnation; for we have all to give an account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead. We feel more in life, as it were, in resisting the flesh; we do not suffer so much; it is an encouragement, therefore, to look forward into the future beyond this life. We must have our minds set continually on the things in the gospel, pressing forward to the prize of the high calling in Jesus Christ. What is it that makes men endure the suffering of the present for the future in this life, but having their minds set on a particular object? So it should be with the Christadelphian: he must have his mind eternally fixed on that which is far distant, and live in the hope of receiving that which he there sees. By these means he will be encouraged to endure the suffering and annoyances around him. If we forget the things that are above, then those things which are around us, which feel irksome and troublesome, will begin to feel more irksome and more troublesome, until it may be, that in the end we shall throw them off, and return to following after the flesh and not the spirit. Peter speaks of "them that suffer according to the will of God." Now we are suffering according to the will of God, in resisting the desires of the flesh, and so suffering, we feel our souls have need of somebody else to keep them up; for so long as we follow the lusts of the flesh, we keep up our own spirits, but in suffering according to the will of God, we feel constrained to commit the keeping of our souls to Him in well-doing, as unto a faithful Creator.—

W. D. JARDINE.

Dec. 29th.

## WHO WAS THE FATHER OF JESUS CHRIST?

### MR. DEALTRY'S REPLY AND THE EDITOR'S REJOINDER.

DEAR SIR,—As you request me to forward the conclusion of my reply to your strictures, I sit down to the work. Before I begin, however, I must say that I should be very sorry to see *The Ambassador* given up, through want of means to keep it on. You ably conduct it. I much relish the articles on "The Judgment," by J. J. Andrew. Do me the favour of putting me down as an annual subscriber for two guineas.

Now to my work. In my former letter I proved that there was perfect accord between Matthew and Luke in the lineal descent of Joseph from David. The former gives it through Jacob, his father; the latter, through Heli, the father of his mother. Thus Joseph, being the *grandson* of Heli, imparted to his <sup>son</sup> Jesus, in whom terminated the two lines from David through Solomon and Nathan, all right and title to

the throne of Israel. I affirm this to be the unmistakable teaching of Luke. "And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age, being (as was allowed) the son of Joseph, who was the son of Heli." You quote "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.*" And then you add: "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. *Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God.*'" "Those who allege he was the son of Joseph, would come under the implied condemnation of this passage." If you are right, then Philip the apostle would share in the condemnation, for he positively asserted his belief that Jesus was the son of Joseph. "Philip findeth Nathaniel, and saith unto him, we have found him, of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph!" Are you prepared to give an absolute contradiction to this assertion? I am scriptural then in affirming that Jesus is the son of Joseph by natural descent, and the Son of God by his anointing at his baptism, and proved to be so by his resurrection from the dead. The voice of the Eternal One was heard at the baptism of Jesus, declaring "Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased." All who believe the truth, and are immersed into Jesus, are also styled "*the sons of God.*" Daniel predicted that 69 weeks, or 483 years, were to elapse "from the going forth of the commandment, to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince." And Paul states "When the fulness of the time (483 years) was come, (which was when "Jesus began to be about thirty years of age"), God sent forth His Son (gave him a divine commission) born of a woman, (as Isaiah had predicted in chapter ix: "For unto us—Jews—a child is born"), born under the law, to redeem those that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." Paul does not say "born of a virgin," but "born of a woman." If I am asked "How then can man be justified with God, or how can he be clean that is born of a woman?" I answer, by doing what God has commanded to be done to that end. John announced a baptism, *the design of which was for "the remission of sins."* Now, although Jesus was a holy man, nevertheless, he submitted to it, and thus fulfilled "all righteousness." When born of water, he was anointed, or became the Christ. He was not *born* the Christ, or anointed at his *birth*. "He went up straightway out of the water," and "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit, and with power." After being thus constituted the Christ and apostle of

God, and proclaimed His Son, his temptation commenced. "He was tempted in all things like ourselves, though *without sin.*" He did not yield to temptation; he might have done, *but he did not.* You say "Jesus was preternaturally begotten of a virgin; and the distinction is highly intelligible and immensely interesting. Introduce Mr. Dealtry's theory, and it is without meaning." If it were true, it would be "immensely interesting." But it is not so. There are four chapters in the New Testament which profess to give positive information upon the *nativity and conception, and birthplace* of our Saviour. The rest of the volume is either silent upon these points, or contains expressions which would lead to a different inference from that of these four chapters. In these chapters it is affirmed that Jesus was born at *Bethlehem*, and that he was ushered into the world under circumstances of the most extraordinary nature. From every other part of the New Testament we should conclude that he was born at *Nazareth*, and that no miraculous circumstances attended him until he "began to be about thirty years of age." It will, therefore, be evident that the argument rests upon the genuineness of these chapters; for if they be *genuine*, that is written by Matthew and Luke, their *authenticity*, that is the truth of the facts recorded, must follow, the *general authenticity* of these writers being fully established. \*

REPLY TO MR. DEALTRY'S  
LETTER.

WE were obliged, from want of space, to withhold the foregoing letter last month, though it was in type. It will be observed that its principal arguments were met in our reply to the former letter. Indeed, there is little in it that is really different from what has already been advanced on Mr. Dealtry's side of the question.

He asks if we are prepared to give an absolute contradiction to Phillip's assertion that "Jesus of Nazareth" was "the son of Joseph?" It is needless to say that no contradiction is needed. Jesus was the son of Joseph by Mary, just as he was the son of David by Mary. The truth requires no softening down of the phrases which affirm his relation to one or the other. There is a place for them both in the truth of the matter. They are not displaced by the fact that he was the son of God. They stand along with that fact: all points of truth co-exist. There is no incompatibility between them. Many things appear to be in contradiction till their relation is perceived. Mr. Dealtry only recognises one fact of the case, viz., that Jesus was the son of Joseph. He

\* We have reserved Mr. Dealtry's argument on the authenticity of the disputed chapters for future consideration.

leaves no room for the other, and much more important fact, that he was the son of God. He excludes this, and extinguishes the "things concerning the name of Jesus Christ." This is the fearful result of his error.

He makes use of Daniel's prophecy of the 70 weeks, to countenance his idea of Christ's divine sonship dating from his immersion, and not from his birth. His reliance is upon the words "From the going forth of the commandment, &c., unto Messiah the Prince shall be" 69 weeks, or 483 years. This period expired toward the manhood of Jesus, and Mr. Dealtry argues that this fact establishes the conclusion that Jesus was not the son of God till then. He fails to perceive that the expiry of the 69 weeks has relation to the period of his anointing, and not to his sonship. Jesus was not anointed with the Holy Spirit till the expiry of the period indicated in Daniel. He was not manifested or fully constituted "Messiah the Prince," till then; but had there been no work of preparation leading up to this event? Mr. Dealtry himself has shown there was. He recognises the birth of Jesus 30 years before, in the line of David—his registration according to proper legal forms, and his training in righteousness as a qualification for the position to be afterwards occupied. Now if Daniel's prophecy admits of this amount and kind of preparation before "the fulness of time," it admits of the other preparation, in which Mr. Dealtry refuses to believe. If it admits of his being born son of Joseph 30 years before his anointing, it admits of his being born son of God 30 years before his anointing. The contention is not as to his anointing, but as to his sonship. Mr. Dealtry confuses these points a little, and obtains an occasional apparent advantage that does not belong to his argument. Daniel's prophecy proves what can never be in dispute, that the Christship (or Messiahship,) of Jesus is to be reckoned from his anointing (christing) with Holy Spirit at his baptism; but on the question of when he became the son of God, it throws no light. It avails Mr. Dealtry nothing for this. It throws him back, for a settlement of the question, upon those larger considerations, and more specific evidences which we have already seen to be so fatal to his theory. It leaves him at liberty (and would to God he would avail himself of it), to recognise that wonderful interposition of divine power and love which prepared a man from the substance of our fallen race, by whom, in subsequent operations, he opened the gates of death without the compromise or infringement of one of the unalterable ways of his wisdom.

Mr. Dealtry makes manifest the utter hollowness and impotence of his theory and the spiritual perniciousness of it, in his attempt to define the means of justification. He says "If I am asked 'How then can man

be justified with God, and how can he be clean that is born of a woman?' I answer *by doing what God has commanded to be done to that end.*" By this answer, he destroys the mission of Christ in its very inception, and subverts the whole course of apostolic teaching, for if his answer be true, there was no necessity for Christ's manifestation in the flesh at all, and no truth in the testimony that it is HE who is our righteousness and salvation, having been "delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification." If a simple compliance with commandment were all that was necessary to justify men, Christ's first advent was merely an incident, and not a necessity, or a vital means of salvation, then by Mr. Dealtry's principle, we could have been saved without it; because, if Christ, a mere man, could do the things commanded, any of us mere men could do the same. The virtue would be in the commandment, and not in anything Christ had done. By "doing what God had commanded to be done to that end," we could have been justified without his death and resurrection. But this principle is a great fallacy. It was demolished 1800 years ago by Paul, who spent a great part of his life in exalting the cross as against the law, and in establishing the proposition that "if righteousness come by the law, then is Christ DEAD IN VAIN."—(Gal. ii, 21.)

As applied to perishing men at the present stage of divine operations, Mr. Dealtry's principle is true, viz., that we become justified "by doing what God has commanded to be done to that end," that is, by believing the gospel and being baptised; but the present matter in dispute has relation to the *state of things existing before this stage was reached.* The principle is true only after, and in consequence of what Christ has done. Applied as Mr. Dealtry applies it, it is false. Taking our stand with Christ, in the days of his flesh, as it were, it ceases to be true. There was no way of salvation then extant, except in the faith that had always pointed forward to him, and which was only prospectively valid, depending for its efficacy upon what he was to accomplish. He *had to die, and to rise again.* God could command nothing that would impart justification unto life apart from this, because the law of sin and death barred the way. This had to be surmounted without violation or compromise, and it was done by a sinless man, standing in our nature, as our representative to suffer the death that had constitutionally passed upon all men, and to secure life unending by a resurrection.

Mr. Dealtry points to John's baptism as a means devised for the remission of sins, and as this is an answer to the question, how can man be justified with God, if Jesus was a mere man, it is evident he ignores the character and accomplishments of Jesus, as the means of our justification, and puts

forward a mere compliance with an arbitrary command instead. He is thus at war with the truth in its most vital point, and in collision with the great bulk of the apostolic testimony, which is emphatically a testimony concerning the cross, as a symbol of our justification through Christ's personal accomplishments. On such promises the first advent of Christ was a superfluity; there was no necessity for his sojourn in the flesh, and his submission to death. His appearance on the scene might have been reserved for the moment when he could enter into his glory without challenge. Why did he come 1800 years ago? The scriptural answer is "to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." The very first character in which he was introduced to Israel by John, has reference to this purpose:—"Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world."—(John i, 29.) The very first explanation of his name is concerned with the same truth. "His name shall be called Jesus, for he shall save the people from their sins." The revelation of his approach in the seventy week period has to do with the same great lesson. "To finish transgressions, and to make an end of sin, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness \* \* \* Messiah shall be cut off, but not for himself."—(Dan. ix, 24-26.) Isaiah's delineation of his first appearing is heavily burdened with the same fact. "He was wounded for our transgressions; he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed," and finally the triumphant song of the redeemed multitude, lays hold even in the hour of consummated glory, of the great work of Christ in the flesh: "Worthy is the LAMB THAT WAS SLAIN \* \* \* thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God BY THY BLOOD, out of every kindred and tongue, and people, and nation."—(Rev. v. 12, 9.) They are only in harmony with the incessant unvarying testimony of the apostles, of which we might quote endless examples.

Now if Christ was a mere man, how could he take away the sin of the world? Mr. Dealtry may say "by obedience." The answer is a true one, but for the present purpose it is not sufficiently explicit. It comprehends but does not define the truth in the details now in question. Two points are involved in it which must be clearly and separately seen. First, his obedience involved death, for "he was obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."—(Philip ii, 8.) Now, if he had been a mere man, his death would not have availed for the taking away of sin, but would have been as final to him as to any unjustified son of Adam; for as a mere man, he would have been a transgressor, at some stage of life at least, and a single transgression would have brought him within the

clutch of death, in which the transgression that made him captive would have held him captive. But (and this introduces the second point,) he was obedient in all things, and from the first, which, as a mere man, he could not have been, all experience being the proof, supported by the testimony of the scriptures, that all have gone astray—that there is none that doeth good, no not one—that there liveth not a man that sinneth not. He was perfectly subject to the divine will, which as a mere flesh born, he could not have been, for it is one of the characteristics of the merely natural mind—the mind formed as the result of impressions on brain flesh in the slow course of experience—that it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.—(Rom. viii, 7.) It is wilful and foolish, from the sheer force of its own nature. This is absolutely true of every human being in the first stage of existence. "Folly is bound up in the heart of a child."—(Prov. xxii, 15) But Jesus was an exception. Of him, the spirit in David speaks thus: "Thou art he that took me out of the womb; thou didst make me to hope when I was upon my mother's breasts. I was cast upon thee from the womb; and thou art my God from my mother's belly."—(Ps. xxii, 9, 10.) The meaning of it is practically illustrated in Christ's converse with the doctors while only twelve years of age. His inception by divine energy gave an affinity for divine things which is lacking in us, poor sons of the earth. To speak phrenologically, the spirit stamped the perfect image of the elohim on the product of Mary's womb, and gave to the powers of his mind that perfect balance, which sin disturbed in the first Adam. Thus there would exist in him that soil for the quick germination of divine ideas, and a strong affinity for the divine relation which was impossible in the first Adam, and impossible with us;—impossible with Adam, because the weight of painful ancestral experience did not exist to incline the balance on the right side; and impossible with us because we inherit a nature hopelessly out of balance—the instincts and propensities far exceeding in development those higher faculties that distinguish us from the brutes. Thus constituted, he was capable of developing a spotless character, and having our condemned nature upon him, he could stand in our stead. He died for us. He rose again. He was without sin. Death had no claim on him as an individual. "God raised him up, having loosed the pains of death, BECAUSE IT WAS NOT POSSIBLE THAT HE SHOULD BE HOLDEN OF IT."—(Acts ii, 24.) Having risen, he is immortal. "Christ being raised from the dead DIETH NO MORE: death hath no more dominion over him."—(Rom. vi, 9.) "He raised him up from the dead, now no more to see corruption."—(Acts xiii, 34.) As Jesus says of himself, "I am he that liveth and was dead; and behold I AM ALIVE FOR

EVER MORE."—(Rev. i, 18.) It is his exaltation to this position that is our salvation. He is now an immortal representative of the human race, and having in himself for us, fully met the law which requires our death, he is permitted, nay, appointed, of God, to offer us a redemption from sin and death, on condition of faith and obedience. It is to him we have to look. He is the appointed life-giver and judge; God will entertain no human approach unless it come through Christ. He is the only channel of prayer, the only source of hope. "There is none other name given among men whereby they may be saved."—(Acts iv, 12.) There is not the smallest chance of salvation for any human being apart from him. IN HIM is deposited the life offered: "he that hath the son of God hath not life."—(1 John v, 11, 12.)

When men and women believe the gospel, and are baptized, their sins are remitted on account of the connection which is then and thereby established between them and Christ; because as their representative, he has taken away sin, and brought life and immortality to light. By the assumption of his name, and the full surrender of the heart and mind to his authority, they are privileged to become heirs of the life and kingdom which are his. He becomes to them "wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption."—(1 Cor. i, 30.) Belief of the gospel and baptism do this for them, *on account of what Christ has accomplished in himself*, and not that God has appointed those as the means in themselves of securing remission of sins and the inheritance of life in the kingdom of God.

Mr. Dealtry gives a very defective definition of the matter when he says that "men are justified by doing what God has commanded to be done to that end." This statement is true so far as it goes, but that does not touch the root of the matter. There is a reason in everything God commands. He does nothing arbitrarily. There is a reason why the gospel and baptism are the things "commanded to be done" as the means of justification; *they give relation to a real means of justification*. They introduce to him who was "delivered for our offences, and again for our justification."—(Romans iv, 25.) Had there been no resurrection of Christ, even though a death of Christ, there could have been no salvation. "If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain and ye are yet in your sins."—(1 Cor. xv, 17.)

Mr. Dealtry's theory would make John's baptism the means of salvation *without reference to that which made it so*. The same principle applied to the law of Moses would make it a law of life. The law was a thing God "commanded to be done;" true, not as a means of justification unto life; but why? Because it was impossible. The law was weak through the flesh.—(Rom. viii, 3.) The flesh was under condemnation, and

could not, on account of its weakness, develop a righteousness that would give a title to resurrection. Paul says "If there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law." But it was impossible that a justifying righteousness could come by any law, or any commandment, except through the provision of a man who would be capable of keeping it, who should die for the sins of those who were weak, and be able by reason of his holiness to rise from the dead. This arrangement was a stumbling block to the Jews, who, "going about to establish their own righteousness, had not submitted to the righteousness of God."—(Rom. x. 3.) Some of the Jewish brethren had still, through the power of early association, a hankering after the law as a means of justifying righteousness. To them he says "*a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ*" \* \* \*

If righteousness came by the law, THEN CHRIST IS DEAD IN VAIN."—(Gal. ii, 21.) Paul here unmistakably connects the death of Christ with the development of a justifying righteousness; but by Mr. Dealtry's theory all this is excluded, for in Christ, he gives us a mere man, born after the flesh, simply and purely to be a king; and for righteousness, he throws us back upon our puny death-stricken selves in the performance of something God has arbitrarily and without any meaning, "appointed to be done to that end."

We shall at once anticipate two objections Mr. Dealtry might urge. He might say was not Abraham justified, and all the prophets, long before the death of Christ? Truly so, but only by prospect. Their justification, so to speak, was dated forward. As a matter of divine recognition, it was a fact existent in their lives, but as a thing to have actual effect in their deliverance from death, it could not become operative till Christ opened the way. He "confirmed the promises made unto the fathers."—(Rom. xv, 8.) Without his death and resurrection, those promises must have remained a nullity, and the justification of the ancients would have been a myth. His death has as much to do with the remission of the sins of those who died before him as with the remission of our sins who live so long after him. This is evident from the following: "For this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, *that by the means of death FOR THE REDEMPTION OF THE TRANSGRESSIONS THAT WERE UNDER THE FIRST TESTAMENT*, they which are called (Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and all the faithful of other times,) might receive the promise of eternal inheritance."—(Heb. ix, 15.) The next objection Mr. Dealtry might urge would be that on the principle laid down, belief of the gospel and baptism, ought to ensure salvation, as a matter of certainty. He

might argue that all such testimonies as "The unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God," and "except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise inherit the kingdom of heaven," are meaningless, if Christ becomes to those connected with him, a justifying righteousness. The answer is that there are two stages in this question which must be kept carefully distinct: viz., before and after baptism. Before baptism, a man can do nothing to save himself; all his righteousness is as filthy rags. After baptism, he is in a position to "work out his own salvation;" because his connection with Christ gives him a position in which *his salvation is possible*. This arrangement in Christ is all of pure favour; our destiny after introduction to this arrangement is all a question of works. Baptism confers a title, but subsequent probation determines whether that title shall be taken away, or ratified at the judgment.

We withhold, for the present, Mr. Dealtry's argument on the genuineness of the disputed chapters in Matthew and Luke. Our space this month is inadequate to the demand that would be made upon it, were we to attempt to follow him through the tortuosities of his attack upon these portions of the word of God. We will content ourselves with an emphatic denial of his remark that "the argument turns upon the genuineness of these chapters." The question, as we have seen, stands upon much broader

ground than he assigns to it. The argument interweaves itself with every utterance of apostolic teaching, and the evidence presses itself upon us at every stage of divine revelation. The history of Christ's life, and the doctrinal application of his achievements by his apostles, involve and necessitate the fact narrated circumstantially in the disputed chapters of Matthew and Luke. These chapters, it is true, contain precise information which is not elsewhere to be found; but that the miraculous conception rests upon them is totally at variance with the fact. They clearly fill in what would be an enormous and painful blank in their absence. They allay the perplexity and the cavilling that would arise in the presence of such a life and such a character as Christ's, were we without the information that he was the son of God, by a direct divine procreation; but that they originate, or singly uphold the great doctrine is utterly untrue. It rests upon the broad basis of all the promises of God; it is upheld by almost every stroke of the apostolic pen; it is inwrought with the very substance and essence of the scheme of salvation. The subterfuge which Mr. Dealtry is practising upon himself rests upon the shifting sands of speculative criticism, the worthlessness of which we may seek on a future occasion to demonstrate, in review of the reasons he adduces from the internal construction of the disputed chapters, in proof of their alleged spuriousness.

EDITOR.

---

## THE POLITICAL HEAVENS AND THE SIGNS THEREOF.

THE political sky is angry-looking and ominous. The dark clouds that have so long obscured the heavens, hurry hither and thither, and enter every moment into new and more threatening combinations. The storm is gathering at every point of the compass. The most notable feature of the situation is the universal preparation for war, and the consequent prevalence of poverty, and even famine in many parts of the world, attributable to the commercial stagnation produced by the political uncertainties of the hour. In illustration of the first point, we subjoin newspaper extracts.

"'Europe,' says one of the Paris journals, 'presents at this moment a most astonishing spectacle. All nations desire peace, and yet all governments are arming with feverish activity; all, however, protest that they are preparing for war in order to avoid it; and at the same time the official writers accuse

foreign governments of desiring to create a universal conflagration. Necessarily there is one, and perhaps more, that lies in the most audacious manner.' No one can deny the truth of what the Paris journalist says."—*Globe* Paris Correspondent, Jan. 21, 1868.

The Paris Correspondent of the *Morning Post*, though reporting that the sovereigns and governments of France and Prussia appear to be on the most friendly terms, observes:—

"The moment you get out of the official atmosphere, the language changes. Military men all over France expect war. They witness the inspection of fortified places, and find that military stores are laid in; guns and sabre bayonets are being produced with amazing rapidity; and, finally, there is the new Army Bill, which the soldier, of course, thinks means fighting. Go amongst the commercial circles, they hope that war will be avoided; they do not see any cause for war; they do not, they say, believe in war. But at the same time there hangs about every



man's mind a painful uncertainty; yes, even amongst a class who are inclined to believe in what they desire. Politics have something to do with the stagnation of trade, the overgrown deposits of the bank, and want of confidence, which seems to increase rather than diminish. The same may be said of the effect of these armaments in Germany. The Germans do not believe, as far as we can judge here in Paris, that Napoleon III. demands such immense sacrifices of his people to create a moral balance of power only. Uncertainty is a European malady just now. We are watching what takes place in Germany, and the Germans are watching us.

Notwithstanding all the promises of pacific intentions by Continental Powers, the preparation of arms and armed men was never more active than it is at the present. Unfortunately, the acts of the governments do not harmonise with the official and semi-official announcements in favour of peace. In Italy the Minister of Marine has asked the Chamber of Deputies for a supplementary credit, to meet the cost of the armament of nine iron-plated vessels, and the alteration of the carbines of the Royal Marines. The Spanish Chambers have unanimously passed an armament bill, and the government it is said, have applied to the United States, for the purchase of 50,000 needle guns. A telegraphic despatch from Vienna mentions that the Servian Government have made a similar application at Vienna, for the purchase of 20,000 guns, and that it was refused. The Chambers of Stuttgart, of Munich, and of Brussels, are discussing army bills. Notwithstanding the pacific declaration of the Berlin journals, if the *Turin Gazette* is correctly informed, Prussia is making immense war preparations; her troops are already concentrating on the Silesian and Saxon frontiers, and with such a formidable accumulation of military material, that one would imagine we were on the eve of a second Sadowa campaign. The *Nord*, which speaks for the pacific policy of Russia, and maintains that to that policy it is owing that the peace of Europe has not been broken before this time, copies an article from the *Invalide Russe*, by which we find that Russia has diminished her active army to 700,000; but that she has an immense reserve, from which the army might at once be increased by 64 per cent. It is further stated that, the army being no longer composed of serfs, the men are animated by the highest spirit. The State and private factories are busily employed in the manufacture of needle guns, of which the *Invalide* calculates that 800,000 will be ready in the course of the present year. The Carl rifle is the one adopted by the government, and the Russian organ evidently expects it will 'do wonders.' Rifled cannon and the preparation of the fortresses, are not omitted from the peaceful anticipations of Russia. Even the

sovereign Pontiff of Rome is studying the art of maintaining peace, by increasing his army to 25,000 men."

"The Exhibition of 1867, has been immediately followed by the most general and most ominous armament, on the part of the continental powers which has taken place since 1815. This armament follows close upon the heels of a military effort, which threw into the shade every other which has been made in the same period; and that, after the Italian campaign and the American civil war, is saying a great deal. The present position of affairs appears, in a very few words to be somewhat as follows. The French consider it necessary for their safety, in which they include the power of keeping all the rest of Europe in a state of chronic apprehension, to have an army, or at all events to have the means of obtaining, on the shortest possible notice, an army of three quarters of a million of men, with power, on rather longer notice, to add enormously to its numbers. The North of Germany thinks it necessary—and, in the presence of such a neighbour, it is no wonder—to have the whole nation armed, and capable of being, in case of need, brought out to fight. It is the same in every other part of the world, if we except England and the United States; and as to the United States, the recollections of the civil war are still too fresh to leave much doubt as to their capabilities of military development in case of need. Thus England is the only considerable exception to the general rule. Whilst every other nation thinks it necessary to keep itself in readiness for making an intense military effort, upon the very shortest notice, our notion is to sit by and moralize on the wickedness and folly of such conduct, and to set an example of the wisdom of an entirely opposite policy. It is a very remarkable state of things."—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

"Whither is Europe drifting? That it is in motion is evident, and the point to be ascertained is whether the tide is carrying the nations so clearly loosened from their old moorings. Is it to a new and better position, or is it to a dangerous snag in the channel, a European war? We confess to ourselves the prospect seems extremely gloomy, so gloomy that we feel half inclined to regard a catastrophe as inevitable. All the signs which have ever preceded European convulsions exist around us in abundance. The *regime* of law has, it is admitted, ended. The central nation of Europe—the pivot on which diplomacy always turns, the one power always organized and always active—is restless, ill content, and ready for the strife. Mentana revealed to the world that the most powerful political instrument in existence, the French army, has been rearmed, and can now meet the needle gun without a quail. The debate of the 5th instant taught us all that

the masters of that army are in that strange temper compounded of fear, self-reliance, and wounded vanity, which in the individual Frenchman, precedes a challenge. The entire current of events convinces men that the re-occupation of Rome will not suffice to restore France to her equanimity, or Napoleon to his undisputed control of foreign affairs. Above all, the acceptance by the Commission, of Napoleon's Army Bill, indicates that the nation feels the need of self-sacrifice for immediate and great ends. There never has been anything in Europe like the "armed peace" of which the *Invalide* speaks, anything so utterly ruinous to civilized mankind. Europe was armed and restless and feverish in 1805, but only one country had then discovered how to change a nation into an army. Now, the world has found out the fatal secret, and out of England and America, every civilized man is commanded to learn his drill. The army of France will shortly exceed the adult male population of Switzerland or Belgium, or the armies of the four military powers collectively equal the adult male population of a State of twenty millions—more than that of Great Britain and Ireland in 1815. The sum expended on destruction would pay the interest of all the national debts throughout Europe, equal, at 5 per cent, to the amount of a debt of about a hundred millions sterling. Probably a clear tenth of the marriageable population of the Continent is forbidden to marry, while 300,000 of the most active and enterprising of her sons annually transfer their energies to the other side of the world. Europe, on which the future depends, is eating herself up, consuming, in the effort to be strong, the best results of strength; actually paying, in one form or another, ten times the largest army the Cæsars ever maintained when the Mediterranean was a lake surrounded by their provinces."

The terrible features of the present crisis, betokening the imminence of a time of trouble such as never was, are graphically delineated in a letter which appeared in the *Morning Star* three weeks ago. The writer (Henry Richards, Secretary of the Peace Society), commences by calling attention to the distress which prevails among large classes of the people in almost all European countries. He says:—

"For many years past, there has not been so general and bitter a cry of suffering, ascending to Heaven from all parts of the world, as we find to-day. Of the wide-spread destitution and misery in our own country, I need say nothing. Your own columns and those of your contemporaries abound day by day with evidence of their extent and intensity. Men

and women and children dying of famine in the midst of us; thousands of honest and industrious working men,

Who beg their brothers of the earth  
To give them leave to toil;

and failing to procure that leave, are forced to seek parish relief or the doles of charity to keep on a lingering and miserable existence; skilled artisans fain to earn sixpence a day at the stoneyards as their only alternative from starvation.

If we go to France, the same scenes of distress meet us everywhere. I say nothing of the dreadful state of disease and famine which prevails in Algeria, of which the Archbishop of Algiers declares that 'calculations which are not exaggerated bring the number of victims within the last six months to above 100,000.' In Paris, we read of twenty charity soup kitchens, distributing daily from 40,000 to 50,000 portions, and of the authorities of the city doling out fuel and bread in large quantities, to save the people from utterly perishing. The managers of the 'public relief' for Paris have received a subsidy of nearly 400,000*l.* from the Minister of the Interior, and they are at their wits' end to make it go far enough. In the provinces it is no better. The *Avenir National*, in a recent number, says 'Most distressing news reaches us from the north, centre, and south of France. It is no longer Lyons, Nantes, Rouen, and Roubaix alone that are besieged by misery. The *Gironde* tells us that at Bordeaux the number of the poor who publicly clamour for bread or work has assumed most unexpected proportions; it has been thought necessary to double the sentries at the Hotel de Ville, and to place a strong body of police at the main entrance, which is constantly encumbered by a famished crowd. At Lille, Auxerre, Limoges, and many other places, the *Bureau de bienfaisance* have been driven to resort to exceptional measures."

Let us then pass on to Prussia, a country which has been and is being held up to the admiration and envy of the world, as having by its wonderful system of popular education almost banished ignorance and misery from its borders; and what do we find? The last tidings from Eastern Prussia is in a letter from Dantzic just published in our journals, which says, 'The most horrible distress prevails in the towns and rural districts of this country, and if the state does not come to the aid of the populations who are suffering from hunger, the greatest calamities are to be feared. At Conitz, Buelens, and Bockum, the want is also terrible.' The *Cologne Gazette* mentions that the number of families in Eastern Prussia which require relief, is 3,500, spread over thirty-five districts. The Sanitary Commission of one of these communes has published a letter, denying assertions made by the semi-official press, to the effect that the distress was very much exaggerated.

'The misery,' adds that communication, 'is indescribable—men, women and children are huddled together completely destitute, in the forest, on litters of straw. Many are attacked with typhus fever, and the greater part are dying of hunger.' But it is not in that portion of the kingdom only that the pressure of suffering is felt. The *Zukunft* of Berlin, of a week or two ago, says 'The distress of East Prussia is not an isolated phenomenon. It prevails more or less in the various provinces of the monarchy. In the richest regions, in the most populous towns, there are murmurs which have not been heard for a long time. The communes are struggling against deficiencies which are crushing them. The stringent means employed to get in the taxes, which it was rare to use formerly, are now of frequent occurrence. Business is at a stand-still; employers dismiss their workmen or reduce their wages; families are driven to inferior lodgings; the number of servants is diminishing; privation, misery, are words which are heard everywhere. If the distress has not reached the intensity which it has in East Prussia, it threatens all parts of the state, and in the course of some months, may lead to the same sad results.'

If we go further east, we still hear the same tale. "The position of Polish Galicia," says the *Moscow Gazette*, "in consequence of the deficient corn harvest, is frightful. Their population is threatened with a famine. The representatives of that province have solicited at Vienna a loan of a million of florins, but the Austrian finances are in such a critical state, that the urgent request has not been taken into consideration."

In Russian Poland it is no better. "By private communications we have received from Lublin," says the French journal, *La Liberte*, "we learn that in that country the famine is yet greater than in Eastern Prussia. Overwhelmed by heavy imposts, the unfortunate Poles see their land become every year less and less productive. This year the kopa of wheat, which yields usually from 24 to 32 garnicks, yields only from 3 to 6. The Polish peasants are not happier than our Algerians, and that is not saying a little."

For the famishing people of Finland, the Society of Friends are raising a generous subscription, and in an appeal they have just issued for more help, they cite a letter from Mr. Campbell, the British Consul at Helsingfors, which draws a melancholy picture of the condition of that province. "The harvest throughout the grand duchy," he says, "has this year been a perfect failure; and I assure you no words of mine can describe the misery, suffering, and sickness, at present prevailing from each end of this unhappy, famine-stricken country. Iceland moss, pinetree bark, and peas straw, ground up together, and mixed with a little flour, is the only food wherewith the mother can now feed her

child, and the only food on which thousands will be dependent for many months to come."

These examples of extreme distress are only the outward symptoms of the general condition of discouragement and depression which exists throughout Europe. Everywhere we hear of enterprise paralyzed, commerce languishing, credit failing, securities depreciated, and all "men's hearts quailing for fear, and for looking for the things that are coming on the earth."

But, in the meanwhile, what are the governments of this distressed, paralyzed, famishing Europe doing? Oh, they are in full and feverish activity, organising their armies, navies and militias, forging rifled cannon, manufacturing Minnie rifles, and Chassepots by the million, building iron-plated ships, constructing new fortifications, stimulating with lavish rewards the inventors of infernal machines, and giving the utmost possible development to the art of destroying life and property. The people ask for bread, and they give them bullets. They cry out for education, and they offer the universal military drill. Whatever trade languishes, the trade of blood is flourishing and luxuriant. While millions of the people are perishing or nearly perishing of cold, nakedness, famine, disease and despair, the treasure wrung from their toil and industry, for the maintenance of large armies and the manufacture of murderous weapons, must be had at any hazard, and be lavished without stint."

#### THE EASTERN QUESTION.

This hopeful constellation of the political heavens—indicating the nearness of the great event which is the hope of afflicted mankind—grows brighter as the months pass. Revolutionary fermentation is on the increase among the "christian" populations under Moslem rule. Turkish impotence to deal with her difficulties is manifested in the ratio of Russian energy and menace. The following newspaper extracts will best illustrate the situation:

"Paris, Feb. 14th.—The prospects of peace begin to lower in presence of the Eastern Question. Yet I am told, on very good authority, that the Emperor holds fast to peace, and that it will take much to force him into detented war. Meanwhile, we are told that at Vienna, as well as at Pesth, the people begin to show like red Indians under the excitement of the war dance. Should this affair become more complicated, and take a serious turn, you may expect to hear of Louis Napoleon once more placing *sur le tapis* his favourite idea of a congress or a conference to solve the pending difficulty. Prince Napoleon is, it would appear, most anxious that France should go to war, inasmuch as he considers it the only safety-

valve left to the Imperial dynasty. The Prince, who has ever been most frantic against Russia, would now, however, be satisfied to see this country declaring war against Prussia; and to obtain this result he has had of late many interviews with the Emperor, urging his Majesty to claim the Rhine Provinces."—Paris correspondent of *Telegraph*, Feb. 14th.

There is (says the *Steele*) at the present moment a regular congress of Russian diplomatists at St. Petersburg. The Russian ambassadors at Constantinople, Paris, and Vienna—General Ignatieff, Count Von Budberg, Count Stackelberg, and Count Von Berg—are assembled under the presidency of Prince Gortschakoff. Baron Brunnow, the Russian ambassador, has been excused from attending on account of his age and the inclemency of the season. The assembling of these eminent persons is generally attributed to the necessity which is felt of having a precise line of policy in the event of the complications which are expected to occur in the East. What seems to confirm this view is that the extraordinary meeting corresponds with the official publication by the Russian Government of the documents which bear upon all the questions which are agitated in that quarter of Europe."

"The *Avenir National* says:—

"The most disquieting news arrives from the East. The Candiotte movement has assumed such proportions that Hussein Pasha has been obliged to ask for reinforcements from Constantinople. The Cabinets of St. Petersburg and of Athens support the insurgents by money and sympathy, and are only waiting to give them more effective aid. Moreover the Servians support the menacing demands of the Montenegrins. We are informed by a dispatch yesterday that Russian agents are travelling through Bulgaria and stirring up the inhabitants to revolt. To-day we learn from Bosnia and Herzegovina that Russian propaganda is equally active in these provinces, and that it is promoted by the aid of the clergy of the Greek rite."—*Leeds Mercury*, Dec. 30.

"The meeting of the Russian diplomatists at St. Petersburg is a strong reason for believing that Russia contemplates some action in the Oriental Question before very long. There is evidence also that the French Government is of this opinion. The French Consul General at Bucharest has lately warned Prince Charles that there was some danger of serious complications arising ere long, and advised him to avoid anything that might cause embarrassment to Austria. The Paris correspondent of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* writes that the Turkish Embassy gives proofs upon proofs that it is Russia's plan to let loose all the Christian neighbours and subjects of the Porte, and use them as a cloud of skirmishers to attack her in the spring."—*Star*, Jan. 14.

"An agitation is being carried on, openly as well as secretly, in Bosnia, Servia, and Bulgaria, by agents employed by Russia for the purpose of spreading discontent and exciting the population of those countries against the Turkish rule. A Vienna correspondent remarks:—'To any close observer, it is manifest that the system of dualism inaugurated in Austria has created a situation which, from its very nature, favours the designs of Russia, inasmuch as the Slavonic races are strongly opposed to the supremacy of the Magyars, against which they are sure to revolt whenever they have a chance of doing so; and facts are not wanting which prove that Russia is nurturing this feeling, and trying to alienate the Slavonians from their legitimate rulers both in Austria and Turkey. By provoking national jealousies and religious prejudices, and claiming the protectorate over them, on national not less than on religious grounds—Russia stirs up the Christian population of Turkey against the dominion of the Porte. During the winter months, all fears of any disturbance taking place may be allayed; the severity of the weather, and, above all, the entire absence of the necessary means of communication, rendering a warlike action on a grand scale impossible. All this, however, will change before long. Servia, destined to act as *avant garde*, will be put forward as *agent provocateur*, and Montenegro will follow in the wake. The moment a rising like that in Crete takes place, Russia will step in, and, taking advantage of the opportunity, raise the standard of nationality and religions, if the Porte should not succeed in suppressing the insurrection in its infancy. The only circumstance which may act in favour of Turkey is the discord prevailing in the provinces and pashalics against each other, and the rivalry of Bosnia and the Herzegovina, which will neither accept nor acknowledge the leadership of Servia. The mind of the entire Christian population has been imbued with the notion of independence. From this springs their determination to submit no longer to the supremacy of the Crescent. The Sultan may introduce whatever form of government he pleases, and if it were the best, it would be of no avail. It will be met by them with the retort 'It is too late.'"—*Globe*, Jan. 14.

"Events seem to be hastening on to a catastrophe in the East. A dispatch from Vienna, dated yesterday, announces that the Government of the Sultan have received information of a vast conspiracy in Bulgaria, and the ministry have been assembled to deliberate on the steps to be taken. The Grand Vizier has been ordered back from Crete. We extract the following from the *North Eastern Correspondence of Vienna*:

"Our most recent information from Bucharest, Belgrade, &c., corroborates our previous reports as to the preparations that

are being made, notwithstanding the denials that have been put forward, for an insurrection in Bulgaria. The funds which are being organised get every support which they require from the authorities in Serbia and Roumania. All our correspondents agree in representing Prince Charles of Roumania as a tool in the hands of Russia."—*Telegraph*, Feb. 10.

"The Servian journal *Zustawa* says:— 'Mithad Pasha, Governor of Bulgaria, has just received from the insurgents of that province a letter bidding him welcome, and notifying in due form a declaration of war, and the speedy opening of hostilities. During the last fortnight the male inhabitants of the villages at the foot of the Balkan have been leaving their homes to swell the rebel bands in the mountains.'"—*Globe*, Feb. 11.

The insurrection against Turkish authority in Crete, continues, and owes its continuance to Russian support secretly bestowed. This appears from letters from the spot, of which the following is a fair example:—

"Turkey is ready and willing to yield most of the points asked from her, and all might go well, but pressure from without makes it an impossibility to put down the revolution so long as that pressure lasts. While Russian ships of war, in defiance of all law and justice, weekly bring provisions, arms, clothing, and—worse than all these—encouragement and promise of assistance, the revolution will never be put down; while Russian ships of war embark and disembark the chiefs of the rebels under salutes from the guns of their ships, and pass in and out through the blockade during the night, without showing lights; while these things are allowed to go on, so long will Crete be in revolt, and a precedent be established in regard to foreign interference, in the event of revolution that may come home to the very door of more than one of the great powers. With Greece Turkey could deal single-handed easily enough; and surely it would be better for Turkey to be at open war than in her present state. The 'exhaustive' policy of her great enemy is, beyond all doubt, doing most ruinous work. Aali Pasha feels all this bitterly, and has, I am told, at last protested strongly against these proceedings."—*Globe*, Jan. 23.

#### THE ROMAN QUESTION.

This question is in transition, not in abeyance. It is difficult, through the mere haze of rumour, to descry the particular shape it is taking; but the general features are palpable enough. The Pope is upheld in his position by the French emperor; the Garibaldian party are writhing in impatient thirst for vengeance, and hatching new schemes for

the completion of their designs. The Italian Government is embarrassed in the presence of French insult and revolutionary intrigue; while the Pope, and his cove of unclean and hateful birds, are full of new hopes and new plans, for the defence of their tottering system. The French Emperor has not made up his mind how to proceed; his deliberations are embarrassed by the combination of conflicting interests, involved in the question. There is every element of instability and ferment in the present position of affairs. The newspaper scraps are as follow.

"A Florence correspondent declares that 'the clerical party in Rome has no idea of a postponement of the Roman Question but considers it likely to progress rapidly, and in a sense extremely unfavourable to Italy. The most sanguine anticipations are there to be heard expressed by persons not usually prone to indulge in them without some grounds to go upon. A French protectorate of the Holy See is more than ever talked of as near at hand, and that not as a final measure, but a step towards better things. The establishment of a French garrison at Viterbo will have strengthened the hopes of the Pope's adherents. It has caused an unpleasant impression here, where people discredit the validity of the excuse given. It is believed that for the number of French troops actually in the Papal States, ample accommodation might have been contrived at Civita Vecchia, without putting any part of them under canvass. The priests look forward confidently to regaining what they have lost. A protectorate established, they believe that the first Garibaldian menace or demonstration (such as the Italian Government could hardly prevent) would be the signal for the occupation of Umbria and the Marches, with a view to their ultimate restoration to the Pope, and to the disruption of Italian unity. There is no doubt that a very large party in France would be well pleased to see the kingdom of Italy broken up, and a federation substituted for it, and some of the best informed people in Rome—on the Papal side—fully believe that it is thus matters will end.'"—*Globe*, January 15th.

"Notwithstanding all that the newspapers have been saying of late about the re-establishment of a good understanding between France and Italy, the fact is that the relations between Paris and Florence were never worse than they are at the present moment. The reason is, it appears, that the present Italian cabinet is unwilling or unable to deal with the difficulties that exist in Italy, as France wishes them to be dealt with; that a bad spirit toward France is manifested throughout Italy, and that the

Government does nothing to check it; and that, in spite of the protection with which France is covering Rome, a new aggression on the Papal States by the Garibaldians is not unlikely; not that it would have any chance of success against the French, but as an act of defiance and scorn of them. So discontented is the French government with Italy that threats against her are, I am told, actually heard in high places. 'She wears us, and we will make an end of her' has, *dit-on*, been said by more than one statesman.'—*Telegraph*, January 22nd.

Writing on Monday, the Paris correspondent of the *Pall Mall Gazette* says:—

"The state of Italy still inspires great uneasiness, and it is acknowledged that no minister can be found bold enough to re-establish the September Convention. At Marseilles and Toulon, four regiments are under orders to be ready to start at a moment's notice, and military and naval preparations are being carried on with great spirit. Admiral Fourichon has been dispatched to visit the different ports, and hasten on the ships in construction and the coast defences. Should war break out, it has been determined to give the command in the north to the Minister of Marine, and that of the Mediterranean to Admiral Jurien de la Graviere."—*Leeds Mercury*, January 1st.

"Rumours that grave events have taken place in Italy are current. The latest letters received from that country are of a disquieting character. In Naples in particular, an insurrection was considered imminent."—*Globe*, January 28th.

Within the last few weeks, Garibaldi, from his enforced seclusion in the island of Capraera, has denounced the enormities of the Papacy in both prose and poetry. His sentiments mark the intensity of the hate by which the Roman Mother of Harlots is coming to be regarded, and as they will, in a certain sense, find an echo in the breast of every true witness for Christ, we append them.

"Capraera, Jan. 3, 1863.

The Ottoman domination is less hurtful to Greece than the Papal to Italy. The Turks oppress the Greeks with every kind of barbarity; appropriate to themselves the produce of their vintage; humiliate them by all sorts of servitude; prostitute their women! their children! But the Turks do not deceive their slaves, nor can they incorporate them with the stock, nor assimilate them to the turpitude of their rulers; they do not, like the priests, prostitute their understanding. The terrible yataghan descends upon the skull of the miserable Greek, through lust of violence, of cupidity, of lasciviousness, of

barbarity. And the slaves repay the atrocities of their masters with hatred the most intense. The Greek sees in the Turk a horrible tyrant, a monster, a demon, hell itself. His hatred, nourished and transmitted from generation to generation, maintains, propagates, increases itself. It has become even a kind of worship in the breast of the poor servant; and sooner or later this hatred will free the unhappy country of Leonidas. The Greeks are cast down, but not converted. They fortify themselves by the very abjectness of their slavery, and preserve those limits which only death can pass between themselves and their oppressors. The masters of the Romans, the priests, have committed the same rascalities upon their slaves, and, there can be no doubt, in a manner even more atrocious, substituting for the yataghan the torture and the flame. They are guilty of the same licentiousness, the same prostitution; they possess themselves of the substance of their slaves, not only by violence, as do the Turks, but by cunning and deceit—by sacrilege!—ever associating with the deeds of their own lusts the most holy name of the Divinity—debasement in every manner. Thus they convert their servants to their own creed: they make their own priests, after having perverted their minds; and, in fine, debase the greatest of the nations to the lowest rank of the human family!—a transformation which the priests alone could effect! Those who, remembering the greatness of Rome, aspire to cast off the infamous yoke, they are incarcerated, proscribed, burnt! In Rome, then, can only live liars, tyrants, and slaves; and therefore, I say to myself, the Roman people not doing its duty, who can hope from it that insurrection which will free humanity from its scourge? The Romans are in exile, in prison, or shamefully perverted! I conclude, that the Ottoman domination inflicts less injury upon Greece than the priestly upon Italy, and that the Greek has been able to preserve more of human dignity under Islamism than the Roman under popery. Both being tyrants and impostors, the worst is the Jesuit.

G. GARIBALDI."

The following is the concluding part of some verses addressed by Garibaldi to Victor Hugo in reply to a poem of the latter which appeared some weeks ago on recent events in Italy. Speaking of the expedition, he says:

"Fools?" Ah! if all who blame in England—  
France—

Had backed the vanguard of that bold advance;  
If Europe, seeing that we warred for peace,  
Had sworn our Argonauts should have their  
fleece;

The diplomatic devils had been cast  
From possessed Europe—these times healed at  
last,

Of papist leprosies—the temporal sham  
Had perished—living long enough to damn  
Its Cæsar, in a last anathema.  
But ever Nations err in this sad way ;  
Leaving a sister all alone to fight,  
Alone to face the common foes of Right,  
While those lock arms, and link their fortunes  
tight.

When? when will all the peoples learn to see  
Their victory's common, and their field must be?  
Of all the powers, none spoke, save Albion ;  
She with her mighty voice—the only one—  
Thundered "Fair play, there!" and the schemer  
then

Turned tail before the votes of Englishmen,  
To look in Luxembourg and Mexico,  
For slaves to drill, and kingdoms to bestow.  
Nay! but he found the name of "Liberty,"  
A name with meaning in it o'er the Sea.  
The New World to the Old sent cartel due,  
"This hemisphere imports no crowns from you;"  
And just enough of Mexico it gave  
To dig his gallant chasseurs each a grave.  
Teach us that lesson great! Columbian breed!  
Teach us the glorious manhood of that deed!  
Here we are grey with serfdoms—sore with loads,  
Kings know the trick to make us kiss their rods;  
With laws awry and falsehoods seven times seven  
And altars where priests sell passes to heaven.  
They fool us well—while with fair words amain  
Their scribes and speakers gild our ancient  
chain.

The spy—the pimp—the prefect, go in silk—  
The way to prosper is to fawn and bilk.  
They write us bondsmen in our children's blood;  
If superstition totters where it stood,  
They help it up again—a hydra grey,  
Which sprouts new heads—the old one shorn  
away.

The monk and emperor go hand-in-hand,  
And Christ's sweet word "Goodwill," is made  
to stand

For "massacre"—the peasant's hard-earned gold  
Is melted down to Chassepot bullets, rolled  
To Chassepot barrels, and the soul of Man  
Stands cited to the bar o' the Vatican,  
With Zouaves for assessors. Your dear home  
And mine—my HUGO! lives by leave of Rome  
And Compiègne—to which pair we do owe  
The French and Roman corpses laid araw  
On red Mentana—white, and not red, now  
With bones of foes, who had been friends, if  
"State"

Did not make earth all charnel—history, hate.  
"The Empire's Peace!" he said. He said, and  
lied!

Who, with more blood, the groaning earth has  
dyed?

Who more, to make a dynasty, has spent  
Lives for his plan—men for its argument?  
Warned off from Mexico—foiled at Berlin—  
He slew my lads—my Roman boys! to "win

Prestige." He won it! Ah, good friends! thy  
verse

Thunders the judgment of a righteous curse,  
On those soiled laurel leaves: But let him be,  
He does the things he must! Wait thou and see.  
A little while his shameless scheme prevails:  
A little while, and God's long-suffering fails.  
And when he ends, and we may pity him,  
The dawn will break on Europe dead and dim,  
The dawn of brotherhood, and love and peace,  
The light of a new time, when there shall cease  
This clamor of armies over Christian lands;  
And nations, tearing off their Lazarus-bands,  
Shall rise—see face to face—and sadly say  
"Why were we foes? why did we serve—and  
slay?"

Poor Garibaldi's hopes are all in vain.  
History has falsified a thousand times the  
expectations reposed in human reforms.  
His expressions, however, are almost  
coincident with the prophetic delineations  
of the crisis to which he is instrumentally  
related. "The diplomatic devils" (see Rev.  
xvi, 14.) which have been active for the last  
fifteen years, will ultimately be cast out of  
"possessed Europe;" the nations will be  
healed of "papist leprosies and the temporal  
sham;" men will live in peace and concord,  
when kings are "gathered into the pit"  
(Isa. xxiv, 21, 22); but these results will not  
be compassed by any agency now in  
operation. There is only one hope for the  
world, and that lies in the provision God has  
made, and for which those who believe his  
promises are now most anxiously looking.  
There is a King who will be able to break in  
pieces the oppressor, and to cause instruments  
of war to be turned into implements of peace  
to the ends of the earth. Till he comes,  
there will be no peace, and no righteousness,  
enlightenment, or prosperity. Nations will  
consume themselves in the fires of vanity, till  
the great day when he shall re-appear to punish  
them for their iniquity—(Isaiah xxvi, 21),  
—and take to himself his great power and  
reign, transferring the kingdoms of men to  
himself, and enforcing his undisputed,  
irresistible, and righteous authority in every  
country on the globe. May this day quickly  
dawn, though come it must, in blood, tempest,  
and trouble unheard of. The signs speak  
loudly to all who are his servants. "Behold  
the Bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet  
him."

EDITOR.

Feb. 21, 1868.

INTELLIGENCE.

**BIRMINGHAM.**—The week night lectures (at which the attendance revived after the Christmas holidays, with a little assistance from the bill-poster) have, for the present, concluded, and their effect is visible in the large increase in the Sunday night attendance, the hall being now filled to the door. On the 10th ult., an open tea meeting was held for free converse with interested strangers. There was a large gathering, and an interesting meeting. Many questions were asked, and answered privately and publicly, and a few applications were made for immersion. Two of the applicants have been immersed: **MARTHA FRY** (18), domestic servant, formerly a Methodist, and **JOSEPH LEA** (36), shoe maker, formerly Church of England; and arrangements are in progress for the immersion of other three. About six others have intimated their intention of early obedience. During the month the ecclesia was favoured with a visit from brother **J. Soothill**, of Harvard, Ill., U.S., and brother and sister **T. G. Newman**, of the same place, but, meanwhile, residing at Teignmouth, England.—Brother **W. J. Bailey** has been dangerously ill for eight weeks, but is now out of bed, and on a fair way to convalescence.—The Editor here acknowledges, as the most appropriate place, the receipt of £1 13s. from a brother in the States (by the hands of brother Soothill) and £2 from a sister in England, for distribution among the poor according to their needs (particulars of appropriation will be privately furnished to the givers); also £2 from a brother toward defraying the cost of entertaining visitors.

**EDINBURGH.**—Brother **Charles Smith** writes, Feb. 15: "You will be glad to know that we are leaving the Temperance Hall for a larger one, viz. Cockburn Hall, Cockburn Street, near the railway station. I hope the change will be for the advancement of the truth, but we get on very slowly in making inroads on the public."

**MANCHESTER.**—Brother **W. Birkenhead**, located at Sale, in the suburbs of Manchester, mentions a breaking of bread having taken place on the occasion of a visit from brother **Milne**, of Dunkeld, sister **McDonagh**, living in the same neighbourhood, being present. He says

"I begin to entertain hope of my mother becoming obedient. She is much interested, and quite accepts of our understanding of the scriptures. My brother and sister also read our works. I should be glad if we could organize an ecclesia near Manchester. It seems as if something ought to be done in so large a town."

**NOTTINGHAM.**—Brother **E. Turney**, writing February 17, reports the immersion of a young man (name not given)—who has been for a long time a staunch Primitive Methodist. His obedience is due to the advertised lectures. His wife would have been immersed on the same occasion, but for special circumstances. Brother Turney adds "We have about a dozen besides, chiefly men, who seem to be on the point of obedience. I am about to see them on the matter. You will get names, &c., from brother Phelps."

**SWANSEA.**—Brother **Randles**, writing February 14, encloses a hand bill, which he describes as "our latest move to keep up the present excitement" about the truth. The hand bill runs as follows:

"Christadelphian Meeting Room, Bellevue Street, Swansea. A course of **THREE LECTURES** will be delivered in the above room, commencing on Sunday, February 9, 1868; subject, 'What says the scriptures upon man in death.' Sunday, Feb. 16th; subject, 'What says the scriptures upon man at his resurrection.' Sunday, Feb. 23rd; subject, 'The world to come: its relation to man and the present age.' Each lecture to commence at 6.30 p.m. 'To the Law and the Testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.'—Isaiah viii, 20.

No collection.—Please bring your Bibles."

Brother **Goldie**, writing February 21st, announces an addition to the ecclesia by the immersion of sister **LANGRAVE**'s husband, who has been steadily attending the meetings for a considerable time. His immersion took place on the 7th ultimo, in Swansea bay.

**WHITBY.**—The brethren have issued a hand bill address, on "The good time coming," to which they append the following **PUBLIC NOTICES. MEETINGS.**—The Christadelphians in Whitby meet at



8, Gray-street (except on the occasions of advertised lectures), every Sunday morning at 10.30, and Wednesday evening at 8.0, for the Exposition of 'The Gospel of the kingdom of God and the things which concern the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.'

**THE GOSPEL TO THE POOR.**—The Christadelphians are open to receive invitations to preach the good news of the coming age, in any house or room where ever-so-few are desirous of hearing.

**BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS TO LEND.**—These may be obtained upon a variety of interesting subjects, by enquirers after the truth applying at the above address. No charge made for loans.

**THE INTERESTED READER** is affectionately invited to attend the above meetings, to open his house, or to avail himself of the book loans. No collections."

Brother Shuttleworth writes that the attendance at the lectures improves, and some interest in the truth it exhibited. He says "Things are assuming a somewhat belligerent aspect. Clerical growls, like those at Swansea keep ever and anon coming to our ears. It is not impossible—(the thing has been ventilated)—that our weekly advertisement of lectures by the bellman may be stopped."

**WISHAW** (Scotland.)—Bro. R. Hodgson, writing Feb. 12, says:—I write to inform you that the Methodist clergyman of Wishaw is engaged in delivering a course of lectures against us. At the close of his second lecture, he intimated that he would answer any questions the following Sunday that might be sent to him in writing by Wednesday. We took advantage of this and sent him upwards of twenty, and these have occupied him for two nights. In all his lectures he has made very free use of your name and your writings, of course doing his best to make both very contemptible. I think he has fairly laid himself open to a challenge to the platform, and I have been revolving the matter in my mind for a week or ten days, as to the best method of coming at him to take the wind out of his sails. At first I thought of writing to him as a friend of yours, to say I had no doubt you would be willing to meet him in public, in defence of what you had written and to show cause why it should not be condemned. Fearing that my interference might afford a pretext for declining to meet you, I have concluded at last to inform you of the matter, and ask you either to send him direct a formal challenge

for discussion, or authorise me to do so should you think that preferable. I have doubts whether he will meet you, but should he decline, we will publish him and show up his bragadocia in the local newspaper, even if we should be required to pay for it as a common advertisement. Should he accept of a challenge from you, the interests of the truth will be greatly subserved thereby, and a better opportunity afforded for its advocacy than ever occurred in Wishaw before, or that may ever occur again. His own chapel is filled every night, and quite an interest manifested, which I believe would be greatly increased if it was known that you were to discuss the matter in public." [We have written to bro. Hodgson, authorising him to convey a challenge to the "rev." adversary. We have not as yet heard the result.]

#### CHINA.

**HONG KONG.**—Mr. E. Lilley, who wrote from Hong Kong for books, a few months ago, writes to acknowledge receipt of them. He says "There are now four of us that believe in the things concerning the kingdom and the name. I have a great many battles to fight. The people think I am an Atheist, and pray for me that I may be convinced of my error; but I go on, clinging to the Bible and leaving Platonism and Miltonism to the learned and wise of this world. We had a meeting the other night at the minister's house—a sort of Bible meeting; but the conversation ended in our being as wise as at the beginning. I should be glad of a little instruction how to conduct an ecclesia."

#### UNITED STATES.

**PHILADELPHIA.**—Brother George T. Simpson, (906, Passyunk Avenue) writes: "Those in this city holding the truth as it is in Christ Jesus, meet at the house of brother George Balmain, 1814, Wood-st.; but we expect before very long to move into better quarters, for the setting forth of the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus the Anointed."

**ERRATA.**—F.R.S.—Quite right; the reference last month (*Enlargement of Ambassador*, p. 59, line 37.) ought to have been Psalm xlix. 18, instead of cxlix. 18: "Men will praise thee when thou doest well to thyself." Other errata have occurred, which the good sense of the reader would detect, such as "obliquity" for "obloquy;" "here" for "nowhere"—the "now" being detached and inserted in the next sentence, to the confusion of both, &c.

# THE AMBASSADOR

## Of the Coming Age.

---

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

---

---

No. 46.

APRIL, 1868.

Vol. V.

---

---

### THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF JUDGMENT.

---

BY J. J. ANDREW, LONDON.

---

#### NOTES AND ADDENDA.

THAT which causes a seed to germinate, is the vitality within it. A sound seed will spring forth, and if other influences are favourable, will develop into a full-grown plant; but a defective seed, whether the outward influences are favourable or not, will either produce an imperfect plant, or it will die away, and never come to perfection. Just so is it with the servants of the Deity: those in whom the spirit of God (as embodied in His word) dwells richly, will have sufficient vitality in them at the close of their probationary career, to entitle them, at the judgment, to be developed into full-grown incorruptible trees, by the very same spirit which has purified their hearts and minds; but those who are deficient of this spirit, will not develop into perfect plants, but will be cut down on account of their withered condition, and be cast into the fire to be burnt.

The change which is to take place, "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye," is synonymous with "this corruptible" or mortal being, putting on incorruption, and not with the restoration of the dead to life.

The statement that "the dead shall be raised incorruptible," when "the trumpet shall sound," is no proof that the raising or building up of the dead, from their present state of unconsciousness to the future state of incorruptibility, will take place instantaneously. The "trumpet"

here spoken of is doubtless the seventh trumpet, the chief events of which are described in Rev. xi, 15 to 18. These events extend over a series of years; and the resurrection and judgment are part of them, as appears from the 18th verse.

The phrases which speak of the righteous being "clothed upon," and "putting on incorruption," afford strong proof in themselves that they are restored to life in a mortal condition, because there must be a body of some kind in existence, in order to be "clothed" or to "put on immortality;" and that body must be a "corruptible" one—i.e., a body capable of decaying, and not in the actual state of corruption—as is the present condition of the dead.

---

#### ADDENDA.

SINCE writing the foregoing, we have met with the following remarks by the late ARCHBISHOP WHATELEY, on Paul's comparison of the seed, which are valuable because they disprove the common theory that the burial of a dead body is analogous to the sowing of a living seed.

"It is worth while to remark that when he (Paul) speaks of our being 'sown in weakness,' some suppose he refers to the committing of a *dead* body to the ground—a body which has lost all the grace and beauty it may once have possessed, and from which the defacing hand of decay is about to sweep the last lingering traces of loveliness. But if you look more narrowly into the context, you will see, I think, that this cannot have been his meaning. For you will perceive that it is our present *living* frame, and not our *dead* body, that he is all along contrasting with the resurrection-state. It is not with the mouldering mass of corruption which we are forced to hide in the ground out of sight, that the new body is compared; but with our present vile body, even in its best state; for even in its best state it is 'corruptible.' 'There is,' says he, 'a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. For so it is written, the first man, Adam, was made a living soul—the last Adam was made a quickening spirit.' The sense here is obscured by the word '*natural*,' which unfortunately is found in our version; for it quite disguises the connection of thought between this and the next verse, where Adam is spoken of as a 'living soul.' The real sense would be much better expressed in modern English, by saying, instead of '*natural body*,' *animal* body; that is a body possessed of animal life; such a body, in short, as Adam had—'of the earth, earthy.' \* \* \*

'There is,' says the apostle, 'an animal body, and there is a spiritual body; and these we derive from different ancestors: Adam was made a living animal, Christ is a quickening (that is, a life-giving) spirit.' Now here you see plainly, that it is not the contrast between an actual *dead* body and a living one, that he is thinking of, but of the difference between two frames—one merely animal, the other spiritual. If we are speaking of the burial of the *dead* body, it is not correct to say that it is sown, or buried, an animal body; for animal life has *departed* before it is laid in the ground. But if we take this 'sowing' to refer not

to our burial, but to the *origin* of our present mortal frame—to our *entrance* into this world, not our departure—then the apostle's language is clear and pertinent. We *are* sown—we are brought into this world—with animal frames, with bodies weak and tender, with bodies taken from the dust of the earth, and hastening every day to corruption; and with these, the imperishable and glorious body which Christ will give, is fitly contrasted. What has put the idea into some people's heads, as the thought corresponding to *sowing*, is the 37th verse; and yet if you will look closely at that verse, you will perceive that it really makes the other way. 'That which thou sowest is not quickened (made alive) except it *die*.' The decomposition and breaking-up of the structure of the seed, he calls, figuratively, its 'death': it is like death—a kind of dissolution—a great, and to a hasty observer, a seemingly destructive change, that takes place. The apostle, you will observe, does not say 'unless it corrupt,' but 'unless it *die*.' Nor does he call this change *dying*, unless he meant to compare it, not surely with corruption, but with *death*. And if so, it is plain the thing corresponding with that change must be *our death*. The seed is first sown, and then dies; and then springs up again. And if this be applied to man's condition—first *sown* into the world, then *dying*, and then *raised*; the comparison is intelligible and beautiful. But it will not agree with the case of a mere dead body. A corpse cannot die. It is dead already: dead *before* put into the earth. And therefore it would not have suited Paul's purpose to speak of it as *dying* seed. It must be therefore our present animal living-frame that he speaks of as seed which must *die* before it can be quickened. \* \* \*

\* \* \* And this interpretation is confirmed by the words of our Lord himself, who employs the very same figure (John xii, 24): 'Verily I say unto you, except a corn of wheat fall into the ground, and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit.' Here he is evidently speaking of the glorious consequences of his own death. Some Greeks had desired to see Him; and this had suggested to his mind the enlargement of the kingdom of God to all nations, which was not to take place till after his death, then just at hand. He compares himself, therefore, to a seed which must die before it becomes plentiful; and I need not remark that the idea of *corruption* can have had no place here, since he was not to 'see corruption.' Hence it is clear that it is to the death of a living man, not to the smouldering of a dead carcase, that he is comparing the change which takes place in a seed cast into the ground. And precisely similar, no doubt, is the thought of the apostle, who would hardly have made the actual corruption of the body a necessary condition of its being raised, when, in the case of Christ himself—the very type and example of the resurrection—no such corruption took place."—*Scripture Revelations Concerning a Future State*. 8th Edition, pp. 113—117. Lecture V.\*

The following quotation from the same author, as far as it relates to the *nature* of judgment, is worthy of the careful attention of all who hold

\* The italics are Dr. Whately's.

the erroneous theory that the judgment is merely for the purpose of bestowing rewards on the worthy. His arguments, though directed against the orthodox view, are equally forcible against the one which necessitates the righteous possessing immortality before appearing at the judgment-seat of Christ.

“This leads me to remark another circumstance which throws difficulty on the subject [the argument between Christ and the Sadducees]; viz., the perpetually-repeated notices of the *Day of Judgment*, and allusions to it, both in our Lord’s discourses and in those of his apostles, as to a time when (the dead being raised) all mankind shall be brought to trial before their all-seeing and unerring Judge, and receive from him their sentence. ‘I charge thee,’ says Paul to Timothy, ‘before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who will judge the quick (i.e., the living) and the dead, *at his appearing and his kingdom* ;’ and in the epistle to the Romans ‘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.’ What I mean is, that all these allusions to one particular *day*, are such as seem to imply that it is *then* that every man’s condition will be finally fixed. Now it is indeed very conceivable that the souls of men, in a separate state, should remain in a happy or unhappy condition till the end of the world, and should then, at the resurrection, be reunited to bodies, and enter on a *different kind* of enjoyment or of suffering; this, I say, is in itself, very conceivable; but it is hard to conceive how, supposing *that* to be the case, the day of *judgment*, at the time of the resurrection, should be spoken of as it is in scripture; since each man would (in the case just supposed) not only *know* his final condition, but actually *enter upon* his reward or punishment, *before* the resurrection, immediately on his death; so that the *judgment of the last day* would be in fact forestalled. It seems strange that a man should first undergo his sentence, and afterwards be brought to trial—should *first* enter upon his reward or punishment, and *then* be tried; and then judged, and acquitted or condemned.

The great Day of Judgment being, to all appearance, so called from some analogy to what takes place in human courts, it seems more likely than not, that it should correspond with our judicial trials in the most essential points. Now the most important point in a judgment-day among men, is that each person is then pronounced guilty or not guilty, and his future fate ascertained. It does indeed, sometimes happen, that a man knows perfectly well before-hand, what his fate will be. A criminal, conscious of his guilt, and aware of the overpowering evidence that can be brought against him, has been known to exclaim, the moment he is arrested, ‘I am a dead man!’ But if this were *always* the case—if matters were so conducted that *everyone* should be fully aware, before his trial came on, what would be the issue (nay, and had been actually undergoing his sentence), we should consider the whole ceremony of the trial, and the solemn pronouncement of the sentence, as no more than a matter of form. Now it does not seem likely that the great Day of Judgment, which is so much dwelt on in scripture, should have been so called from its resemblance to our judgment-days, merely in a matter of form, and not in anything essential.

It is true that if such a day were appointed among us, on which each man, though already certain of his acquittal or condemnation, should be finally dismissed, to receive his appointed sentence,—one to death, another to imprisonment or banishment, another to liberty, &c., this would indeed be a very *important* day; but it would not be important as a day of *judgment*. It would be rather a day of *execution*;—a day of *allotment*;—a day of *assigning* to each his destined reward or punishment: but the primary and most essential character of *judgment*, or decision, would be wanting; namely, the *ascertaining* of each man's doom. Yet such we must suppose the great judgment-day to be, if we suppose an intermediate state of consciousness, and consequently of reward and punishment. For, on that supposition, each man would know, beforehand, his own doom, and would only be afterwards removed from one kind of enjoyment or suffering to another. Now, not only the very use of the words 'judge,' and 'judgment,' seems unsuited to suggest to us this view of the transaction, but moreover the sacred writers, and especially our Lord Himself, seem to point out the day of judgment as that on which the *separation* will be made of 'the sheep from the goats';—on which the decision will take place as to each man's deserts,—the final destiny of each be *ascertained* and made known to himself: for example, "many will come *in that day*, saying, Lord, Lord, have we not preached in thy name \* \* \* and in thy name done many mighty works? And then will I say unto them, I know you not; depart from me all ye workers of iniquity."—*Scripture Revelations Concerning a Future*. pp. 82-86—Lecture IV.\*

---

## THE GOSPEL QUADRILATERAL;

OR THE FOUR RELATIONSHIPS OF CHRIST AS THE SEED OF  
THE WOMAN, THE SEED OF ABRAHAM, THE SON OF DAVID,  
AND THE SON OF GOD.

### SEED OF ISHA.—(THE WOMAN.)

JESUS was the seed of the woman—(Gen. iii, 15; Gal. iv, 4.) This involved a flesh and blood relationship to the Adamic race.—(Luke iii, 23-38; Phil. ii, 7; Heb. ii, 14; John i, 14; 1 John iv, 2, 3; Acts ii, 30); and, by consequence, to sin and suffering (Rom. viii, 3; 2 Cor. v, 21; Heb. ix, 28; 1 Pet. ii, 24; Isaiah liii, 3, 4, 5), and death.—(Isaiah liii, 8, 9, 10; Dan. ix, 26; Matt. xxvi, 38; John xii, 33; Heb. ii, 9.)

By this, he was also related to the earth as man's habitation (Gen. i, 26, 28, 29; Psalm viii, 6; civ, 13, 20; cxv, 16; Acts xvii, 26; Isaiah xlv, 18; xviii, 3; Luke xxi, 35), and to human nature.—(Gen. ii, 7; Psalm cxxxix, 15; 1 Cor. xv, 47.)

The Adamic race and their habitation (the earth) were given by the Deity to the Christ for a possession.—(Psalm ii, 8; John vi, 37, 39; Heb. ii, 13; Psalm lxxxii, 8; lxxii, 8; John xvii, 6, 8; Dan. vii, 13, 14.)

---

\* The italics are Archbishop Whateley's.

## SEED OF ABRAHAM.

JESUS was the son or seed of Abraham (Matt. i, 1; Gen. xii, 7; Gal. iii, 16), by which he was constituted a member of the house of Israel (Num. xxiv, 17; Isaiah ix, 6; Heb. ii, 14, 16; John i, 11); heir of the Holy Land (Gen. xii, 7; Gal. iii, 16; John i, 11—see *Diaglott*), rightful sovereign and instrument of blessing to all nations.—(Gen. xii, 3; xxii, 17, 18; Gal. iii, 14; Isaiah xlii, 6; xlix, 6.)

The whole house of Israel, after the flesh, have been given to him for his flock, and the sheep of his pasture (Gen. xix, 24; Matt. xxiii, 37; Isaiah xviii, 7; Ezek. xxxiv; xxxvii, 21, 22, 24; Matt. xv, 24; Isaiah xl, 11); likewise also the house of Israel after the Spirit, as joint heirs of the covenanted blessings.—(Gal. iii, 29; Rom. viii, 17; John x, 29; 1 Cor. xv, 23; Mal. 3, 17.)

## SON OF DAVID.

JESUS was the Son of David (Acts ii, 30; Matt. i, 1; Rom. i, 3; Rev. xxii, 16), which secured to him the royal rights pertaining to the throne and kingdom of Israel (2 Sam. vii, 12-16; Psalm lxxxix, 3, 4, 27, 35, 36; cxxxii, 11; Isaiah ix, 6, 7; Jer. xxiii, 5, 6; Luke i, 32, 33; Acts ii, 30; Ezek. xxi, 27), and also the right of empire over all nations.—(2 Sam. xxii, 44; Psalm ii, 8; Isaiah ix, 7.)

## SON OF GOD.

JESUS was the Son of God.—(Matt. xxvii, 49, 54; viii, 29; xiv, 23; Luke i, 35; iv, 41; xxii, 70; John i, 34; iii, 18; v, 25; ix, 35; x, 36; xi, 4; xix, 7; xx, 31. Acts viii, 37; ix, 20; Rom. i, 4; 2 Cor. i, 19; Gal. ii, 20; Eph. iv, 13; Heb. iv, 14; vi, 6; vii, 3; x, 29; 1 John iii, 8; iv, 15; v, 5, 10, 13, 20; Rev. ii, 11; John iii, 16; Acts iii, 13, 26; Rom. viii, 3, 32; Gal. iv, 4; Heb. i, 2; 1 John i, 3, 7; 1 Thess. i, 10; Matt. iii, 17.)

By this relationship to the Deity, he is enabled to effect the object contemplated, in the three aspects already defined. His divine sonship is the source of the redemptory power necessary to the deliverance of the Adamic race and their habitation, from the condition and results of transgression, the preliminary also and basis of his own realization of them, as the gift of Jehovah in a condition of exaltation and obedience. As a descendant of Eve, Abraham, and David simply, Jesus could do nothing (John v, 30; viii, 28), but as Son of God, he could say concerning his life: "I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it up again."—(John x, 18), for, said he, upon another occasion, "As the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in himself" (John v, 26); and concerning his ability to impart it to others, he could say, upon the same ground, "I am the resurrection and the life" (John xi, 25), which life, says the apostle, "was (originally) with the Father, and was manifested unto us," as the word of life "made flesh," which, says he, "we have looked upon and handled."—(1 John i, 1, 2; John i, 14.)

Again, said Jesus, inheriting His Father's prerogative, "As the

Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will. For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son; that all men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father.”—(John v, 21, 22, 23.) To the same purpose is the following: “All power is given to me in heaven and earth.”—(Matt. 28, 18.)

The realization of the covenants of promise to Abraham was contingent upon this paternal relation of the Deity to Jesus, the mediator of the new covenant. Had he been other than Son of God, the sinless character which qualified him to be the sacrificial lamb, would have been wanting; the representative testator to the Deity's will, he could not have been, and the resurrection of the fathers from the dead, and their personal realization of covenanted blessings, would have failed in his failure.—(1 Cor. xv, 14; Acts xxvi, 6, 7, 8, 23.)

The same may be said of the “sure mercies of David;” the power necessary to the rebuilding of the tabernacle of David, and to the restoration of the breaches thereof, after the manner of the covenant, was inherent only in the Deity, to whom also belonged the kingdom. The incorruptibility and stability which will characterize its restitution, therefore, will accrue to it from the begotten relationship which Jesus sustains to Jehovah, and hence the following: “God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye crucified, both Lord and Christ.”—(Acts ii, 30. See also Acts, xvii, 31.)

It is evident, therefore, that whilst the heirship of Jesus was based upon his hereditary relationship to the woman, to Abraham, and to David, the power of inheritance came by his Sonship to Jehovah.

His Melchisedec priesthood was also inherited in the same way.—(Heb. vii.)

*Whitby.*

F. R. SHUTTLEWORTH.

---

SUNDAY MORNING AT THE CHRISTADELPHIAN SYNAGOGUE,  
BIRMINGHAM.—No. 5.

---

*From Shorthand Notes by brother JOHN BUTLER.*

---

THE SONS OF GOD—THE WORLD'S IGNORANCE OF THEM—THEIR CHARACTER AND DESTINY—THE PRESENT STATE OF EVIL—THE OTHER SIDE OF THE DIVINE PURPOSE—THE PRESENT TIME OF TRAINING—THE NATURE AND OPERATION OF OUR DISCIPLINE—THE RESULT—PEOPLE WHO WORK FROM WITHIN, AND THOSE WHO WORK FROM WITHOUT—THE TIMES OF REFRESHING—THE ROCK OF AGES—WHAT WE SHALL BE—THE WORLD'S SCEPTICISM—THE GLORY THAT SHALL BE REVEALED—THE PERSONAL MISSION OF THE TRUTH—FOOLS FOR CHRIST'S SAKE.

1 JOHN iii. We are reminded, in this chapter, of the relationship which we sustain as believers of the truth—a relationship which we ought never to forget, but should continually strive to realize in the strongest manner. This is relationship that is sure to become enfeebled and destroyed by our intercourse with the world, if that intercourse be not set off and counteracted by



our own reading of the scriptures—our own intercourse with the divine mind. I refer to the statement of John, that we are now the sons of God:—"Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God; therefore, the world knoweth us not, because it knew Him not." Now, although it is true that the state of the world at the present time presents a favourable contrast, in many respects, to that which existed in the days of John,—our forms of life are more civilized, and, perhaps, the institutions that regulate society are of a more rational kind, yet, so far as this fact stated by John is concerned, the truth remains the same, viz., that the world does not know the sons of God. It does not know what a son of God is; it laughs when such an idea is seriously propounded. I can safely appeal to every brother and sister, in whatever walk of life their lot may happen to be cast, whether it is not true, in the society in which they are thrown, that there is no comprehension of what is meant by a "son of God?" Well, we cannot expect the world to comprehend it; it must ever continue to be true what John here declares, that they know not and understand not the sons of God. But we should comprehend it; we should understand and realize the position those men occupy who are sons of God. It is a subject requiring a clear and tranquil mind for the apprehension of it—the state of mind which the truth, fully laid hold of, is calculated to induce, and, without which, the truth cannot be realized; for there are many senses in which "the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God." A distempered state of mind, an eager, anxious, excited, jealous or angry mood, is not the frame of mind

in which divine things can be apprehended. The things that are divine are subtle and cool and eternal, working invisibly, from generation to generation, outwearing the puny impulse of man, and silently circumventing his mad schemes. They are always true, like the light which nobody can see, but which everybody can perceive in its effects. We now approach one of those divine things. A son of God, by the very phrase, is one who is subject to the mind and will of God. You cannot have a dutiful son, or a real son, without submission. Now, this is just the point at which the education of the truth begins, and to which it is intended to bring us ultimately, in a perfect form, namely, submission to the will of God. The will of God is the ultimate standard of all perfection. We make its acquaintance in a bitter form now, because, in the present state, we are on the wrong side of it, as it were. We are familiar with evil because sin abounds; it is not His will that sin should bring forth sweetness. When we are on the other side of his will—when instead of ignorance, insubordination, and rebellion, knowledge and righteousness, and perfect obedience are triumphantly established in the universal throne of the earth, in the persons of all who, in ages gone by, have submitted themselves to his law, we shall then experience those "exceeding riches of his grace," which Paul says will be "shewn to us in the ages to come, in His kindness towards us, through Christ Jesus."—(Eph. ii, 7.) The sunshine of eternal favour will be ours—and what heart can conceive what this means?—if we safely weather the storms of this sin-period. We are now in training for submission to God, that we may be sons of God. The truth begins the work in a palpable shape, and in a shape that

most human beings are able to conform to, in so far as it requires them to believe and be baptised. This is the first act in the story, as it were, of divine submission. It may be said to be but the crude and gross and easy form of submission; the real submission to the divine will comes after, and extends to every hour of a man's existence, and every act of his life, and every thought of his mind. Paul says the object of the truth is to bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ, that is, that from our conceptions of God and His purposes, down to the motives of our trivial actions, our minds must be brought into slavish bondage to Christ, who is the expression of the divine will, in a living, speaking, loving, but firm and exacting Master and Teacher. This can only be done by intently "hearing" his sayings, and "doing" them—making them the law of our life. We shall thus be his real disciples and his true brethren, and therefore sons of God; for he is the Son of God, whose meat and drink it was to do the will of Him who sent him. To attain truly to this position of sonship, we must be in this mental condition, that the will of God, the law of the Almighty, is the highest law of our minds, the thing that guides us, that works from within, the thing that constitutes the mainspring of our operations. This cannot be come at all at once. There are many things to prevent us getting to it instantaneously. There is, to begin with, the natural ignorance and wilfulness of the fleshly mind, which besets us all at the outset—that has to be overcome; and it can only be overcome in one way. The progress of subjection begins with a comprehension of the truth; but to be completed, it must be carried into that degree of familiarity with the divine intention, and likings, and desires,

and will, which can only come with the habitual study of His word. Day by day, as years go on, the mind becomes leavened as it were, by ideas that in days of our ignorance, were both foreign to us and above us. In the days of ignorance, no divine idea has any relish. Our law is our liking. Our liking forms a very blind and erroneous law; our law in that respect is the law of the beasts of the fields. They are guided simply by their likings—by their blind instinctive impulses, and in these things the world resembles them. They are prompted by their selfish instincts and impulses. But it is not so with the sons of God. On this point God has made known His distinct will; and we can only make that will the law of our being, by putting it into our being in the way appointed, viz: by studying continually those scriptures in which it is communicated to us. When it is so implanted, there is a chance of its being carried out. There is a very great difference between the man who works from the secret implanting of the will of God, and the man who simply works from impulse—the man who works from his own liking, and the man who works from a sense of duty. The one is fickle and uncertain; he may be found in the way of duty if circumstances are agreeable, but he never goes out of his way to do it. If it comes in course, and all things are convenient, he will be found in the way of God's commandments; but you never find him making an effort, or sacrificing a point. With the other it is different; he does not work by attraction or accident. He is not at the meetings because he is entertained or because he likes them—although there is always a liking connected with duty—but because it is his duty to be so. He works as in the sight of Christ, whom he recognises as

his law-giver, to whom his being is wholly consecrated and given over. All those who are the sons of God are of this sort; they are those who work from the inside. Mankind, especially that portion of mankind professing the truth, may be divided into two classes;—those who work from the inside, and those who work from without; those who are the mere creatures of chance, whose action depends upon external circumstances; and those who are masters of circumstances to this extent, that they determine what to do, and do it as in the sight of God, and not as in the sight of man. All true men are those who work from within; these are self-acting men, and it is a very refreshing thing to see self-acting men and women in the truth. There is no more delightful spectacle than to see men and women who can keep going of themselves, from an individual sense of their subordination to Deity, and an individual appreciation of the greatness of the truth, and of the destiny to which they are called by it. At the same time, there always comes this reflection, that we must not look for a perfect refreshment until the times of refreshing comes from the presence of the Lord, when he shall send Jesus Christ.—(Acts iii, 21.) Then indeed we shall be refreshed. The topmost man of the whole community which will then spring into visible and glorified existence, will be the most self acting man of all, even he who said on earth “My meat and my drink is to do the will of Him who sent me,” and every one of the community that will surround him will be self-acting, for he will choose none that are not dutiful, that do not work from an appreciation of himself, that do not work from a motive that is independent of the men and women by whom they may be surrounded. Then we shall be refreshed

indeed to see and mingle in a great community, each individual of which is a man of understanding and appreciation, and who is like God, in that he is not selfish, but filled with that love which John here asserts to be characteristic of those who are God’s. We must always keep our minds upon that time. Let us never fix them upon the present, or we shall be continually faltering; if you lean upon a broken staff it will surely give way. We are obliged occasionally to use a stick that will break, but we do not put our whole weight upon it; we lean just a little and with a sufficient muscular reserve to hold ourselves again in case of accident. So in these things we must never put our whole weight upon anybody, or any number of “boddies.” We must lean upon the rock that David leaned upon—the rock that is higher than ourselves. Then if all the broken sticks fail, it doesn’t matter. It makes no difference to our position, because we are planted upon a rock. If every one took this position, we should help each other most gloriously, because there would be no staggering anywhere, no breaking. We should move forward in an unbroken phalanx. The man who is leaning upon the staff that is eternal will always be upright, always at his post, never failing, never changing, but keeping steadily to the one purpose to which we are called in Christ. “But,” as Paul says of another matter, “there is not in every man this knowledge.” We are, therefore, to some extent a broken army, and there is laid upon each man the obligation to assist his neighbour, to “comfort the feeble-minded, support the weak, and be patient toward all men.” “But it doth not yet appear what we shall be.” There is nothing at all in the present situation of affairs to indicate that which is coming, and for

that reason, the world does not believe it. The world has no understanding in this matter. It is like an ignorant child. It does believe in some things that it does not see. For instance, there is a certain chemical compound which, to look at it, is a dull, lustreless powder, but which, if you light it, will send forth a brilliant crimson light over all. The world looks at the powder and believes in the light, but a child, knowing nothing, is uninterested; its little, ignorant eyes only see the powder. It has no experience of the result that will follow ignition. Now, this is the position of the world, in reference to this higher matter. They see this book—the Bible—but they do not see the glory that is going to rise out of it. They know the facts under its eyes, but, have no comprehension of the future with which they are linked, and speak evil of the things they understand not. They see the ancient land of Assyria desolate, the towns in ruins, and robbers wandering about; and when they are told that in that contemptible corner of the world, beyond the pale of civilization, is to be founded the city from which the earth will be regenerated and glorified, it says "How absurd." It only sees the powder; it does not see the great light. The world sees men and women, like ourselves, who, though citizens of so great a commonwealth to come, attend to their businesses like other people; it sees them behave themselves, let us hope, as well as other people do, though, to a certain extent, from different motives—for all depends upon a person's motives as to the nature of his acts; it sees a great many coming together Sunday after Sunday, but they laugh when we talk of the light that is to come of all this: that splendid glory we have been taught to look for—and the certainty of which is based upon an oath—laying hold of the very existence of the Almighty; for he says "As surely as I live, all the earth shall be filled with my glory." That is part of the powder, but the world has no faith. It sees the words, but it cannot understand the light to come from them. It doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we can see it although very faintly; we have a very feeble conception of what is coming. We do catch just a glimpse now and then. We can have some sort of a notion of what it must be to be incorruptible: free from every weakness and pain; possessed of great strength and great clearness of faculty, and great profundity of under-

standing. We can form some sort of idea what it must be to be in a community every man and woman of which is a source of wisdom, and a well-spring of blessing. We can have some sort of an idea what it must be to be moving among men and women, who are every one of them children of love, and every one of whom are free from frailty and blemish, or aught that would interfere with the free course of joy. We can have a faint idea of what it must be when the government of this world is in the hands of such a community, instead of the wretched fraternity of rulers who keep the kingdom of wickedness in order. We can imagine the joy that will fill our souls when the proprietor of all the earth will be He whom we commemorate this morning—our Lord and Master—and when there breathes not a soul upon earth, who will not bow the knee and move the tongue in his praise! We can have some idea of what it must be when the righteous are ruling—when righteousness is the order of the day—when mercy and truth and justice will cover the earth with glory. We can form some sort of idea what it must be to be planted down upon a basis of life, from which we can contemplate an unbroken futurity of perfect life—an azure prospect of unclouded and endless tranquillity and joy. But it is only a faint idea. "It doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is;" and as John adds, "Whosoever hath this hope in him, purifies himself even as he (Christ) himself is pure—for in him is no sin." This is the important consideration for us in the present time, viz., that if the hope we have has not the result of purifying us, even to the degree of zeal for God's law, it fails; and that although we may be the sons of God in a legal sense now, we may never become the sons of God in the perfected sense, by rising to spiritual existence at the resurrection. To earn a good degree at the appearing of Christ, we must be content, in the present state, to be considered fanatics; and to be considered weak-minded, for confessing to scrupulosity with respect to the divine law. We must, when it comes to this, be content to be held in derision, to be rejected, to be cast out, to be thrown in the mud and beaten. We can purchase the opposite by faithlessness; we can hide our light, and be considered respectable; we can wink at dishonour, and be counted good fellows. We can carefully conceal it

from knowledge that we expect Christ to come, and do a great work upon the earth, and thus preserve our characters; but we must remember the other side of the picture. "He that saveth his life shall lose it," and what applies to the life, applies to everything: he that saveth his reputation shall lose it; he that saveth his pocket shall lose it; he that saveth his business shall

lose it; he that saveth his comfort and respectability, by hiding the truth and by being ashamed of the cause of Christ, shall lose them, when the day comes that these things will be put upon a fresh and a right basis. But he that loses his reputation, and his business, and his respectability, and his life for Christ's sake, the same shall find them.

## THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD.

And Peter, James and John kept the saying of Jesus with themselves, questioning one with another, what the rising from the dead should mean.—(MARK 9, 10)

The above doctrine having recently been much agitated, it seems to be desirable that a clear and scriptural statement of the subject should be made out, and laid before those that are searching for the truth. Accordingly the following treatise is presented in hope of its being a solution: in order to which it is needful to distinctly comprehend the meaning of the terms made use of: so also, the words used must express the ideas intended, and figurative expressions should be carefully preserved in their immediate connections. If additional truth be revealed, it is of great importance that we understand accurately to what it has reference, *in particular*; and we may not apply it to another matter, even though there may apparently be a remote connection subsisting between the two. These remarks by the way; and now let us ascertain "what the rising from the dead should mean."

To rise is to get up, to appear at first:

To be risen is, to have come forth:

To be raised is, to have become perfect.

"Now that the dead are raised, even Moses shewed at the bush." How did Moses shew this? Answer: by stating that the Almighty was the God of the Patriarchs, who were dead at the time. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob died in the faith of receiving the promises made of God unto them; they had *not received* them, but seen them afar off in the future, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them; and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims in the land; looking for the country in a better, or heavenly condition; for their personal inheritance, and everlasting possession. Jesus did not

say that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were raised from the dead at the time he was speaking, neither did his opponents, the Sadducees, understand him to affirm such a doctrine, for they denied it altogether. Still, they did acknowledge the authority of Moses which Jesus quoted, in order to prove to them, that 'the dead are raised.' Inasmuch, therefore, as Moses says, God is not the God of the dead but of the living, and yet that he is the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, this implies their rising from the dead. So, even their own lawgiver shows this at the bush, for all live unto Him, who counts the things that be not (if promised) as though they were, and sees the end from the beginning. Paul in his Epistle to the Corinthians, informs us that there were some among them that denied the resurrection of the dead, this error arising out of ignorance of revealed truth, which was shameful. And Jesus informs the Sadducees of the same as being the cause of error to them, and ignoring the power of God; and we find that the sceptic at Corinth erred also just the same, or he would at least have made some allusion to the power of God in the questions he asks; but no: God is not in all his thoughts. He enquires, How are the dead raised up? Answer, by the power of God; and again, with what body do they come? Answer, one given by God as it hath pleased Him. Paul calls their attention to an agricultural and natural operation, and says the bare grain which he sows himself in the earth, is not quickened, except it die; appealing to common sense and observation; and to the fact that dead grain lives again, which is undeniable. And since he soweth *not the body that shall be*, this shews that a body is *reproduced* of the same kind, from the seed-body, sown. A "man casting

seed into the ground" and he himself sleeping and rising night and day; and the seed springing and growing, *he knoweth not how*, for the earth bringeth forth fruit of herself; first the blade, then the ear, after that, the full corn in the ear; but when the fruit is ripe, he putteth in the sickle, because the harvest is come, completely does away with both these foolish objections to the truth; for he must admit the reproduction of *grain*; or that the dead grain is 'raised' for his sickle, God then giveth it a body as it hath pleased Him in nature, God blesseth the springing thereof (i.e. the grain): God giveth the increase; God crowneth the year with His goodness; and God worketh all things after the counsel of His own will, and man shall find *nothing* after him. Neither in the regular and periodical productions of His wisdom and goodness from the earth—no—nor in that wonderful operation of the mighty power of God, through His son, by whom He will in due season bring to pass "the rising from the dead," of all that in previous ages have fallen asleep in Christ, and who lie buried in the earth. And why should it be thought a thing incredible with any one, that God should raise the dead? Echo answers, Why! seeing we know that as wonderful and incomprehensible things are accomplished in the natural world around us. The Corinthian sceptic shuts out God from our view: hence his folly is manifested unto all men: for the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things which are made, even His eternal power and Godhead. Such therefore are without excuse. *The process of sowing, commences with casting seed into the ground; it is inclusive of its death, and finishes in corruption: being thus, 'it is sown.'* Raising is a continuance from corruption in the earth; it includes quickening, springing forth, and standing up before the sun to receive perfecting influences from heaven, and is finished in incorruption: being thus, '*it is raised.*' And raised, or ripe grain fit for the sickle, will retain its kind and vitality for thousands of years. How then does a man raise a crop? Answer, by faith of the operation of God: otherwise, he would not throw away his seed into the ground to die, if he had not faith in God's operating upon his dead seed, when under the clods. And it is precisely so with regard to the resurrection of the dead in Christ. Paul says that if there be no such operation of

God upon them, then those that are fallen asleep in Christ, are perished, like as would be the man's seed, if it were rotten under the clods, and God did not operate upon it. The cases are parallel, and there is no hope for the dead, except by the man Christ Jesus effecting 'the rising again of the dead.' And as in the one case, so in the other: a crop is not raised at once, neither is the resurrection of the dead: but both are continuous; neither is done by one exercise of power, but each is accomplished in due order. Thus we gather 'what the rising from the dead should mean,' first, that a corn of seed is *sown*, when in corruption; and second, that it is *raised*, when in incorruption: and it is written, 'that the hour cometh in which all that are in the graves shall hear the voice of the Son of man and shall come forth.' Yes, and may I ask, unto what do all these come forth? Answer, unto him that calls them from death (i.e. unto Jesus) who himself is 'the resurrection and the life.' But do they after rising from death, proceed to meet him alone? or are any others from among those who are alive at that time, to be assembled in company with them, previous to all being conveyed away to where the Lord Jesus himself is? Answer: when caught away, those who have not tasted death are assembled together with the risen dead, and *all go away together*. How are these two classes of persons conveyed away to the place of meeting? Answer: most probably as Phillip was caught away to Azotus, or by angelic arranging, but clearly in a super-natural manner, which will admit of no escape. Thus will be simultaneously moved off, from all the earth, *all his people*, from Adam to that time, from among the living and from among the dead; for 'we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ,' that everyone may give account of himself unto God. Everything that transpires to this point would appear to be of a progressive kind; but at this crisis, when the trump of God sounds, Paul informs us of a secret operation, saying we shall not all (be dead); 'but we shall ALL BE CHANGED' in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised *incorruptible*, and we (living) shall be changed, for this corruptible (sinful flesh) must *put on* incorruption, and this mortal (blood life) must *put on* immortality.

The apostle informs us that there is a spiritual body, which succeeds that which

is natural; it is attained to by the change just spoken of. It is the heavenly body, like unto the Lord's glorious body. That highly-exalted nature, holy and spiritual, equal to the angels, will, when manifested, prove who are the sons of God, out of all the assembled myriads before "the Lord the righteous Judge." This *changing* of all the blessed and holy, will be done in a moment; and by this single and signal act of omnipotence, their vile bodies shall be fashioned like unto Christ's glorious body; and thus will such as have been dead, become incorruptible; and those who have *not tasted* death will become immortal. A great gulf is thus fixed between the righteous and the wicked, and in it death is swallowed up of victory, and mortality is swallowed up of life. It is the manifestation of the sons of God. It separates the sheep from the goats, and the wheat from the tares. It qualifies the righteous to inherit the kingdom. All will experience *this change* at the same moment, and all will be perfected together. "They, without us, shall not be made perfect." No, but says the same apostle "not to me *only*, but unto all them who love his appearing, will the Lord, the righteous Judge, give a crown of righteousness at that day." And the coronation is undoubtedly the changing of an heir into a *perfected king*, and commences his "reign on the earth." Jesus, who is the author, on the aforesaid day, becomes the finisher of the faith of all who believe God, like Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; and they enter into the possession of the land for ever; "they enter the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world." Thus will he bring many sons unto glory. They will become resplendent as the celestial luminaries; and Paul points up to the glory of the sun, moon, and stars, in order to illustrate the future body. This grand fact will become such in a similar way to putting on a crown or robe. It will soon be done; and in no way resembles the raising of produce from the ground. Indeed it is another matter that is set thus before us, and *not* rising from the dead: its meaning is *heavenly*, for ever, and it is done, and *at once*. But it may be asked here, how about those who have to be punished? Are they in any way affected personally? Yes, they are ashamed before the Judge of all the earth, and He will do right to them. These receive the due reward of their deeds; and "into smoke do they (after punishment) consume away"—they perish. But have

they no experience of "*the change*?" No, certainly not, and being not redeemed in person, they are "hurt of the second death." But were not many of them risen from the dead? Yes, certainly they were; they came forth unto Jesus when called by him. But he did not make them perfect. Is there a difference, then, between having risen "from the dead" and being raised to glory? Answer: Yes, verily, there is; and this is a point deserving of being more fully explained. For instance: Martha and Mary's brother was raised from the dead; he came forth, and was restored to them again, but he was no more equal to the angels than before his death; he was not exalted to the divine nature, but remained still flesh and blood; and such will actually be the case "in the resurrection;" they will arise and come forth the same kind of individual characters that each was when 'sown.' That which each was at the close of his career, he will come forth. But do you not perceive that this holds good in nature also? Does not the same kind sown invariably reproduce itself? Yes, of course, you must admit this much. Well, then, let me ask you, is not the risen grain standing up in the field? and has *it* not come forth out of the ground? Yes, certainly it has. Is it then *raised*? Can you secure it in that condition? Answer, No, because it is not ripe. Exactly so; and this is the case with the dead. They will arise *before* the living are moved away to judgment, but they are not, and cannot fairly be said to be perfected, which is undoubtedly the meaning of the word 'raised' as used by Paul in his argument concerning the grain illustrative of the resurrection of dead persons. Something further is requisite and necessary, as well for the grain as for the man. And that something is a *change from heaven*, from God, in order to its, or to his, becoming perfected, or 'raised.' For be it observed, that man cannot ripen his standing fields of corn, with all his inventions that he has found out. Neither can he change human to divine; both these are the work of God. And unless the Divine Being condescends to complete the *risenmen*, they must perish, none being imperishable until this quality is imparted to them, which when done, is as aforesaid. The changing will crown all the hopes of the righteous with abundant success; 'a crown of life that fadeth not away.' It is indispensable to be made perfect in order to the confessing of individuals before

the Father and the holy angels at the presentation, with exceeding joy, in glory; for man as constituted at present, cannot look steadily on the sun at noon day; how can he then endure the sight of him who dwelleth in the light which is unapproachable? Before this, this mortal must put on immortality, and this corruptible must put on incorruption, and we *must* be changed. And, on the authority of Paul, we know we shall *all be changed*. Albeit, "it doth not yet appear what we *shall be*, but we know that when he (Jesus) shall appear, we shall be like him, for we shall see

him as he is; and everyone that hath this hope in him, purifieth himself even as he is pure. Be patient, therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord. Behold the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the earlier and the latter rain. Be ye also patient, for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh, who will change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto the body of his glory, according to the mighty working whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself."

CHARLES WALKER.

Scarborough.

---

### CHRIST THE FIRST FRUITS OF THEM THAT SLEPT.

---

Jesus said that the law and the prophets witnessed till John; and after his resurrection, to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus, he said "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things—the events which they had been relating—and to *enter into his glory*? and, beginning at MOSES, and all the prophets, he expounded unto them, in all the scriptures, the things concerning himself."

Paul, in his address to king Agrippa, says "Having, therefore, obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and *Moses* did say should come, that Christ should suffer, and that he should *be the first that should rise from the dead*; and should shew light unto the people and to the Gentiles. These statements are sufficient to show that the writings of Moses contain witness or instruction concerning not only the sufferings, but also the glory of the Christ. But is the witnessing of Moses to be found in clear statements? or is it the wisdom of God, hidden in types and figures? From the teaching of the spirit, through the apostle, it is evident that the wisdom of God was hidden, or laid up, in the Mosaic law:—"The wisdom of God in a mystery;" "kept secret since the world began"—kept so until "the fulness of the time was come, when God sent forth His son made of a woman, made under the law;" and by Him revealed, or manifested, that hidden wisdom. And since Jesus, *beginning at Moses*, expounded unto them in all the scriptures, the things concerning himself, opening their understandings that they might understand the scriptures. Since then, they have declared that wisdom; and Paul, who was as one born out of due time, adds, "But is now made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the

commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith." But some one might say, if the hidden wisdom of God contained in the types of the Mosaic law, has been revealed by Jesus and his apostles, shall we not get an understanding of it in the teachings and the letters of his apostles, without a study of the dry details of the Mosaic law? An illustration may here serve better as an answer than perhaps anything else. Suppose that one is looking at a picture, containing in it many very striking figures, but that he is altogether ignorant of what they represent—their meaning, which may be very comprehensive, is to him all a mystery. But another person standing by, gives to him a book, a key, explanatory of the figures, telling him what they represent. By a study of both the book, and the picture, his understanding is opened. But he cannot dispense with the picture, for without it, the book would be of little use. Now, Jesus supplied to his disciples the key to the Mosaic picture, but did he dispense with the picture itself? Certainly not, else he could not have explained it to them; therefore he began at MOSES, and proceeded to all the prophets, teaching them the things concerning himself. Their understandings being thus opened, and being empowered by the spirit, they were fitted for the proclamation of the good news of the glory of the Christ; and when engaged with this proclamation, to what did they refer to illustrate and prove the things concerning the kingdom, and the things which concern the Lord Jesus? To the writings of Moses and all the prophets. Paul, who played a highly prominent part in this proclamation, has stated that the Jew had the "*form of the knowledge and the truth in the law*." Having made the matter thus far clear, it is our object now to confine



our study of that most comprehensive picture, (the law of Moses) to the offering of first fruits, and see if there be not in them, clear teaching regarding the acceptance of Jesus by his Father as the first fruits of the creation of God—the first new creature.

The offerings of first fruits were connected with the feasts of Israel, (of which there were three) at which all the males of the nation were commanded to appear before the Lord, and none were to appear there empty. But it was only at the first two feasts that the first fruits were offered. These feasts occurred in the following order, and all of them lasted seven days—the passover first; the Pentecost next; and the feast of Tabernacles last. The passover was also termed the feast of unleavened bread, beginning on the evening of the fourteenth, and ending on the evening of the twenty-first, (Ex. xii, 18, 19.) The fifteenth being the first entire day of the seven, was always to be kept as a sabbath; and the morrow after it, that is the sixteenth, was the day for the offering of the first of the first fruits, (Exod. xxxiv, 26, and Lev. xxiii, 10, 11.) From this day they were commanded to count fifty days; the fiftieth was the first day of the feast of Pentecost, or feast of weeks. On this day, they were to offer the second offering of first fruits, termed a new meat offering, to be brought out of their habitations, consisting of two wave loaves baked with leaven, (Lev. xxiii, 16, 17.) What then is to be understood by these figures, seen in the Mosaic picture of the knowledge and the truth? But before turning to examine the key, it may be well to look a little more closely at the picture. Looking therefore again at the passover season, and the *first* of the first fruits offered at that time, the question naturally arises, was this not a very early period even in that genial climate, to depend upon getting a sheaf of ripe grain to be offered before the Lord? Some writers upon this subject have supposed that it would be brought to Jerusalem from the plains of Jordan, as being the earliest part of the land. But in looking at the law, it will be seen that ripe grain was not required, for it is stated in Lev. ii, 14, "If thou offer a meat-offering of thy first fruits unto the Lord, thou shalt offer for the meat-offering of thy first fruits, *green ears* of corn dried by the fire, corn beaten out of full ears." "And thou shalt put OIL upon it, and lay frankincense thereon; it is a meat-offering" (v. 15.) "And the priest shall *burn* the memorial of it, part of the beaten corn thereof, and part of the oil thereof, with ALL the frankincense thereof; it is an offering *made by fire* unto the Lord."—(v. 16.) It may not be un-instructive to make here a short extract from Josephus, bearing on the point. "On the second day of unleavened bread, which is the sixteenth day of the month, they first partake of the fruits of the earth, for before

that day, they do not touch them; and while they suppose it proper to honour God, from whom they obtain this plentiful provision, in the first place they offer the first fruits of their barley, and that in the manner following—they take a handful of the ears and dry them, then beat them small, and purge the barley from the bran; they then bring one tenth deal to the altar to God, and casting one handful of it upon the fire, they leave the rest for the use of the priest; and after this it is that they may publicly or privately reap their harvest. They also at this participation of the first fruits of the earth, sacrifice a lamb as a burnt-offering to God." These remarks of Josephus, are also corroborated by Lev. xxiii, 14. "And ye shall eat neither bread, nor parched corn, nor green ears, until the self same day that ye have brought an offering unto your God." This is further illustrated in the account given of the tribes entering the land under Joshua. They crossed the Jordan on the tenth day of the first month, and were in possession of part of the land for four days, but touched none of the fruits of the land, not even the old corn, until the fruits of the earth had been consecrated to the Lord. But after the passover, the manna ceased, and they ate of the fruits of the land. It has still to be noticed that the time of the offering of the *first* of the first fruits, was the days of unleavened bread, and also that part of them were *burnt* upon the altar. Let us now examine the record given of the second offering of first fruits, at the Pentecostal feast or feast of weeks, it is stated Lev. xxiii, 16, 17. "And ye shall offer a *new* meat-offering unto the Lord, ye shall bring out of your habitations *two* wave loaves of *two-tenth deals*; they shall be of fine flour; they shall be baked *with leaven*; they are the first fruits unto the Lord." But let the reader carefully keep in mind the *difference* between these offerings of first fruits. The first was single, and *unleavened*, the second was double, and *leavened*. The first was the putting in of the sickle at barley harvest—in fact the first that was cut by it, and offered with *oil* and frankincense, to be accepted for the people. The other was the produce of wheat harvest in its last stage of manufacture—bread, and offered with *leaven*. The first had a memorial of it burned upon the altar. The second was only waved before the Lord, it not being *possible* that any memorial of it could be burned on the altar, as *no leaven* could come upon the altar, upon which point the following testimony from Lev. ii, 11, 12, is conclusive. "No meat-offering which ye shall bring unto the Lord, shall be made with *leaven*; for ye shall burn *no leaven*, nor any honey, in any offering of the Lord *made by fire*. As for the oblation of the first fruits, ye shall offer them unto the Lord; but they *shall not* be burnt on the

altar for a sweet savour." Having now surveyed these two figures in the picture, let us try, (by turning to the key) to ascertain their meaning. Paul speaking of meats, drinks, holy days, new moons, and the sabbaths, says "Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body (or substance) is of Christ." Jesus in his interpretation of the parable of the sower, says—"The field is the world. He has first shown the seed to be the "word of the kingdom." Further he says "the good seed are the children of the kingdom." And "He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man." In this we have a parable, or illustration of Christ and his brethren, having its shadow in the natural sowing and reaping of the fruits of the earth, in the land of Israel. [But as Jesus had been labouring towards the gathering of them (his disciples) as the first fruits of wheat harvest; he also sent them to labour in the same field. And speaking to them, he says John iv, 35, "Say not ye, there are yet four months, and then cometh harvest; behold I say unto you, lift up your eyes, and look on the fields; for they are white already to harvest. And he that reapeth receiveth wages and gathereth fruit unto life eternal, that both he that soweth, and he that reapeth may rejoice together." The fruit of that harvest, we see, was unto eternal life. Jesus, shortly before he was taken by wicked hands to be crucified, said (John xii, 23, 24.) "The hour is come that the Son of man should be glorified. Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." If Jesus was the corn of wheat, was he not also in his resurrection to life eternal the first fruits of the harvest? But of which of the two offerings of first fruits in the picture, can he be the antitype? Paul in his first letter to the Corinthians xv, 20, says "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept." He continues, "Every man in his own order; Christ the first fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming." Now the testimony of the spirit through John (Rev. 14.) regarding his coming, shows that the second first fruits to be "those they are redeemed from among men, being the first fruits unto God and to the Lamb." Now, unless the key be carefully examined, and the picture also, there is here great danger of making a mistake, and supposing that as Christ is the antitype of the passover first fruits in his resurrection and exaltation, so are his brethren at his coming the antitype of the Pentecostal first fruits. But a careful examination will show that this cannot be the case, for the Pentecostal offering of first fruits were two wave loaves baked with leaven. Now the saints who sing the new song before the throne, were an unleavened lump for "in their mouth was found no

guile; for they are without fault before the throne of God." This is one of those cases, and they are not few, where the type has a double fulfilment. And there is not much difficulty in accounting for this—for as the FIRST of the first fruits, was *one* sheaf; so is the body of the Christ *one*, although composed of many members. Each member is a first born; but unitedly, they are the *one* seed (in the singular) by whom all the nations of the earth shall be blessed.

In the examination of the events connected with the resurrection of the Christ, it will be seen that the day upon which he came out of the tomb was the exact day of the offering of the passover first fruits. Could that then be a fulfilment of the type? It is evident that his mere emergence from the tomb, could not; for, before he could fulfil the type, there must be a *burning upon the altar*. According to another figure in the picture, *he was the altar*, sprinkled by the blood, or life of the victim. Being in himself, then the first fruits and the altar, there must be a burning of these. But it might be well to pause and consider how that could be. Looking back again on that wonderful picture, to the confirmation of the covenant in Christ, 430 years before the giving of the law, it will be seen that Abraham fell into a deep sleep (the figure of death). He, after falling into the state of typical death, saw a lamp of fire—the spirit's fire,—passing between the flesh. This was the acceptance by God of the sacrifice. When the antitypical confirmation of the new, or Abrahamic covenant was effected, the spirit's fire must have passed between and consumed the flesh, thereby accepting the sacrifice. Now a memorial of these first fruits *unleavened*, and in the days of unleavened bread, were burned upon the altar. How beautifully the key here answers to the picture—Jesus himself the first of the first fruits, and himself the altar, himself the temple of the Deity, the Father's house, which he had raised up in three days. But where was the locality, it may be asked, of the antitypical offering and acceptance? In his own person, most certainly, and nowhere else: for he was the *true* tabernacle of the Deity raised up without hands—the *true* heavenly. He was the holy while in the flesh of sin; he put away sin, when he put away the life God's law demanded; and therefore he stood on that sixteenth day of the first month, pure as Adam when he came from the hands of his Maker; but more than this can be affirmed of him, for he had developed a character under trial which, like frankincense, ascended as a sweet-smelling savour to his Father. In past times, his custom was to depart to a solitary place alone, there to commune with his Father in prayer, and just before drinking the bitter cup of his humiliation, "he withdrew from them about a stone's cast, and knelt down and prayed." Reasoning from

his manner of meeting with his Father before he died, it may be expected that he would meet with him again, by himself, ALONE; and that in such circumstances, the Father would accept of him by the transforming power of the divine power, or Holy Spirit, passing him from the holy into the most holy—from thenceforth to be the Lord, the Spirit. It will be apparent that as the natural first first-fruits were offered and accepted on the third day, the spiritual, which is in perfect harmony with the natural, must have been the same.

Turning now to the second offering of first-fruits, let us apply the key to them, and see if it be possible to ascertain their meaning; and notice first, that the time of their offering was exactly on the fiftieth day, from the offering of the first of the first-fruits. Now proceeding forward, from the third day on which Jesus arose and was accepted, to the fiftieth day, there ought to be in harmony with the picture, an antitypical offering of first-fruits *with* leaven. Before proceeding further, it may be better to see in what sense leaven is used in the key. Paul, in his first letter to the Corinthians (v, 6), says "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 (that is, in Christ), for even Christ our passover, is slain for us. Therefore, let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the *leaven of malice and wickedness*, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth." From this it is clear that leaven represents an evil thing, which spreads and corrupts all it comes in connection with. This is sin, or in other words, the transgression (or the manifestation of the results of that transgression by constitutional inheritance) of God's law. Now what took place on that fiftieth day? What was offered to the Lord as a wave offering, and yet not free from leaven, or sin? The answer is found in Acts ii. *They* were all with one accord, in one place, when a mighty rushing of the Spirit filled the house where they were sitting; they were all in flesh of sin, and had all at one time been sin's servants; but had yielded themselves servants to the Righteous One. They were representative men, for the two houses of Israel; and therefore the two wave loaves. It may not be out of place here to state that the whole tribe of Levites were offered before the Lord as a wave offering by Aaron.—(Numb. ix, 11; margin.) James in his epistle states "Of His own will begat He us with the word of His truth, that we should be a *kind of first-fruits* of His creatures;" and Paul said that they had the first-fruits of the spirit. Can there be any doubt, then, that the antitype of the two wave loaves, baked with leaven, and offered on the fiftieth day, was the waving of the disciples, by the spirit as a wave offering before the Lord, and thus consecrated like the tribe of Levi, to serve the tabernacle—the antitypical or *true* tabernacle

which the Lord pitched, and not man. That tabernacle, when fully reared up, is composed of the general assembly of the church of the first-born—the heavenly Jerusalem. But in the First-born it has already been pitched afar off without the camp, and after the manner of Israel (Exodus xxxiii, 7), all who seek the Lord must go out unto the tabernacle which is without the camp. In the words of Paul, "Let us go forth, therefore, unto Him without the camp, bearing His reproach." And "by Him let us offer the sacrifice of praise continually, the fruit of our lips confessing to His name." In reference to the oft-pressed objection to the offering and acceptance of Jesus in his Father's presence, a little while after his rising from the grave, on the morrow of that sixteenth day, that there is no proof when and how such an event took place: in addition to what has already been remarked, it may be further observed that the locality of the manifestation of the Father's presence in recognising the antitypical wave-loaf offering, with leaven, of these disciples, was an ordinary house. They had been in the attitude of prayer. When the spirit was poured out upon them, the presence of the Father became manifest in that locality. Can there be any great difficulty in understanding how Jesus, loosing himself from Mary's hold, saying "Touch (or hinder) me not," passed to a quiet spot alone, and there, in the attitude of prayer, presented himself before his Father, whose presence was manifested by His changing him in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, and thus becoming the *accepted* first-fruits, burned with the fire of holy spirit on the altar—even himself. As to the locality—are not Jesus' words to the woman of Samaria to the point here? "The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth?"

In conclusion, the teaching of the type makes it clear that Jesus arose from the tomb in the same nature and flesh as he had before (but without sin); and that he was in this flesh condition until his acceptance, some time in the course of that day. Now this is sufficient to show that his brethren shall be raised out of their graves in the same flesh as that in which they lay down; in other words, in a state capable of *acceptance*—not in the actual accepted state. But it would be unreasonable to suppose that because Christ was accepted in such a very short time after his resurrection, that it must necessarily be the same with his brethren; and that therefore there should be no time for their appearing at the judgment-seat. Without doubt, he is their great exemplar; but very many things which happened to him cannot take place with any of his household; and it is safe to say *vice versa*. But the *principles* which operated in his case will also operate in theirs. And the *principles*, although not the exact *detail*, of his and their resurrection, will

assuredly prove the same. Now the appearing at the judgment-seat of Christ, and the time and place of reward, are so plainly revealed in the scriptures, that no one honestly seeking the truth, need make any mistake. For example: "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.) "Who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom."—(2 Tim. iv, 1.) "And behold, I come quickly, and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be."—(Rev. xxii, 12.) And again, "Thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just."—(Luke xiv, 14.) And "Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth."—(Proverbs xi.)

Passages might be multiplied, but the above are sufficient to show that the brethren of the Christ, who, although cleansed, or put into a legal state, by the shedding of the blood or life of Jesus, have to work out their own salvation through him, and are therefore under law to him. So that when he comes to administer the law, they must be brought before him, to render an account of their deeds, as faith alone will save no one; for "he will render to every man according to his deeds." Let all then, having the faith, "by a patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory, honor and incorruptibility, that they may receive the reward of Eternal Life."

C. F. SMITH.

Edinburgh.

## ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

### THE PREACHING OF THE CROSS.

W.O.—The "cross," as a subject of preaching, can only be understood in a symbolical sense. It occurs in Paul's letters, as the representative of the system of doctrine which had its centre and culmination in the death of Christ, and not as a literal expression—though having its origin in a literal occurrence. It cannot be that the cross itself—the actual framework upon which Christ was cruelly impaled by the Jews and Romans—had any vitality or place in the preaching of the apostles. Otherwise, the Roman Catholics are right in their superstitious deference to the structural form, and in their devout appreciation of "the wood of the true cross," which has been distributed in ship loads among the million worshippers of this mark of the beast. Unless we put the cross in its proper place, as the symbolical expression of the great doctrine of Christ's sacrifice, in its absolute truth, it becomes an idol, whether clasped in material form with the devotions of the benighted Catholic, or cherished as a spiritual ideal with the undiscerning enthusiasm of "evangelical religion." The brazen serpent, elevated in the wilderness for the cure of believing, serpent-bitten Israelites, was a legitimate object of regard, when accepted as a divine appointment for good; but when, afterwards, the children of Israel degenerated to the idolatrous worship of it, Heczekiah, with divine approbation, "broke it in pieces," calling it contemptibly "a piece of brass."—(2 Kings xviii, 4.) Weeping, as the expression of an intelligently broken and contrite heart, is an acceptable sacrifice to God; but when put in the place of truth and righteousness, it became a cause of offence in Israel, and is certainly not less so now. "And

this have ye done again, covering the altar of the Lord with tears, with weeping, and with crying out, *inasmuch that he regardeth not the offering any more, or receiveth it with goodwill at your hands.*"—(Malachi ii, 13.)

The religious outcry about "the cross" of the present day, is in the same category of perverted truth, and is doubtless as displeasing to the Almighty, as the excessive and irrational zeal of the Jews for the sacrifices and feasts of the law, while neglecting the "weightier matters" with which they were associated. There is a true doctrine of the cross, but the moderns, with all their outcry about the cross, deny it. That true doctrine is that death—the resolution to original dust of the creature formed from the dust.—(Rom. v, 12; Gen. iii, 19.)—is the consequence of sin; that death reigns on account of sin; that Christ came to suffer the death due to sin in the nature that was in sin, and to rise to the possession of life eternal for bestowal upon all who believe in him. The moderns deny the first proposition, and by consequence, all the rest. They say there is no death; that all men are immortal; that eternal torture in hell is the wages of sin; that all men by nature go to hell to be tormented of the devil, and that Christ came to endure the suffering due to these hell-doomed immortal creatures. What is their preaching of the cross, under these circumstances, but a denial of the truth, and a trumpeting of pagan doctrines under a false name?

To preach the cross truly, is to preach immortality through a crucified and risen Christ. No man can preach the truth without preaching this: but the precise terms in which he may do so, is a question of circumstances. In a day when "the cross" is universally current in a perverted sense, the use of the phrase is not a likely way of

making the truth understood. We must adopt *whatever language is necessary to convey the truth*. The truth is the main thing; words are merely secondary, and must be subordinated to ideas. In the days of Paul, there was no false tradition of great antiquity hanging around, and almost depending upon the phrase he used to express the doctrine of Christ's sacrifice. It was a new and fresh and ignominious motto, and exactly equivalent to what "the gallows" would be in our day. He could use it with great advantage. It was a neat, curt, intelligible and telling expression of the great doctrine of Christ as the end of the law for righteousness. Its use was convenient and effectual as against Jews and Greeks. To the former, it asserted the supremacy of Christ's sacrifice over those of the law, and in a word, placed it in the forefront of the gospel. In relation to the latter, it was a challenge of the "philosophy and vain deceit" which taught human immortality from human nature, and human deification from human virtue. But the situation is wholly changed now, except as regards the Jews, who seem now wholly beyond the influence of gospel operations. The Gentiles have accepted Paul's phrase without accepting Paul's doctrine; and hence in attempting to force the doctrine upon their attention, it is useless using the phrase, without new forms of phraseology, which will make the phrase scripturally intelligible.

You must remember that Paul's language was affected by the circumstances of his own time, and that therefore, to some extent, with an alteration of these circumstances, there is forced upon us, if we would succeed in making Paul's IDEAS understood, the necessity of an alteration of phrase. The moderns deny the kingdom that Paul preached, and therefore, in modern teaching of the truth, there must, of necessity, be given great prominence to the doctrine of the kingdom. They do not deny the cross in the historical sense; they misunderstand it, so that the doctrine of the cross naturally becomes more a matter of explanation than proclamation. The kingdom is entirely unknown. The dead weight of modern opposition falls upon this branch of the truth; and therefore through the sheer force of necessity, this takes the front in the battle. But do not suppose because Christadelphians speak much about the kingdom, they think little of the cross scripturally understood. You will find that both occupy, in the system of truth to which they are related, that position of supreme importance which they possess in fact—the one as much as the other; but in the public presentation of the truth, the form or manner of it is determined by the public necessity which, as already said, calls for a prominence of ideas over phrases misunderstood, and a prominence of the kingdom (apparently) over the cross.

#### WHAT IS TO BECOME OF THE GOOD AND "PIOUS" PEOPLE OF ORTHODOXY?

"I see one other very powerful objection to your theory; the exclusion from participation in the gospel salvation of the—what I cannot but call—good and holy men of many ages past, who have not accepted the 'kingdom;' men who have, according to their understanding of the gospel, lived and walked close to God; and who, at the coming of the Lord, may claim 'the inheritance among those who are sanctified,' having 'forsaken all and followed Jesus.'"—W.O.

This is a common and not very unnatural objection to the truth, on the part of those who, after a long training in orthodoxy, are introduced to it for the first time; but it is one that will not stand the slightest examination. It is either true or not true, that the gospel preached by the apostles—consisting of the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, (Acts viii, 12; Acts xxviii, 31.)—is the power of God unto salvation.—(Rom. i, 16; Gal. i, 8.) If it is not true, then it does not matter what a man believes; salvation is a matter of sincerity and good conduct all the world over, and has nothing to do with the gospel of Christ at all; in which case, of course, our correspondent's difficulty would be settled in favour of his preconceptions. But if it be true (that no man can establish for himself a title to immortality and the kingdom of God, except by submission to the arrangement God has placed among men, by Christ and his apostles) then we can only in humility accept the fact, whatever conclusions it may bring with it as regards others. If it be true of us, it is true of our neighbours, and true of our ancestors. There is no respect of persons with God. No man can hold that the gospel is necessary in his case, and unnecessary in the case of others. A man's estimate of his own position is virtually a decision bearing upon others. If he comes to the conclusion that he is mortal, and alien from the promises and good purposes of God, and can only come within the scope of them by believing the gospel preached by Jesus and the apostles, and being baptised, and continuing in the steadfast obedience of what they have commanded, he is inconsistent in denying that all men are in the same position; and that therefore sincerity, even to the point of martyrdom, will not impart a title, which, outside of the gospel, men cannot acquire. It is a painful conclusion doubtless, for those who have cherished the memory of departed men of godly repute in history, especially the memory of deceased relatives who may have been sincere and consistent in error: but it is inevitable, and when it comes, it is a triumph of the spirit over the flesh. It is akin to the perfect submission of Abraham, who was ready to

offer up his only son at the divine behest. The divine law is everything. We have to learn obedience to it: this obedience requires a perfect recognition of our helplessness in relation to a future life, apart from what God has arranged, through Christ. And of course, a recognition for ourselves in this matter is a recognition for all; for there is no respect of persons.

But there is no necessity for thinking of those who are gone: it is our own position that should be the subject of concern. As Jesus said to the women of Galilee, "Weep not for me; weep for yourselves." Is it true that there is "a way of salvation," apart from which we cannot be saved? If so, we must bow in the presence of divine law, and act with perfect reverence and submission, and enter that way. We are nothing in ourselves—we are as clay in the hands of the potter. We can command no destiny—we can control no power—we are in the death-grip of a law that is sending us all to corruption. We may well, then, bow in the presence of Creative Power, and say "Thy will be done." We may well accept with gratitude the offered favour in Christ, and joy for evermore, saddled howsoever it may be by conditions; and let us not be scared from our purpose by difficulties with regard to the fate of others, which at the best, are mere presumptions, sanctioned it is true by general belief; but not founded upon divine assurance, and opposed to the teaching of what God has, without doubt, made known for our guidance.

"But it is very hard to think that all these good men will be lost." If "lost" meant being consigned to a place of endless misery, such as the hell of popular preaching, the idea would certainly be appalling; but when we realize that "lost" is but the state expressed by the word non-existent, the matter stands in a different light. There is no calamity in annihilation, except such as is felt by those who are alive to think about it. When a man ceases to be, his consciousness of deprivation is at an end. It is only while he is alive that death seems a terror. In death, all is as blank as if a man had never been born. Therefore, those who fail to enter into life are sufferers only in the sympathies of those who are alive. But, our correspondent may say "it is dreadful to think of annihilation." We have even heard men go so far as to say that they would rather endure the endless miseries of hell than be put out of existence. No doubt, to a living being, who has tasted the sweets of existence, there is something awful in the idea of death, but then it is a mistake to discuss the matter from the aspect of human feelings. The whole question is one of God's will. Our conceptions of the subject are sure to be fallacious, if formed in the light of our own desires and narrow views. The mission of the truth is to "*cast down* IMAGINATIONS,

*and every high thing that exalteth itself against THE KNOWLEDGE of GOD, and bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ.*"—(2 Cor. x, 5.) It is the exclusive province of God to say upon what conditions the condemned children of the dust shall be admitted to the glorious liberty of incorruptible existence; and our only safety in judging of the question, although with reference to ourselves, is to abide reverentially by the teaching of the word, even if it guide us to conclusions in opposition to our feelings and long-established sentiments.

"Men of upright and holy lives, such as Baxter, Romaine, Bunyan, Whitfield, and others, present to me a stumbling-block," says our correspondent, "I cannot think they will meet with condemnation at the righteous judgment." Our correspondent need not stumble. The simple question for him to consider is "What is the truth?" Let the answer to this, rule minor questions. It is going the wrong way to work, to set a conclusion in array against the premises. It is like seeking to extinguish the sun by putting up your shutters. Attack and destroy the premises if you can, and the conclusions will vanish into air, but so long as they remain, all attempts to get away from results must be futile.

But does it stand to reason that these "men of upright and holy lives" should come short of Christ's salvation, though ignorant of the gospel? It all depends upon the relation of the one to the other. If an "upright and holy life" gives a man a right to eternal life, then it would be very hard that their ignorance of the gospel should exclude them. But is it so? If we are to be guided by the scriptures (and what other light is there in these dark times for our benighted steps?) we must record a decided negative to this question. There is nothing more emphatically taught than that it is impossible for man to justify himself before God; that the best of our lives, with respect to righteousness, is as filthy rags; that it is utterly beyond our power to remove the sentence of death that works in our members; that there is only one way of salvation; that that is the way opened in Jesus Christ, and that there is only one method of entering that way, and that is by believing the gospel and being baptized. Hence the "upright and holy life" of an unjustified sinner will avail him nothing, in ignorance of the gospel. If it were otherwise, the advent of Christ and the mission of the apostles were unnecessary. Such a life may engage sympathy and excite admiration, but it does nothing to alter the individual's position in the sight of God. He is still an unmentioned descendant of Adam, uncovered with God's righteousness provided in Christ; unredeemed from the sentence of death that has passed upon all men. When a man becomes fully

enlightened in divine principles, he sees this as a matter of course. It is difficult, we admit, after a lifetime of training in the orthodox school—a school whose lessons ramify into every part of the social structure: literature, art, politics, as well as religion—to accept an issue so direct, with all the prejudices and opinions of early life, but it is what every man will come to, who consistently follows out his professed belief in the word of God. The mere sentimentalist, who admires, but does not study the Bible—who lives in a moral atmosphere of his own or somebody else's creation—who measures the relations of men in the mere light of sympathy—who looks at things in the light of conventional views and feelings, and is carried away by the mere magnitude and external beauty of the orthodox religious system—this type of man will, of course, remain stock-still; but the man who has a mind to understand, and a heart to desire to know the *mind of the Almighty*, will, by diligent application to His word, arrive at a clear and certain conclusion. He will, in time, acquire the ability to exalt the word of God, as the imperative and universal standard; and subordinate himself and all mankind to the revealed ways and counsels of that mighty Being, in whom all things exist; who, in His own wise way, is slowly working out the redemption of this fair planet from sin and death, and the million other evils that curse the family of man.

“But will these ‘upright and holy men’ be condemned at the righteous judgment?” The answer to this is, that if they were ignorant of the gospel, it is doubtful if they will be brought to judgment at all. “Where there is no law, there is no transgression.—(Rom. v, 13.) “If ye were blind, said Jesus to the leaders of the Jews, ‘ye should have no sin.’—(John ix, 41.) “Times of ignorance” God winks at.—(Acts xvii, 30.) Those who are in ignorance will not rise from the dead. “Man that is in honour and understandeth not, is like the beasts that perish; he shall go to the generation of his fathers; they shall never see light.”—(Psalm xlix, 19, 20.)

One word more, before leaving the subject. Biography has transmitted exaggerated views of the characters of the men in question—not in the shape of intentional misrepresentation, but as the sheer effect of a partial picture. Only the broad outline—only the external acts of a man's life, can be known to those who are not domesticated with a man. Hence biographers are incapable of giving an exact picture. Most commonly, they speak from report; and we know how much a matter suffers, either upwards or downwards, in the process of transmission. Experience compels us to recognise in these men, the weakness and imperfection of mortality. The biographers show the lights without the shadows,

and even the lights are contemplated through a magnifying medium. They were doubtless men of great intellectual and moral energy; but that they were the perfect angels of light depicted in common tradition or in authorised narrative, it is impossible to believe. It is important to recognise this, for the sake of seeing that their future destiny is determined by precisely the same rules that govern us; and that they stood as much in need of the gospel as do we poor creatures. But the best way is to leave all such questions out of sight in pursuing the enquiry “What must I do to be saved?”

#### AN INSIGNIFICANT PERIOD OF ENJOYMENT.

“If the kingdom to which men are called, is only to extend over a period of a thousand years, what an insignificant period of enjoyment and bliss it is, compared with the *everlasting* felicity offered in the orthodox view—a mere drop in the bucket to the ocean illimitable!”—W.O.

If the kingdom were to last only a thousand years, the remark of our correspondent would be deserved; but it will last *for ever* in the absolute sense. “Of his kingdom, there shall be no end.”—(Luke i, 33.) The “thousand years” only measures the process or period by which the world will be raised from its present state of evil to a state in which there will be no death. This transition requires and is effected by the machinery of the thousand years. Jesus as the supreme pontiff, reigning in the joint capacity of king and priest on the throne of David, assisted by the hierarchy of his glorified people, who shall be his representatives and the channels of his power in all the earth, will effectually develop for universal man, those conditions of temporal well-being and social harmony, that will admit the full play of the spiritual forces that will then be set in motion. Enlightenment and obedience will quickly become the order of the day, and by the close of the thousand years, millions will have become the prepared and accepted candidates for eternal life. This is the great work of the kingdom of the thousand years; and it is to this that men and women are now invited by the gospel—to become the reformers of the world, under Christ, in the age to come. Fitness for this work has now to be developed by obedience and trial. When the work is finished, and the earth populated with a glorified race, the kingdom will enter upon a higher and eternal phase. “Then shall the Son also himself be subject, unto Him that put all under him, that God may be all in all.”—(1 Cor. xv, 16.) There then lies before the blessed of the Lord an “*everlasting felicity*,” quite equal to anything that was ever imagined by the most fervid orthodox heaven-painter, even an “ocean illimitable” of life, love, power, faculty,

knowledge, peace and joy; but subject to law and organisation, doubtless, for God is a God of order in all He does. The first-fruits of the human race, who reign with Christ during the thousand years, will probably have a rank and a function above the millions that will be gathered in at the great harvest, at the close of the thousand years. It is not given to us to know the details beyond the first stage of the kingdom. All we know is—and it is sufficient for all purposes in this dispensation to know this much—that beyond that, there is endless life and perfection. God does all things well, and we may depend upon it that the state of things after the labour of the thousand years, will be the very best that can be.

#### INHERITING THE PROMISES.

“Followers of them, who through faith and patience *inherit* the promises.”—If they are inheriting the promises, the thing must be settled.”—W.O.

The verb “inherit” is here used indefinitely, and may be past, present, or future, or all together at the same time, according to the nature of the subject. Supposing, therefore, the allusion is to the promise of eternal life and the kingdom of God, it settles nothing as to the question *when* these are possessed: the scope of the tense would have to be governed by the facts of the case. But the context shows that the allusion was to a past occurrence. Paul immediately adds, “For when God made promise to Abraham, because He could swear by no greater, He swore by Himself, saying, Surely blessing, I will bless thee, and multiplying, I will multiply thee; and so, after he had patiently endured, HE OBTAINED THE PROMISE.”—(Heb. vi, 13, 15.) The reference is therefore to the promise of a multitudinous posterity, which Abraham began to realise before his death. When the promise was given, Sarah was old and barren, and there was no human probability of his having seed; but after patient faith, the promise was fulfilled. But that Abraham is inheriting the promises, in so far as they involved eternal life and the kingdom of God, is contrary to Paul’s express declaration. “These all (Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, &c.) died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off.”—(Heb. xi, 13.)

#### WHEN AND WHERE DID CHRIST MAKE THE ONE GREAT OFFERING?

By DR. THOMAS.

1.—By what phrase is this Offering Scripturally expressed? By the words “the offering of the Body of Jesus Christ once.”—(Heb. x, 10.)

2.—In what did the offering of this body consist? In the condemnation of sin in the nature that sinned in the Garden of Eden.—(Rom. viii, 3.)

3.—What were some of the typical relations of that Body prepared for Christ, in the process of crucifixion unto death? It was an altar of sacrifice, the antitype of the brazen altar (Heb. xiii, 10); it was a rent veil (Heb. x, 20); it was a *hilasterion*, or Mercy Seat (Rom. iii, 25); and it was *ta hagia hagion*, the Holies of Holies, (Dan. ix, 24,) the antitype of the two holy places.

4.—Who was the High Priestly Offerer in the crucifixion? The Eternal Spirit (Heb. ix, 14), upon the principle that what one doth by his instruments, he doth himself; thus Herod, Pilate, the Rulers, Romans and Jews did whatsoever God’s hand and counsel determined before to be done.—(Acts xviii, 27, 28.)

5.—What is the Melchizedec High Priest? The Eternal Spirit manifested in flesh.—(1 Tim. iii, 16.)

6.—What was this manifested Priest’s sin offering? “His own body.”—(1 Pet. ii, 24.)

7.—Where did this Eternal Offerer offer his sacrifice? Upon the cross “without the gate,” or “without the camp.”—(Heb. xiii, 12, 13.)

8.—When was the Jesus Altar purified; the Jesus Mercy Seat sprinkled with sacrificial blood, and the Jesus Holies of Holies lustrated? AFTER the Veil of his flesh was rent, and before he awoke at the early dawn of the third day.—(Mark xv, 37, 38; John xix, 34.)

9.—Why was the sprinkled, purified and lustrated body awakened in life again? That it might not see corruption (Acts ii, 27, 31) which, had it so happened, would have rendered all that had been transacted, vain and unprofitable.—(Psalm xxx, 9; 1 Cor. xv, 14, 18.)

10.—Why was the body “revived” or quickened, AFTER it “rose?”—(Rom. xiv, 9.) To show “the path of life,” and that it might “ascend to the Father,” from the nature which is “a little lower than” the angels’ consubstantiality with Him; thus become (*charaktees tes apostaseos autou*) an exact likeness of His substance (Hebrews 1, 3)—“a greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hands.” In ascending from the human to the divine nature, he was “clothed upon” with the “house which is from heaven;” that the mortal (*to thaneton*) born of the earth, might become the immortal born of the Spirit; and so perfected to enter the Divine Presence.

11.—Did the resurrected and quickened body enter the Divine Presence WITH its blood or THROUGH its blood? “Through his own blood.” (*dia tou idiou aimatos*.) The body is nowhere said to enter heaven with its blood. Aaron entered the Holies with blood, representative of Jesus entering



the true, *through* his own blood. In this the shadow and the substance approximate as nearly as the parable demands.

12.—What are the Jesus “Holies of Holies,” or *hagia hagion*? The Eternal Spirit, tabernacling in Jesus before and until He forsook him on the cross; and the same spirit tabernacling in him when the risen body, by *quickenings*, became Spirit. Thus the body born of Mary, was the tabernacle for the Spirit in two states—the former *imperfect*; the latter perfect. In the imperfect state, the corporeal tabernacle was “greater and more perfect,” and it, with its occupant, “the Holies of Holies.” “The True Tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man.” The rent veil divides these two states. To pass from the imperfect state, or holy, into the perfect or Most Holy, *flesh* has to be transformed into *Spirit*. We are passing through the veil, in dying, rising and being quickened. The imperfect, lesser, holy tabernacle, is flesh and blood; but “the greater and more perfect,” Most Holy, admits no flesh and blood into its constitution of state or of nature, both state and nature being most holy. This arrangement is therefore fatal to the speculation of Jesus going into heaven mortal, and with his blood circulating in his veins.

13.—If Jesus, because of the tribe of Judah could not be a priest on earth, how could the “one great offering” be made on Calvary? Jesus could not be a priest according to the Mosaic Law to offer sacrifices on the brazen altar, and to carry the blood thereof into the holy and most holy places. But he could be a victim to be offered upon Calvary by the Father who tabernacled in him, and said “No man taketh my life from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again.”—

(John x, 18.) These words came out of the mouth of the body prepared for sacrifice; but they were the living words of the Spirit.—(John vi, 63; vii, 28, 58; x, 38; xii, 49, 50.) A man cannot breathe his last, or die by the mere force of his will, nor can a corpse of itself resume its life. Both results ensued in relation to Jesus; but, in both cases, it was by the power of the Father, who, after the example of Abraham, offered His own Son on the same platform: the Mount of Yahweh, in the land of Moriah.—(Gen. xxv, 2, 14.)

14.—*What direct testimony is there to show that the Eternal Father was with Jesus on the cross?* In John xvi, 32, Jesus tells his companions that the hour was coming when they would all desert him, and leave him alone; “and yet,” says he, “I am not alone, for the Father is with me;” and from the account of the crucifixion, we learn that the Father did not forsake him till all things predetermined were satisfactorily finished. He was then left to the death which resulted from the Father’s withdrawal.—(John xix, 30.) “He yielded up the Spirit”—*to pneuma*.

15.—*How long was it from the quickening of the risen body on the third day, to its glorification in the heaven where the Father dwells?* Forty days. Jesus sojourned with his disciples during forty days, in which he was discoursing with them on the affairs of the kingdom.—(Acts i, 3.) At the end of this period, he was taken up and received into the glory he had with the Father before the world was.—(Acts i, 11; 1 Tim. iii, 16; John xvii, 5.)

16.—*What proof is there of the exaltation of Jesus to this glory?* The outpouring of Holy Spirit, and the testimony of that same spirit in the mouth of Peter, seven days after.—(Acts ii, 33, 36.)—*Marturion*.

## INTELLIGENCE.

**BIRMINGHAM.**—There have been six immersions since the last issue of the *Ambassador*, viz., **JAMES VOYCE** (32), shoemaker, formerly neutral—deaf, but can speak, as he did not lose his hearing till he was eight years of age.—**ROBERT KING** (22), shop assistant, formerly Wesleyan.—**WILLIAM WHITCOMB** (37), engraver, formerly Dawsonian.—**Mrs. NEWPORT** (30), wife of brother Newport of Weston-super-Mare: formerly Church of England.—**WILLIAM RAMSDEN** (32), clerk, formerly Church of England; and **LAVINA MARY RAMSDEN**, his wife. The meetings continue well attended, and the work of conviction is in some cases rapidly proceeding.

**EDINBURGH.**—Brother Ellis, writing March 17th, says—We have had two friendly discussions with our would-be brethren of Union Hall. The discussions originated by my asking what they meant by the phrase “The Signs of the Times” upon their bills—seeing they denied any times, and consequently could have no signs. The first meeting terminated with no result beyond a clearer definition of our respective positions—James Cameron maintaining that the resurrection of the dead and change of living, have neither time nor sign to indicate when they could be expected, since the days of the apostles. We maintaining on the other hand that these events

immediately precede the day of Christ, and that they are connected with that epoch. J. C.'s argument is based upon the notion that the coming of Christ and the day of Christ being distinct matters, the former *may* take place any time, and take away his saints—as in the instances of Enoch and Elijah. The second evening drifted into the same position, which was not very well sustained by J. C., as he had to admit that the last trumpet of 1 Cor. xv, 52, and the seventh trumpet of Rev. xi, referred to the same time; and as a consequence, that a last necessitated others to have preceded; and also a seventh implied that six had gone before. This admission proved fatal to his notion being reasonably held; but whether he intends to hold it, remains to be seen. The next subject is resurrection and judgment. I have no fear of the result being for the good of those who, as yet, have not given these matters any consideration; although I have little hope of doing anything for the leaders.—Last Sunday evening, brother Paterson gave the first of six lectures to be delivered in Dalkeith. The attendance was between thirty and forty; and the impression was very favourable. I hope the result will prove successful.

GRANTOWN (Scotland).—Bro. Robertson writing from Turiff on the 19th ultimo, reports a lecturing visit to Grantown. He says free use of the Town Hall was granted by the factor's clerk. Bills were issued, announcing a course of lectures on the revealed purposes of God in relation to the earth; but on the very day the lectures ought to have commenced, the factor himself withdrew the liberty granted by his clerk; and there being no other public place available, the brethren were obliged to make the best shift they could. Brother Gordon, determined that Grantown should hear the truth in spite of the public rebuff it had met, (for which brother Robertson is of opinion they had to thank clerical influence,) put his workshop in order, and gave fifty or sixty people an opportunity of hearing eight lectures on things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ. The result is that some are interested, and another visit spoken of, when good weather will admit of operations in the open air.

NEWCASTLE.—It appears from a letter received from brother Young, (by brother Dean, of Birmingham,) that there is some likelihood of a Christadelphian ecclesia being formed in Newcastle. For some time past, says brother Young, there have

been certain men who held part of the truth in a Campbellite way; these, brother Dunn (immersed at Halifax last year,) has come in contact with, and is likely to succeed in putting them right. Three have been re-immersed; particulars next month. They have been holding meetings for some time past, but brother Young has not yet broken bread with them, desiring to feel his way carefully, and to be sure that they build on a right foundation. He has hope of much good being ultimately done in Newcastle.

NOTTINGHAM.—Brother Phelps writes to say that the brother whose immersion was mentioned last month, is THOMAS OVERTON (29), framework knitter, formerly Primitive Methodist; also to report three other immersions, namely, GEORGE BANKS (34), machine ruler, formerly Church of England; WILLIAM HENRY THURMAN, florist, formerly an Adventist; MARY THURMAN, wife of the last-named, formerly Church of England. Brother Phelps mentions that there are several earnest enquirers, of whom obedience is shortly expected. Another course of lectures is in progress, with promise of good results. The subjects of the new course of lectures are as follow:—Scripture teaching concerning the Sabbath day—Public worship in the future age, or during Christ's reign—The teaching of types and shadows in Moses and the prophets—The Father, Son, and Holy Spirit at variance with general belief—The Roman Question viewed in the light of the Old and New Testament prophecy—The Eastern Question, or the downfall of all present governments.

Brother Turney writes (March 23rd): "The truth goes on better in Nottingham. Since my last, three persons, of middle age and good understanding, have obeyed, and a good many more are evidently getting forward. Nearly twelve persons, I believe, have embraced the faith since our taking the hall—a result which, though very small in itself, is, nevertheless, in advance of anything hitherto attained here. Well, one need work; for "the night" is fast closing round "when no man can work."

SWANSEA.—Brother T. Randles writes, March 22nd, to announce two additions to the Swansea ecclesia, viz.: EMMA BOUNDY, (26,) formerly Primitive Methodist, and her sister, ELIZA JANE BOUNDY, (17,) till lately, in a Wesleyan Sunday School. He says "On a profession of their faith in the covenants of promise—that good confession which is unto salvation,—they were

immersed into the Christ on Tuesday last." Speaking of the expected obedience of another, he adds that there is a great stir and feeling of uneasiness among the orthodox people, and that a pamphlet is expected from the pen of a local Baptist minister, in refutation of the recent lectures in the Music Hall. A fresh course of lectures has been delivered in accordance with the following announcement:—

"Christadelphian Meeting Room, Bellevue Street, Swansea. A course of FOUR LECTURES will be delivered in the above room as follows:

On Sunday, March 8th, by Mr. D. Clement, subject, 'The One Baptism.'

On Sunday, March 15th, by Mr. W. Clement, subject, 'The One Hope.'

On Sunday, March 22nd, by Mr. W. Clement, subject, 'The Kingdom of God.'

On Sunday, March 29th, by Mr. T. Bchenna, subject, 'The Signs of the Times' in relation to the Kingdom of God.

The Lectures to commence at 6.30 p.m. To the law and the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no Light in them.—Isaiah viii, 20. No Collection. Please bring your Bibles."

Brother Randles says several strangers are in constant attendance, and appear interested.

WHITBY.—Brother Shuttleworth, writing March 20th, says—"During the month, the following persons have been immersed: WILLIAM RIPLEY (21), shipwright, formerly belonging to Church of England; WILLIAM MIDWOOD (45), shipwright, formerly no religion; MRS. MIDWOOD (48), formerly a Primitive Methodist; JOHN STEPHENSON (38), shoemaker and bellman of the town—formerly a Roman Catholic; GEORGE ROBINSON (43), cabinet maker; JOHN ROBINSON (19), shoemaker; HENRY CLARKSON (55), just returned to Whitby from Chesterfield—tanner; and his wife, MRS. CLARKSON (58). The last four were cases of re-immersion, on attaining to the truth of the divine sonship of Jesus, which was previously ignored or misunderstood by them; but now confessed and realised as the basis of hope, and as the spirit's key to the otherwise inexplicable moral and physical phenomena, subsequently developed in the Christ for the salvation of all who believe upon his name. The room in which you lectured at Christmas (which has been retained to the present time), has now been thoroughly cleaned and decorated. An unsuccessful attempt has been made by one of the clericals to

get such 'infidel' people ejected. We intend however (D.V.) to continue as hitherto, a matin and vesper testimony, every Lord's Day. We have also made arrangements for holding the mid-week meetings at the room. Two canvas tablets (4 feet by 3 each) are about being placed in the front window, with the following inscriptions:—

### CHRISTADELPHIAN MEETING PLACE.

#### PUBLIC LECTURES,

On Sunday Mornings, at 10.30; Evenings  
at 6.30; Wednesday Evenings 7.30.

When the scriptures of Moses, the Prophets and the Apostles, are read and expounded, relative to the Signs of the Times, the Coming Kingdom of God; the Way of Life and the Second Manifestation of Jesus Christ, for Judgment and Salvation, to the end of the Earth"

WISHAW.—Brother Hodgson has received no answer to his letter, in which he conveyed to the "rev." Mr. Harrison the Editor's challenge to debate. He heard the letter was ignored on the score of its impertinence. To take away all such plea for refusal, the Editor transmitted a direct communication, couched in the language of perfect courtesy and respect, but this has been equally unsuccessful in evoking a response. The brethren have published the following paragraph in the local paper: "The Rev. Mr. Harrison, P.M. minister of Wishaw, has delivered a course of lectures in his own chapel, on the separate state and immortality of the soul. He has come forward as the champion of orthodoxy, to expose and refute 'certain errors and errorists' in Britain and America, who maintain that the revealed purposes of God have been obliterated by the philosophy and deceit incorporated in said orthodoxy. In his lectures, Mr. Harrison principally directed his attacks against 'a writer of the name of Roberts of Birmingham,' and 'a Dr. Thomas of America.' The former gentleman has since challenged him to a public discussion in defence of what he has written, but Mr. Harrison declines to meet him. Thus, like the cowardly guerilla in his attacks, he seeks the security of the bush, rather than a fair encounter in the open field. How are the mighty fallen!"

CANADA WEST.

**GUELPH.**—Lectures have been given in the new hall, opened by the brethren here, by brother Evans of Listowell, brother Coombe of Toronto, and brother W. Gunn of Inner Huron. Brother H. L. Drake, writing on these labours, says the attendance has been fair, and some are interested, and copies of the Lectures placed in their hands. The following notice of proceedings appeared in the *Guelph Chronicle* of Jan. 24:—**CHRISTADELPHIANS.**—The opening service of this body took place on Sunday last, at the old Masonic Hall, Wyndham street, when Mr. James Evans delivered a lecture on "The Hope of Israel." The hall was comfortably well filled with an attentive and intelligent audience, and the interest in the subject continued to the close. The lecture commenced with a reference to the promises made to Abraham, about the possession of Chaldea, showing that up to the present time such had not been fulfilled; that the promises made to David, of the possession of the throne of Israel for ever, was not now the case; that the universal preaching of the gospel there was little probability of accomplishing, under the present state of things, and that the time must come when Christ will reign on earth 1,000 years, when the apostles would sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes—and that in those days, Christ will put all enemies under his feet. The lecturer took his position, and placed his numerous quotations with much ability, displaying great familiarity with both the Old and New Testaments; and invited his hearers carefully to study the texts to which he made reference. He pleaded strongly for the Old Testament prophecies, to which the New and the apostles themselves were continually referring, and which Christ said he came to fulfil and not overturn.

UNITED STATES.

**KANKAKEE, ILL.**—Brother R. C. Bingley writing, Feb. 23rd, announces a course of lectures on behalf of the truth. After the first lecture, his child, an engaging little girl, aged two years and three months, died from the gradual effects of change of climate. He felt so prostrated by the blow that he dared not trust himself to deliver the second, which was advertised the very day the child died. His course at the time of writing was undecided. Removal to Chicago for change of scene, on sister

Bingley's account, was in contemplation; but in any case he should finish the lectures began at Kankakee. He says: "You must know I was no speaker, but I felt it my duty to make a bold attempt, after hesitating a few months, and, to my own surprise, I succeeded well, and interested, I believe not a few. I have the use of the school-house in this country part, from the trustees, who hold the right of granting it on Sundays for preaching. My father-in-law is very bitter, and would prevent me, but not being one of the trustees, he cannot. There is a school-house close by, in which he has influence, so I could not get that; but my first subject was written in chalk, on a black board, behind the desk, much to the disgust of the preacher and others. It was written by my father-in-law's son, just before the preacher came, [for the audience to see?—Ed.] and on his arrival, my father-in-law insisted his son-in-law should rub it out, but he would not. I have to write out posters, and fasten them on rail fences and boards on the farms of those who are liberal-minded. My first subject so interested the audience that I was prevailed upon to give one on Wednesday as well. I arranged my subjects thus:—

- 1.—What saith the scriptures on the nature of man?
- 2.—Has mortal man any hope of eternal life?
- 3.—The kingdom of God: its past and future history.
- 4.—The promise made to the fathers not yet fulfilled.
- 5.—Christ the king of the Jews and future monarch of the earth.
- 6.—The gospel of the kingdom (Matt. iv, 23) necessary to be believed for salvation.

I had intended giving another course, but I fear I must abandon it for awhile, or make occasional visits from Chicago.

NEW ZEALAND.

**CAVESHAM, near DUNEDIN.**—Brother William Wilson Holmes, writes an interesting letter, under date December 18th. After a somewhat chequered career, which he describes, he says he met with the *Lectures*, in August, 1865: they were put into his hand by John Graham. "I invited him," he says, "to my house, to discuss them. Of course, I contended for orthodox views, using the arguments of the apostacy on various passages. I would not give in; but my wife, who was an attentive listener, saw that my arguments

were weaker than Graham's, and she reaped the benefit, and became, in due time, convinced, along with other members of my family. But I had to go through some further tribulation before the thinking of the flesh could be subdued. I took a trip on business to the west coast, and was nearly wrecked. On getting safe to land at Hokitika, I failed to find the object of my search, and went 100 miles further south. On getting to the end of the voyage, the passengers had to land in an open roadstead; consequently, we had to pass through the surf before we could get ashore. This explains what happened, and as it had something to do with my accepting the truth, I name it. On our boat getting within the first breaker, she upset, and eight of us were precipitated into the water. The next breaker righted the boat, and being each of us swimmers, we laid hold. The next breaker turned her again, and we were obliged to let go and swim; then the next wave righted her, when we laid hold again. This was done four times. The fourth time I went down I knew my life was fast going. When under the water, I cried in my mind "O Lord, save me from drowning." I knew if I went down again, it was all up. I thought of the soul flying away on angel's wings, according to the doctrine of the apostacy, and was shaken. A boat was approaching from the shore. On coming to the surface for the fourth time, I found myself dragged by the hair of the head. We were all saved; some nearly dead when brought to land. On getting round, I vowed I would not rest till I found the truth. Thanks to the Deity, I am here living to praise Him, having found the object of my search. On my return home, after eleven months' absence, I found my wife and son had been immersed, and also sister Calder. I devoted myself for six months then to the study of the truth. I first went through your *Lectures*, in the humble spirit of a child, comparing everything with the Bible, and then read the works of our venerable brother, Dr. John Thomas, viz., *Elpis Israel*, *Eureka*, vol. I, and

*Anatolia*. Brother Murray also supplied me with *The Herald of the Kingdom, and Age to Come*. Finally, I accepted the truth, and was immersed. There are now six of us, meeting as an ecclesia every first day of the week, viz., brother Greig, of Dunedin and sister Sinclair, his daughter, sister Calder, my wife and son, and myself: all zealous advocates of the truth, and walking, I hope, in the obedience of it. There are some here we have to contend with, who ought to be co-workers in the good cause, but who do a serious injury to it, particularly to those who are enquiring, viz., our friend Mr. White, of Dunedin, and Mr. Graham. Mr. White is full of Campbellite prejudices and crotchets. They all deny the judgment. When I was immersed by Mr. David White, the question of mortal resurrection had not come up, but I never lost sight of the judgment, and, on coming to speak with the Whites a month after, when the question of the mortal resurrection did come up, I found their notions opposed to the scriptures. I felt disappointed to think that, after all, I had got mixed up with a class that denied one of the first principles of the truth. I tried to get them from their false position by quoting 2 Cor. v, 10; Dan. xii, 2; 2 Tim. iv, 1; Heb. ix, 27; John, v, 21, 22, but without effect. Letters have passed and books sent, but to no purpose, so we have left, according as Paul says, in Rom. xvi, 17: "Mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have received, and avoid them." We are all now happy, walking in the obedience of the one faith; as also our brethren at Green Island, and brother and sister Murray and Perry, of Port Chalmers. We all meet occasionally; 6 here, 7 at Green Island, 5 at Clutha, and 3 at Port Chalmers—total 21. There are 2 in Cavesham studying the word, who, I hope, will soon become obedient. So you see the work is going on in the remote ends of the earth, a few being called out for His name here and there." [The foregoing is a condensation of a long letter.]

# THE AMBASSADOR

## Of the Coming Age.

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

---

---

No. 47.

MAY, 1868.

Vol. V.

---

---

### THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF JUDGMENT;

A HARMONY OF SCRIPTURE TESTIMONY ON THE SUBJECT OF RESURRECTION AND JUDGMENT, EXHIBITED AT ONE VIEW, IN THE FORM OF CONSECUTIVE DISCOURSE, WITH THE AID OF PARAPHRASE.\*

BY J. J. ANDREW, LONDON.

For the purpose of carrying out the divine decree that

Eccles. iii, 17. *God shall judge the righteous and the wicked, the Father hath*  
John v, 22. *committed all judgment unto the Son. But where no law is*  
Rom. iv, 15. *there is no transgression. Sin is not imputed when there is*  
Rom. v, 13. *no law—for man that understandeth not is like the beasts that*  
Psalm xlix, 20. *perish; hence those only who have sinned in the law shall be*  
Rom. ii, 12. *judged by the law—that law of righteousness required by*  
God during the dispensation in which each individual has  
Rom. ii, 16. *lived. This object will be effected in the day when God*  
*shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, who*  
Psalm xevi, 13. *will come a second time to judge the world with righteousness*  
*and the people with his truth, for Paul says he shall judge the*  
2 Tim. iv, 1. *quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom. When*  
*he so comes he will render to every man according to his*  
Rom. ii, 6-11. *deeds; to them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek*  
*for glory, honour, and immortality (he will render) eternal life;*  
*but unto them that are contentious and do not obey the truth,*

---

\* To distinguish the words of scripture from the words used to connect them, the former have been italicised.

*but obey unrighteousness (he will render) indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish; for there is no respect of persons with God.*

- This judgment is of two kinds—individual and national. The latter consists of the infliction of judicial vengeance on the nations, as they exist at that time, but the former is applicable to the people of God, in all past ages; and, as they possess, from their knowledge of the truth, a greater amount of responsibility than the Jewish and Gentile unbelievers, it has been decreed that *judgment must begin at the house of God.* To accomplish this object it is necessary that the dead members of that household should be restored to life, and, therefore, *there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust.* Accordingly, *at that time—the time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation, when the nations are angry and thy wrath is come—many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake*, or, in other words, *they that are in the graves shall hear God's voice, and shall come forth; some, i.e. they that have done good (shall come forth) to everlasting life, or unto the resurrection of life; and some, i.e. they that have done evil (shall come forth) to shame and everlasting contempt, or unto the resurrection of damnation.* When this event occurs some members of the household will be alive, and will not, therefore, need any resurrection; hence, *we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent (go before) them which are asleep, for the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up (away) together in clouds to meet the Lord in the air.* (Aerial.) This is the time of the dead that they should be judged, and, therefore, at this time, he to whom that duty has been assigned—even Jesus Christ, whom God has ordained to be the judge of quick and dead—must return from the far country to his own home, when he will command that those servants to whom he had given money or talents—the members of his own household—be called unto him that he may know how much every man has gained by trading. Consequently, *when the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, before him shall be gathered all nations—his disciples who have been gathered out of every kindred and tongue, and people, and nation—that the words of Paul may be fulfilled, when he said we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, because every one of us shall give account of himself to God.* Or, as Peter expresses it, *we shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead; for every idle (evil) word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of*
- 1 Pet. iv, 17.
- Acts xxiv, 15.  
Dan. xii, 1.  
Rev. xi, 18.  
Dan. xii, 2.  
John v, 28, 29.  
Dan. xii, 2.  
John v, 29. }  
Dan. xii, 2. }  
John v, 29. }  
Dan. xii, 2. }  
John v, 29. }
- 1 Thes. iv, 15-17
- Rev. xi, 18.
- Acts x, 42.  
Lu. xix, 12; }  
Mat. xxv, 14. }  
Luke xix, 15.
- Mat. xxv, 31, 32
- Rev. v, 9.
- Rom. xiv, 10;  
Rom. xiv, 12.
- 1 Pet. iv, 5.  
Mat. xii, 36, 37.

- judgment, for by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned. When the Judge asks for this account, some will be able to say *Lord thy pound hath gained ten pounds*; while others will have to reply *Lord, behold here is thy pound, which I have kept laid up in a napkin, for I feared thee, because thou art an austere man; thou takest up that thou layest not down, and reapest that thou didst not sow.* Then shall the judge separate these two classes *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. Then shall the king say unto them on his right hand, Come ye blessed of my Father, good and faithful servants; ye have been faithful over a few things, I will make ye rulers over many things, enter ye into the joy of your Lord, ye shall inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world; for I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me in; naked, and ye clothed me; I was sick, and ye visited me; I was in prison, and ye came unto me. Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungred and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee? Or when saw we thee sick or in prison, and came unto thee? And the king shall answer and say unto them, Verily, I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.*
- Mat. xxv, 41. *Then shall he say also to them on his left hand, Out of your own mouths will I judge you, ye wicked servants; ye knew that I was an austere man, taking up that I laid not down, and reaping that I did not sow; wherefore then gavest not ye my money into the bank, that at my coming I might have required mine own with usury? Therefore, depart from me ye cursed into everlasting (aionian) fire, prepared for the devil (adversary) and his angels (messengers); for I was an hungred, and ye gave me no meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me not in; naked, and ye clothed me not; sick and in prison, and ye visited me not. Then shall they also answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungred, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee? Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily, verily, I say unto you, inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me.*
- Mat. xxv, 41-45. *Then will the unworthy servants realize what it is for their master to be ashamed of them, when he cometh in the glory of his Father, with the holy angels; for he shall say unto them that stand by—the holy angels—take from them*
- Luke xix, 16. *Lord thy pound hath gained ten pounds; while others will have to reply*
- Luke xix, 20, 21. *Lord, behold here is thy pound, which I have kept laid up in a napkin, for I feared thee, because thou art an austere man; thou takest up that thou layest not down, and reapest that thou didst not sow.*
- Mat. xxv, 32-34. *Then shall the judge separate these two classes 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. Then shall the king say unto them on his right hand, Come ye blessed of my*
- Mat. xxv, 21. *Father, good and faithful servants; ye have been faithful over a few things, I will make ye rulers over many things, enter ye into the joy of your Lord, ye shall inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world; for I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me in; naked, and ye clothed me; I was sick, and ye visited me; I was in prison, and ye came unto me. Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungred and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee? Or when saw we thee sick or in prison, and came unto thee? And the king shall answer and say unto them, Verily, I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.*
- Mat. xxv, 41. *Then shall he say also to them on his left hand, Out of your own mouths will I judge you, ye wicked servants; ye knew that*
- Luke xix, 22, 23. *I was an austere man, taking up that I laid not down, and reaping that I did not sow; wherefore then gavest not ye my money into the bank, that at my coming I might have required mine own with usury? Therefore, depart from me ye cursed into everlasting (aionian) fire, prepared for the devil (adversary) and his angels (messengers); for I was an hungred, and ye gave me no meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me not in; naked, and ye clothed me not; sick and in prison, and ye visited me not. Then shall they also answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungred, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee? Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily, verily, I say unto you, inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me.*
- Mat. xxv, 41-45. *Then will the unworthy servants realize what it is for their master to be ashamed of them, when he cometh in the glory of his Father, with the holy angels; for he shall say unto them that stand by—the holy angels—take from them*
- Mark viii, 38. *Then will the unworthy servants realize what it is for their master to be ashamed of them, when he cometh in the glory of his Father, with the holy angels; for he shall say unto them that stand by—the holy angels—take from them*
- Luke xix, 24. *Lord thy pound hath gained ten pounds; while others will have to reply*



- Luke xix, 26. *which have but one pound, and give to them which have ten pounds; for unto everyone which hath shall be given, and from him that hath not, even that he hath shall be taken away from him* or, in other words, *he that is unjust, let him be unjust still, and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still.* All who are in this condition will be cast into the furnace of fire, where there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth; not a fire, however, which will never cease to burn, but one in which they shall consume away into smoke; for it is written that all that do wickedly shall be stubble, and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of Hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch—which is the second death. Then shall the judge say, *These—the goats—shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous—the sheep—(shall go) into eternal life.*
- Rev. xxii, 11.
- Mat. xiii, 50.
- Ps. xxxvii, 20.  
 Mal. iv, 1.
- Rev. xx, 6.  
 Mat. xxv, 46.
- Col. iii, 3.
- 1 Cor. xv, 45.
- Rom. viii, 11. }  
 Phil. iii, 21. }  
 1 John iii, 2. }  
 2 Tim. ii, 12. }
- 1 Thess. iv, 17.  
 1 Cor. xv, 51,52
- 2 Cor. v, 2.  
 1 Cor. xv, 53.  
 2 Cor. v, 4.  
 1 Cor. xv, 42-44
- Luke xx, 35,36
- 2 Pet. i, 4.  
 Luke xx, 35,36
- Rev. xxi, 4.  
 Rev. xx, 6.  
 John v, 29.
- Rev. xx, 6.  
 Gal. vi, 8.  
 2 Cor. v, 10.  
 Gal. vi, 8.  
 2 Cor. 5, 10.  
 Mat. xvi, 27.
- The latter part of this decree will be carried out by him in whom our life is hid, who, after having pronounced his approval of them, as their judge, will become to them the Lord the Spirit, because as the last Adam, he has been made a quickening spirit. This he will do by quickening their mortal bodies, and fashioning them like unto his glorious body for when he shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is, and shall reign with him, and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Then it is, and not till then, that the righteous shall all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, and Paul's desire will be fulfilled, to be clothed upon with our house, which is from heaven; when this corruptible shall put on incorruption, and this mortal put on immortality, that mortality may be swallowed up of life. Then it is that they who have been sown in corruption, weakness, and dishonour will have been fully raised (built up) in incorruption, glory, and power. Then it is that they who have been accounted worthy to obtain that world (age), and the resurrection from the dead, will be made equal unto the angels, by becoming partakers of the divine nature, after which they will neither marry nor be given in marriage, neither can they die any more, and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain. Then will it be known what it is to have part in the first (chief or better) resurrection—the resurrection of life, in contradistinction to the resurrection of damnation—for on such the second death hath no power. Then it is that they who have sown to the flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption, by receiving through the body according to the bad things they have done; while those who have sown to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting, by receiving through the body according to the good things they have done; for when the Son of Man shall come \* \* \* then shall he reward every man according to his works. And he that shall*

- Heb. x, 37.      *come will come, and will not tarry; for he has said Behold, I come quickly, and my reward is with me, to give to every man according as his work shall be.*
- Rev. xxii, 12.      *I come quickly, and my reward is with me, to give to every man according as his work shall be.*
- Mat. xiii, 30.      This coming to judgment is *the time of the harvest*, when the Master of the field, in which the seed of the kingdom has been sown, 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.* This is the time when the net of the kingdom, which has been *cast into the sea* of nations, having become full, will be *drawn to the shore*, for the purpose of *gathering the good fish into vessels, and casting the bad away.*
- Mat. xiii, 30.      This is the time when the marriage-supper, which has been prepared for the King's son, becomes furnished with guests, and is, therefore, visited by the King, who, on seeing any at the feast not having on the *wedding garment*, or robe of righteousness, gives instruction to his servants to *bind them hand and foot, and take them away, and cast them out into outer darkness, where there shall be weeping; for the ungodly shall not stand in the judgment, nor sinners in the congregation of the righteous.* This is the time when the husbandman visits his vineyard, to cut off and burn up the withered and broken branches; but those which are still animated by the life-giving sap which proceeds from the root (of David), he will plant as trees of life by the spirit-giving river, that they may produce more abundantly the fruits of the Spirit, to the honour and glory of God. This is the time when the *bridegroom* cometh to meet the virgins who have agreed to wait for him, some of whom will be asleep, and without oil in their lamps, and will, therefore, be unable to go in with him to the marriage; while others will be awake, and watching, with plenty of oil in their lamps, and will, consequently, be permitted to enter into that marriage chamber, where they will participate in the marriage-tie, which will never be broken—the marriage between the Lamb of God and his Bride. And then will the redeemed be able, with unspeakable joy to exclaim, *O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?*
- Ps. i, 5.  
Jno. xv, 1 to 6.
- Jer. xvii, 8.  
Rev. xxii, 2.
- Mat. xxv, 1 to 13
- Rev. xix, 7 to 9
- 1 Cor. xv, 55.

## THE TRUTH ASSAILED.

THERE has just been issued from the press, a pamphlet of 54 closely printed pages, (by the "Rev." J. P. Barnett, of Swansea,) entitled "LIFE AND IMMORTALITY; a reply to Mr. Roberts, of Birmingham, with Remarks on some other parts of Mr. Roberts's teaching, as embodied in his "Twelve Lectures." The Editor has procured fifty copies of the pamphlet, and can supply it at 6d., post free. An answer will probably appear in due course.

In the May number of "*The Voice upon the Mountains*," a monthly periodical with a slight tendency in the direction of prophetic subjects, there is a lengthy article against what it describes as "*The Christadelphian Ecclesia*, a new sect which has arisen through the mission of John Thomas, of America, M.D.:" The Editor of *The Voice* appends the following note to the article:—"Some of our readers may not be aware of the rise and spread of the dangerous errors referred to. Further information shall be given in succeeding numbers. The spreading of these views and the establishment of the Christadelphian ecclesia in so many of our large towns, especially in the Midland Districts, is a very ominous sign of these evil days." Our readers will hear more of this article in future numbers of the *Ambassador*.

---

 EXTRACTS FROM AN UNPUBLISHED LETTER OF DR. THOMAS.
 

---

A MACEDONIAN CRY—"JOSEPH" REMEMBERED—RESURRECTION  
FIRST, JUDGMENT AFTERWARDS—THE INCORRUPTIBLE NATURE  
—STATE OF THE TRUTH IN THE COUNTRY—THE MEANS OF  
IMPROVEMENT—THE TRUE DIOTREPHETIC SPIRIT—AMERICA  
AND EUROPE IN THE IMPENDING STRUGGLE.

---

THE following are extracts from a letter received some years ago by brother Ellis, of Edinburgh, from Dr. Thomas, shortly after the Dr.'s return to America, from his last visit to this country. They treat of some matters having special reference to the time at which the letter was written, but will be read with as much interest as if written yesterday, for, in everything the doctor writes, there is a strong vein of original thought on matters of everlasting moment. In addition to special matters, there are some topics of universal interest, which will be read with special relish. We make no further preface, but at once introduce our readers to

## THE EXTRACTS.

"In my epistolary pamphlet, sent by brother Towert (which afterwards appeared in the *Ambassador*—ED.) I did not mention that I visited a new place in my long tour—a place called Hayfield, Crawford Co., Pa., about 420 miles from N.Y., near Meadville, on the Great Western and Atlantic R.W. My visit was occasioned by the following Macedonian cry: 'Why can you not visit us? We are very anxious to see you, and hear you expound the word. We are the more anxious because of your bold, uncompromising position in reference to the truth, which many of its professed advocates, from certain situations into which they have thrown themselves, dare not do. We, as a body, stand aloof from all these. We know no so-called 'evangelists, pastors, or teachers,' and do not belong to any 'conference' or 'gospel associations,' 'for the spread of the truth and the good of the precious cause.' We reject these high-sounding and plausible pretensions, in regard to persons and things, in the absence of spirit power, as mere vanity and arrogance, and adopt the Spirit's rule: 'Let him that understandeth say come.' Now, brother Thomas, do try and give us a call on your way to Henderson. We really want you to come and talk to us. There are some brethren, of the one faith, scattered abroad in this section, who would be glad to see you.' Though I am very backward to visit new places, because of the universality of God-dishonouring and truth-nullifying traditions, which make one's labour so much beating of the air, this cry was irresistible. I went and found them a plain unsophisticated farming people, in sections of Pennsylvania and Ohio,

where these States come together, in a radius of some fifteen miles from Hayfield, where brother Dunn resides. This brother is the principal brother among them who says 'Come,' and who told me that he was happy to say that they had no crotchets among them. They were originally Sabbatarian Baptists, zealous for the law of Moses, but when, by the instrumentality of the *Herald*, brother Dunn was exorcised from the demon, and clothed in a right mind, when he saw that the law is fulfilled in them who walk after the spirit or the truth, he set to work to enlighten his co-religionists, so that the Sabbatarian church of which he was formerly deacon, is now reduced to the parson and his six confederates. Strange to say, brother Dunn has not imitated Pharaoh's cup-bearer, who, when set free, forgot his friend Joseph, and left him to rot in gaol for ought he cared. His policy has not been to bury his friend in gaol-obscurity, and to palm off on an undiscerning public the things he can now talk about with a sane mind, as the wisdom he has discovered by the mighty power of his uneclipsed and extraordinary phrenology. He has even ventured from the mountain recesses of his own section to invite Joseph out of darkness to help them. Was not this strange conduct when tried by what you know to be common among certain christians, so called, in regard to me, whose main affair it is to make broad their phylacteries, which are mere counterfeits of something of which they are too earthly, soulish, and demoniac (this is James's 'vulgarity,' not mine) to attain? I had the use of the Sabbatarian Meeting House, and the Sabbatarian pastor, and another sort of Baptist preacher, unlike pastor Dowie, when I was in Auld Reekie, not only did not warn their flocks not to hear me, but left them to their own will, and came themselves to hear me. I talked much to them in public and in private until it began, after five days, to tell upon my nervous system, which caused me to cut short my visit lest I should not be able to hold out through all my proposed tour. In Henderson Co. what I feared overtook me. For several days I was prostrate: appetite fled and energy none. Rest restored me, and I proceeded according to what you already know, and need not be repeated here.

Yes, I have ever taught resurrection first, and judgment afterwards. Saints are raised to judgment before judgment is committed to them. If there were only one class of saints, and that class consisting of the righteous only—that is, who only walk in the truth or Spirit, there might be some reason in and for the issuing from Sheol, Hades, or the invisible state of things, incorruptible. But there were in the days of the apostles, and there have been in all ages and generations since, and will be till Christ comes, two classes of saints—the just and the unjust. The just who contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered to the saints, and hold fast their begun confidence, firm and unshaken to the end, and are always found where the truth is, sharing with it whatever good or evil may befall; and the unjust, who, though 'washed hogs,' return to their wallowing in the mire. These 'handle the word of God deceitfully.' They teach for doctrine the commandment of men; they make void the word of God by their insane and foolish traditions or

crotchets. 'They discuss everything, and settle nothing;' they speak evil of those things they do not understand; but what they understand naturally, or as natural men, such as a vain philosophy and science falsely so called, about which they are always twaddling and trying to harmonise with revelation the natural motions of sins, and emotions of the flesh: in these things they corrupt themselves: these are spots in the feasts of the saints, clouds without water, carried about of winds; they beguile unstable souls, to whom they promise liberty, while they are themselves the slaves to corruption. 'Better,' says Peter, 'for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than after they have known it to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them.' These are they who 'sow to the flesh,' while the saints of the first class are they who 'sow to the Spirit.' Now Paul says 'whatsoever a man, or saint, soweth, that shall he also reap.' But when shall he reap what in his sainthood he sows? A child, such as Timothy was once, would easily answer this question. But now, 'grave and reverend signors,' and those who ape them in their chirurgical substratum of ecclesiasticism, know not how scripturally to answer the question. They affirm traditions that nullify the truth, some affirming that he reaps as soon as he dies; others, that he reaps when he comes out of the grave, incorruptible and immortal. The former affirm that it is an immortal soul that reaps at death: the latter, that it is an immortal body at the resurrection. Will they tell a simple enquirer how an incorruptible soul or body at death or resurrection, in dying or rising, can 'reap corruption of the flesh,' and be subject to 'second death?' That which is incorruptible, cannot reap corruption from any source, within or without. Nor can it be said that the reaping of corruption pertains to the present life. This would nullify and destroy the apostle's argument, and be to subject both classes of saints to a common punishment. This state of existence is the sowing time, the resurrection is the springing time, and judgment in the presence of Christ is the reaping time. Paul must be construed in harmony with himself. Paul pointed the Christadelphians in Thessalonica to the Lord's presence, as the time when and place where he would have joy or sorrow on their account. No; reason teaches (and Paul had much to do with reason and reasoning,) that for saints who have been sowing to the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life, to reap corruption of the flesh, in the presence of the Lord at his coming, that flesh must come out of the ground flesh, capable of corrupting, which incorruptible flesh cannot. When corruption and mortality *put on* incorruptibility and immortality, bodily *appearance* is not necessarily affected. Incorruptibility is a matter of essential being. An incorruptible being, endued with life, can diversify its appearance—can become luminous, or draw in its light and appear as ordinary beings. See that remarkable testimony quoted in my last, from Zechariah xiv. It can affect others by divine power, for it is divine, and its power divine. When Christ returns, and has his first interview with the Elders of Israel, he will, doubtless, *draw himself in*, which is opposed to what is indicated by the phrase *letting himself out*. During

the forty days with the apostles, he *drew in*; so when he comes to revise his suspended work in the midst of the years—in the forty-years' epoch of the Second Exodus—he will draw in: else how shall one discern the wounds with which he was wounded, in the house of his friends? For to let himself out would so dazzle all observers, as totally to obscure all sight of his wound-scars.

The Antipas Association of Christadelphians at New York, proclaims itself *for the time being* the head quarters of the Testimony, that it may serve 'the least' who is disposed to 'receive with meekness, the engrafted word which is able to save souls.' It seeks no other honour or profit. If all those questionable things styled 'churches,' in Britain and America, were to acknowledge it as the radiating centre of the Testimony, it would not profit a single Christadelphian one cent. The Antipas has no desire to make merchandise of souls; it only desires souls to be benefited and honoured, in receiving 'without money and without price,' the testimony of God. That they may be enabled to do this, John Christadelphos works among them without compensation, and 'finds' himself. If he depended upon the Antipas in N. Y. City for support, he would have been, with all dependent upon him, under the green turf long ago. 'I robbed,' says Paul (*εσπλησσα*, rightfully seized from) other ecclesias, receiving recompense, to do you service.' He called this abasing himself, that the Christadelphians of the Antipas in Corinth might be exalted, because thus he preached to them the gospel of God 'freely.' This is the scriptural relation which subsists between John Christadelphos and the Antipas in N. Y. City. See what Paul says in 2 Cor. xi, 9., then he adds, 'as the truth of Christ is in me, this boasting shall not be stopped in me, in all the regions of Achaia,' and so says John Christadelphos. He is the servant of the least, and seeks only them, and nothing they possess. Such is his ambition, nothing more.

"Much change for the better in the meetings throughout the country" cannot be expected under the dispensation that has hitherto obtained. The discussing everything and settling nothing system is that dispensation that must be superseded, by 'wholesome words, the words of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the teaching which is according to godliness,' before there can be much change for the better anywhere. You in Edinburgh must diligently devote yourself to this 'godliness,' which Paul says is a great mystery. You must put yourselves in the best possible harmony with it, and then shine forth in the darkness. Where they cling to the dispensation aforesaid, which has waxed old and crazy, and I hope soon to vanish away, there can be no change for the better, and the darkness will still be incomprehensible of the light. A right understanding of the truth is the only cure for all the evils. No one can really love the truth who does not understand it, and without love of the truth, there cannot be 'faith that works by love and purifies the heart.' People rarely now 'receive the word *with meekness*' What little they acknowledge is mostly in the arrogant spirit of unsubdued Old Man-ism. 'Our lips are our own,' say they, 'who is Lord over us?' One man's opinion is as good as another's; I believe

what I please. 'Thus they speak vanity every one with his neighbour; with flattering lips and a double heart do they speak;' and the faithful fail from among such children of men. But though opinions at best are doubtful matters, and though it be true that one natural man's opinion on God's wisdom may be as good as another natural man's; it is not true of all natural men's opinions. The opinion of a well-instructed saint is better than the opinion of a saint who has become a well without water, or a tempest-tossed cloud, like those who rejoice in the dispensation aforesaid. There must be teaching of the word, or no progress can be made, no improvement can be developed. This is the divine agency for the enlightenment of the human mind: 'The things which thou hast heard through me, among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, able to teach others also;' for all faithful men are not able to teach; and there are those who are qualified to testify to the things spoken through Paul. If those things could be all rightly squared and compassed, there would be the right sort of agency to exercise the tongue and pen for improving the state of affairs throughout the country.

And now, brother Ellis, what can I say more at this time? If I write no more to Edinburgh for six months, none there, I think, can say that I have neglected to show interest in their spiritual well-being. I desire to hear of you being the light of Edinburgh; of you having become abundantly endowed with the "spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of Christ." When you prosper, I prosper; when you rejoice in the truth, so do I. This is the diatrephetic spirit found in me! This is the lordship I desire to exercise over you all in Auld Reekie, to get the truth and the love of it into you abundantly, that it may rule you all unto eternal glory. I have no other desire. Let this be the aim of others too; and even they who now seek to destroy all memorial of me, will also be found co-labourers with me."

We have no special revelation concerning American affairs. We can, therefore, only wait and watch. A revolution in the American Colonies preceded and promoted the earthquake that shook down the Tenth of the Great City, the French Monarchy, in 1789-90. My strong conviction is that our present revolution is the precursor of times of perplexity and distress among the nations of Europe; so that if we flee from this country, we have no guarantee that in leaping out of the frying pan, we are not leaping into the fire. But the Lord's hand is in all this; therefore, I have no fear what man may do. A way of escape will open up, when his time comes. He did not forget Noah, the preacher of righteousness, when the world of the ungodly was to be destroyed, nor did he leave Lot to perish when Sodom was to be engulfed."

---

### " THE ROMAN QUESTION."

---

The EDITOR having received authority to bring out an English edition of this tract, has put the matter in the hands of the printer. Copies will be procurable within a week of the issue of this number of the *Ambassador*. Price 3d.

---

SUNDAY MORNING AT THE CHRISTADELPHIAN SYNAGOGUE,  
BIRMINGHAM.—No. 6.

---

*From Shorthand Notes by brother JOHN BUTLER.*

---

AN AGED APOSTLE'S LETTER.

JOHN, Second Epistle. This letter (short and sweet) though apparently addressed to an individual, is without doubt, written to an ecclesia. John by this time was an old man. He was nearly 100 years of age when this was written; and we know that when a man gets up into life, his mind develops with advancing years. He loses the plain, cold, literal style of speech that belongs to the first stage of mental action, and becomes mellow and metaphorical. This is a universal rule, and you find it illustrated here. John styles his brethren and sisters, his children: he says he had no greater joy than to see his *children* walk in the truth. Now his children were not boys and girls as the term literally construed, would express; but men and women whom he had brought into Christ, by the preaching of the truth. The same style of expression is observed in the beginning of this letter: he addresses himself "to the elect lady whom I love in the truth;" not a literal lady, but the ecclesia to whom he was writing. You will find that he sends, in the last verse, the love of the ecclesia with which he was connected, in a similar form. "The children of *thine elect sister* greet thee." The children were the members of the ecclesia with whom he worshipped.

LOVE IN THE TRUTH.

The next feature to be noticed is the fact stated in the commencement of this epistle, that his love to them had its basis in the truth. "Whom I love in the truth." Now we can all to some extent understand what John means by that; because we have all in a greater or less degree, experienced in some shape, and are prepared by contrast to understand, love in the truth. There are various kinds of love. There is even among thieves a kind of brotherly love; they are attached to each other as members of the same gang, having a common interest. Among the lowest and most degraded, you will find some form of attachment. Wherever men's interests are identical, there is always a certain interest in each other, which does not exist towards those who are strangers to their pursuits. There

is on the other hand a mere neighbourly love, which springs up with mere contact—a mild sort of interest that does not go below the surface, and belongs to the day and the hour. Between the sexes, there is another and more special form of love.

THE WORLD'S LOVE EPHEMERAL.

All these loves have their origin in the flesh; that is, they result from the action of the mere instincts with which we are endowed in common with the brute creation—instincts which form a valuable element in the mental composition where the higher faculties rule, but which are neither capable nor designed in themselves to afford a basis of lasting happiness. The love that exists in the world is based upon one or other of these shallow feelings, and is, consequently, of an ephemeral and uncertain character. It burns dimly and selfishly while it lasts, and quickly vanishes before a change of circumstances. The love that springs from companionship in pleasure flies before adversity. The love that comes from identity of business or social interests is destroyed by a single breath of misfortune. Nothing is more notorious than that the world goes cold and turns its face away when the sun of prosperity ceases to shine. Even the love of the sexes dies with age, and cannot flourish against ill-favoured conditions.

A HIGHER LOVE.

Now, love in the truth is a very different affair from all these; it is quite a higher thing, in every respect; higher in the conditions it requires for its activity—higher in the nature of its action. It is at once a more delicate and more enduring thing, more refined, and more tough. It lays hold of, and has relation to, a much higher aspect of being. It deals with higher things. It mounts to God, stretches to futurity, and strikes root deeply into the very foundations of being while the love of the world ignores God, fixes on the present only, and has relation to the mere surface of things. Speaking phrenologically, love in the truth engages and requires the front and top brain, while the world's loves have to do with the side and the back. That may appear a vulgar way



of putting it, but you will find it is literally true.

#### THE STARTING POINT.

But, of course, nothing can be done without the truth. Love in the truth must start with the truth; it cannot make a beginning without it. You will find, as a matter of religious experience, that our love is bounded by the truth. It cannot be bestowed in a very warm form where the truth is unknown, and still less where it is opposed and rejected. Where the truth is received there is a starting point; but even after that, the degree of its intensity is determined by conditions. Personal love will exist in the ratio of the love existing for the truth itself. You have only to pass in review the different classes of people professing the truth to see the truth of this.

#### NOMINAL FRIENDS OF THE TRUTH.

Take first the individual who simply gives in his adhesion to the truth in its doctrinal form: he has come to the conclusion that the popular doctrines are fables, and the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, are the truth; but it is with him simply a matter of intellectual recognition. It is only theory with him. His practical estimate of things has not been altered by his new convictions. The things involved in the truth have not engaged his love. His interest still runs in a worldly channel. He is taken up with the things that belong to the present. His affections are set on things on the earth, and not on things above. Conversation on the truth is impossible with him. His replies on religious matters are monosyllabic. He assents to a remark made, but he never supplies fresh material; his mind is not running on the matter. Only turn, however, upon another subject, begin to ask him about his business, and instantly he will become voluble, his tongue will be loosed; he will be able, with multiplicity of words and emphasis of expression, almost rhetorical, to describe the various matters pertaining to his particular occupation. Or, suppose he is a domestic man, he will be able to give almost an inventory of the furniture and effects, and a treatise on the best articles of diet and the way to cook them, the terms upon which the house is leased, and all the minutæ of details going to make up the mere substratum of existence.

#### THE POLITICIAN AND TOWN GOSSIP.

Another man, still of the same type,

who has simply received the theory of the truth, and is, nominally, one of the truth's friends, but of whose heart it has not taken possession—in whom Christ does not dwell by faith—takes a particular interest in politics or town gossip. He will be able to talk over the last move in the cabinet, or the merits of some local candidate for electoral honours. Or, it may be, he is a devotee of science, too wise to appreciate the truth, or the enthusiast of some social movement, to whom the truth is too sober and abstruse. In either case, the result is the same. The truth has no charm for him. He is not taken up with Christ. The things that are of God he hurries out with monosyllables.

#### STRANGERS AND PILGRIMS.

Now what I mean to say is this, that if you yourself are thoroughly engrossed with the truth—if you are one of those strangers and pilgrims who feel, mournfully, that you have here no continuing city, but look for one to come—your love is feebly excited by such an individual. His acceptance of the truth imposes upon you the obligation to recognize him, to help him, to countenance him, to co-operate with him; but you feel you have to put forth an exertion to do it, as a duty to Christ. He does not draw the love out of you, because he lacks the spiritual magnetism which the heart generates in a heart that fully takes it in. Temperance movements, scientific hobbies, and political agitations are of no value to the man who has the truth. They are beneath his notice, as a matter of life service. They are gods of the world, at whose shrine worship is worse than wasted. They will be nowhere when our life is run out, and the times of the Gentiles are past; and yet so imperfectly educated is this class of man we are considering, that he prefers the bubbles of the passing generation to the solid riches of Christ. What a pity for all concerned.

#### MEN OF GOD AND THE WORD OF GOD.

How different to cultivate love in the truth with those who know the truth, and are enamoured of it heartily and thoroughly; whose minds are steeped in it because they steep them; for, be it always borne in mind, that this is not a thing that comes by accident or depends upon temperament. A man's natural capacity may have something to do with the success of his studies, but there is no man that will come at the love of the truth by accident. It is quite a matter of business

in one sense—a plain case of cause and effect. Here is the truth; here is the brain. If the one is put into the other, there will be a result; the mind will reflect the divine things contained in the Bible; but I know that if I don't read this, I shall not come under the power of it; I shall have no idea of it, and think nothing of it. If I apply my brain to mathematics, or devote my faculties to business, there will be a similar expenditure of brain power, but with a very different result—a better result in a temporal point of view it may be, but a very different result as regards tone of mind. The views, motives, tastes, and hopes become very different under the two processes. The man having his eyes opened to what the bible reveals, may be very aptly compared to the man in the parable who discovers there is a pearl hid in a certain field, but he knows he cannot get it without digging. Spiritual-mindedness is in the Bible, but we cannot acquire it except by constant intercourse with the Bible

THE WAY OF TRUTH AND LOVE  
THEREIN.

We can only hope to get our minds under the influence of the truth, by steeping our minds in it, and this is only to be done by laying it down for ourselves as a rule to read it continually, day by day. If we do that, then we shall get at the result; the mind will become steeped because we steep it. When you get hold of a man who thus steeps his mind in divine things, what a luxury beyond expression! You then experience what it is to love in the truth. There is no love so genial, none so rich, so pure and lasting as that which springs from a unity of interest in spiritual things. The real joys of existence are all connected with the truth; outside the truth, there is nothing but doubt, anxiety, fear, distress, sin, and death. They, therefore, make a great mistake who let the truth slip from any cause, or who give the truth the second place in the economy of their life. There are no circumstances that will justify such a mistake. God will not accept any justification of it.

A LIVING SACRIFICE.

Jesus demands to be put first; and when we realize who he is, and what it is he calls us to, we can see the reasonableness of his demand. He is only exacting of us that which will be for our supreme benefit, though it may not appear so now. Joy

unspeakable and full of glory is latent in all his commandments. In due season we shall reap the rich harvest of obedience, if we faint not. The man who gives Christ the second place will realize his position when this puny life is gone; and it will go, however filled up and impressed with its concerns we may be at the present moment. The time will come, as sure as the sun tracks his daily course in the heavens, when we shall have to say good-bye to the things of the present life, and when they are cut away, they will be gone for ever, and the man who lives for them, and is part and parcel of them, will vanish with them. Nothing but the truth will remain. "The world passeth away, but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever." The man who has lived for Christ, has something laid up in store which nothing can touch and no time decay, an inheritance undefiled and that fadeth not away.

ONLY ONE SAFE STANDARD.

In these matters, we must mistrust the sentiments that are current around us. The mind of Christendom, in practical as well as doctrinal matters, is not the mind of Christ in scarcely one particular. Our only safety lies in the close companionship of the Bible. In this we have the whole of God's written word, bound up in a compendious form, which we can consult at home like one of the ancient oracles. This is so true and yet so difficult to realise, that it becomes necessary to insist continually upon it, line upon line, precept upon precept, as it was in the days of old. People agree with it as a matter of sentiment, and yet when they get into the current of active life, they are traitorous to their convictions—they allow the temporary interests of this passing mortal state to divert them from what theoretically they admit to be the highest duty of life. They have a Bible, but they cannot find time to read it; they say it is the word of God, but they are not interested in it; they go on from Sunday to Sunday, thinking that in the end it will be all right, whilst they are thoroughly absorbed in the secular affairs of life.

THE END OF FOLLY—AN UNHEEDED  
LESSON.

At last they come to their death-bed, where we shall all certainly have to review our past career, if Christ does not come before that event; then they suddenly open their eyes to their folly, and speak words of warning to the living. But the living take no heed. They are full of life's

concerns. They may be momentarily impressed, but they have a strong mental background relating to this life. They go, it may be, into the chamber of the individual who has wasted his life, and they hear him say "Do not as I have done; be wiser than I have been." They heave a solemn sigh, but it is a surface sigh: it only emanates from the side next to the dying man. Behind them is the picture of the great world without, and the sigh doesn't reach this. It is not that they should be frightened. It is a matter of pure common sense. Given, that this life must soon come to an end; given, also, that this life as at present constituted, is not worth the living; given on the other hand, that there is a life to come that will never end, and one that is vastly superior to this life, since in it we shall realise the very object of being, which we catch only faint and casual glimpses of at present; given, also, that the means of getting that is by giving this—and what course would common sense suggest? It is not a matter of fear. A man deliberately makes a choice. A man's religion should never be a Sunday religion, or a death-bed religion. It should not be the kind of sentiment that depends upon tragedy; that is melted by the sun or blown away by the breezes of the mountain top. It should be a matter of wisdom, deep set, logical, real—a something that is continually present, and takes full and calm possession of the mind.

#### A THOROUGH POLICY—NO HALF MEASURES.

I do not mean to say that fear should have no bearing upon it; for all things are of God. By all our fears, and all our hopes, and all our expectations, we ought to give heed to the calling that is in Christ. It is almost derogatory to the matter to call it "important," or apply to it any of those mild commendations which imply a reservation in favour of something more important still. There should be no tinkering with the truth. It should stand at the top. Some make a profession of it, but live for secular objects. They seem to consider the truth very good; but that the really important matters relate to property and family, which with them are of supreme and crowning importance. They stand on the platform of secular life, and patronise the truth. God will accept no man's patronage. Christ will not accord to any man a position in the future, who does not surrender to him the present; for his request is that we leave all things in a

mental point of view, for him; that is to say, that we should prefer everything pertaining to the future, vastly before the trifles connected with the present. To use the familiar and oft-repeated words, but which cannot be burnt too deeply into our minds, "If any man come after me, and forsake not all things, he cannot be my disciple; if anyone love father or mother, husband, wife or children, houses or land, more than me, he is not worthy of me." These words ought continually to ring in our ears, for we shall awake some day to the time when they will be applied. We shall find ourselves in the presence of the august personage who spoke these words, and who will compel us to witness the review of our own lives; and although he is meek and lowly, yet when he comes the second time, he is to take the position of Judge, and to manifest God's anger toward all unrighteous men; and it will be a fearful thing to fall into his hands.

#### GOODNESS TO ALL MEN.

Next to love in the truth, we have to cultivate kindness. We are to do good unto all men, as we have opportunity. Christ says that if we do good only to those who do good to us, we are no better than the Pharisees and the sinners. Patient commiserative benevolence must characterise our dealings with those without. In the world, from the highest politician to the meanest street sweep, retaliation is the order of the day. As soon as anybody shows the cold shoulder, the result is to resent. This must not be so with us. Christ has given commandment how we ought to walk. John says we deceive ourselves if we say we are children of God, and do not His commandments. We are commanded to overcome evil with good, and not return evil for evil. The good deeds of those who are God's will not depend upon external incitement, or attraction, or upon personal benefit, but will bud forth as from an internal sap, and well up as from a spring. Doubtless the good things done for those who are Christ's, will be very thorough, very cordial, very delightful; at the same time, the unthankful and the evil must come in for a share of our beneficence.

#### A HARD TASK.

We see people who are ungrateful, who are inferior, and low and vulgar and unworthy; nevertheless, having Christ in view, we are enabled to do good to them. It is a good discipline: but if we keep Christ out of view, we shall only consider

our own feelings, and bestow our benefits where they will be appreciated. We have a good many things to learn, and many of them difficult to learn; but we must ever try to submit to the divine lessons. The children of God are to be like their Father, who sendeth rain upon the just and upon the unjust.

#### THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN KINDNESS AND LOVE.

At the same time, that is quite a different thing from love. Though God sends His benefits upon the wicked He does not love them; the very opposite—we are told that He hates them.—(Psalms xi, 5.) He is angry with the wicked: "My soul hateth the proud man," He says; and to certain people who brought their sacrifices with uncleanness, He said "These are a smoke in my nostrils: a fire that burneth all the day." Therefore to be like God we are not required to do a moral impossibility; for it is a moral impossibility to love everybody. We can be kind: that is another thing. It is possible to be kind—to take a benevolent interest in people, saying as it were to ourselves, "Well, poor things, there they are, very inferior sort of people, no doubt, but for the moment, they cannot help it, and we must try to be good to them." We can bring ourselves to this; but to arrive at the point of love is impossible. God does not ask us to do what He doesn't do Himself; and He doesn't love the wicked—neither does Jesus; for he is coming to destroy them. But he is kind and patient for the present, and so must we be.

#### PATIENCE AND THE RESULT.

Only have patience, and all things will come right; God doesn't allow us to put them right. We cannot put them right if we would; it is impossible. Christ will do it for us: he will put everybody into his place, by and bye. He will extirpate from the earth those who do iniquity, and exalt the righteous to life and joy for ever.

#### THE GOOD TIME COMING.

The earth belongs to Jesus. At present it is in wrong hands, and in consequence there is a great deal of misery. But there is a good time coming, when the Lord of the Earth will take possession. Our meeting this morning has reference to that good time. The truth points us to that good time. We cannot love a person in the truth, who is not in love with that good time and with him who is to bring it about. The gospel is the glad tidings of God's purpose

to bless all the world, and make His will done here as it is in heaven; and if we will only be patient and wait, and be like Abraham (who against hope believed in hope), and be faithful in all circumstances, we may hope that when Jesus—who is here represented by the symbols on the table—comes, he may judge us not unworthy of a place in that glorified throng, who shall unite in a song in which there shall be no jar—no cracked voices, and no imperfection. "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, who hath redeemed us to God by his blood, and has made us kings and priests, and we shall reign upon the earth."—EDITOR.

#### FAITH & WORKS: THEIR BEARING ON INDIVIDUAL SALVATION.

Truth has many sides; when looked at every way, good results from it; but truth half told is injurious; and however conscientious the person may be, one side of the truth only, results in evil. Some one has well said "half-truths are the worst of falsehoods;" as an illustration of what I mean, take my last exhortation to you: then I dwelt upon the grace of God, by which we are saved, holding it up so close to your mind's eye, that faith, and hope, and works were scarcely seen. So much was this so, that a brother kindly added a word or two to my remarks, lest a wrong impression should be created. This was very necessary, for this one-sided view of the truth has led thousands into Antinomianism. Now for the other side. This morning's endeavour will be to remove any misconception; first, by bringing the truth before you; secondly, by pointing the connection these truths have one with another; and thirdly, to apply them for our spiritual benefit. First, then, what can we do to save ourselves, who are but defiled dust and ashes? (Gen. xviii, 17.) "All the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing before God."—(Daniel iv, 35.) We are here for awhile; our days are few; "we flee as a shadow, and continue not."—(Job xiv, 12.) "Man and beast, all go unto one place; we are all of the dust, and all turn to dust again."—(Eccles. iii, 18, 20.) We cannot save ourselves, nor can we make any demand upon God, who only hath immortality; but if we are like David, we shall thank Him for having had any being. Thoughtful gratitude will creep over us, and make us exclaim "We might not have been, but we are; and we will praise God while we have any being." But still there is the longing after immortality—and such

a longing! O who will satisfy this deep craving? Man cannot, nor can man lay claim upon the only one who can. Yes, Paul was true when he said (Ephes. ii. 8) "By grace ye are saved (through faith); and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God;" for God can create and destroy; and the clay cannot say to the Potter "What doest Thou?" But (praise His name) by the Potter's favour, a way is opened to escape destruction. What can it be? Shall our intensest wish be satisfied? Yes; for "God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life;" and again (2 Cor. v, 19.) "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." Ah! this just meets our wants; for we are incapable of spotless righteousness; and could we be pure from now, future purity could not cancel past transgressions. Shall sin go unpunished? Shall the law that "the wages of sin is death" be abolished? Shall God's immutable and righteous law go unvindicated? No! Forasmuch as children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself took part of the same, that *through death* he might destroy him who had the power of death. He took not upon him the nature of angels, but he took upon him the seed of Abraham (Heb. ii, 14, 16). "God sent His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, to condemn sin in the flesh."—(Rom. viii, 3.) Thus our annihilation is righteously prevented, and God's eternal law honoured; for, "since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead."—(1 Cor. xv, 21.) "He *was wounded* for our transgressions, he *was bruised* for our iniquities, and *with his stripes* we are healed.—(Isaiah liii. 5.) The grave being unsealed, the pathway of life is complete; the door of the realisation of the promises is opened; we may enter in by faith. Faith is the being fully persuaded that what God has promised, He is able to perform.—(Rom. iv, 20, 21.) Abraham believed God and it was counted to him for righteousness; and the promise that he should be heir of the world, was not to Abraham or his seed through the law, but through the righteousness of faith.—(Rom. iv, 3, 13.) "Ye are saved through faith."—(Ephes. ii, 8.) Thus, those who believe the gospel of the kingdom, have justification by faith, through the name of Jesus, provided they have been baptized into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. But we are not saved yet:

we are only "being saved;" our faith must be unfeigned, of a good conscience, having love flowing out of a pure heart.—(1 Tim. i, 5.) If we depart not from iniquity, nor purge ourselves, or cease to do good, our peace through believing, flies; our love grows cold; our faith is dead; the promises of God our Saviour vanish; and the Lord Jesus is no longer our hope. Well did the apostle write to the Romans (viii, 24,) "We are saved by hope." This hope is a flower of delicate growth; it only arrives at perfection in those who sow to the Spirit, suffering with Christ, not counting present losses for the thought of the glory which shall be revealed in them, when they are manifested sons of God, at Christ's appearing. Presumption, the counterfeit of hope, grows rank enough by the wayside, among the thorns, almost everywhere; but he who sows to the flesh, who is the presumer, will find none of his presumption realised; for he who is our hope laid up in heaven, cometh to take vengeance on the ungodly; but the patient, working, hopeful soul has strong consolations—having fled for refuge to the hope set before him; he feels sure, and stands steadfast—hope acting as an anchor to the soul. Yes, we are saved by hope; for who will be saved that has not hope? and that hope once for all delivered to the saints. But James asks the question, "Was not our father Abraham justified by works?" Yes, he was; though by the works of the law shall not man be justified. Abraham's works were not works of the law, but works of faith; for he believed that God would provide a lamb, when according to God's command, he offered up Isaac. He acted upon his faith, which brought forth works that were justifying. Works without faith are no more justifying before God, than faith without works; but the works of faithful servants are remembered; "For," says Paul, "God is not unrighteous, to forget your work and labour of love."—(Heb. vi, 10.) "Ye see, then, how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only."—(James ii, 24, 26.) "For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also." "Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord; forasmuch as ye know that your labours are not in vain in the Lord."—(1 Cor. xv, 58.) Secondly, grace, faith, hope, works, these four blend one into the other as the colours of the rainbow; and as there could be no light without the sun, so there would be no faith without grace (or favour.) In

God's favour we hope, looking to the recompence of the reward. Faith is the motive power of good works. Good works prove our faith to be alive. By faith as sinners, we are justified from sins that are past; as saints we are justified by works; for works make our faith perfect. A patient continuance in well-doing is the only way by which, *as saints*, we may expect to reap glory, honour, and immortality. Therefore, let each of us be up and doing,

and what we find to do, do it with all our might, imitating him who was mighty in word and deed.—(Luke xxiv, 19.) The Chiefest among ten thousand will soon be here; the Deliverer will only quicken into incorruptibility, those who sow to the spirit; may we be found faultless before the presence of his glory, unblamable and irreprouvable in his sight—holy and without blemish.—H. TURNER.

### THE EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT OF THE BIBLE NOT EVERLASTING TORMENT.

*“And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal.”*—(Matt. xxv, 46.)

THERE has been no small dissension and disputation about the above passage of holy scripture. The dispute itself indeed seems likely to be *everlasting*, at least with those who cannot, or will not, understand the meaning of the words about which they debate. A strong argument with those who would have us believe that everlasting *punishment* is synonymous with everlasting *torment*, and of the same unlimited duration as the future life of the righteous, is that precisely the same Greek word is used in both clauses of the verse under consideration, that is to say, the Greek word *aionian* is applied both to the punishment and to the life, and that consequently the one must be of the same unlimited duration as the other. The fact that the original word used is the same in both cases is readily admitted, but the fallacy of the argument founded upon this admission, will be apparent wher. it is understood that neither the Hebrew nor Greek words in the Bible translated everlasting, eternal, for ever and ever &c., express any *definite* period at all. Such period may be long or short, limited or unlimited, past or future. This point can only be determined by the context and the nature of the thing spoken of. Thus in relation to God, unlimited duration in the widest sense is obviously implied. The same is true of the life promised to the righteous. But in relation to the wicked, it is not so. They are not destined to live for an unlimited period; on the contrary, the scriptures declare that such shall die, consume away into smoke, utterly perish, and become as extinct as if they never had

been, or never existed. The punishment of the wicked therefore cannot possibly mean everlasting life in conscious torment. The primary signification of the Greek word *kolasis* translated punishment in the authorized version is not *torment*, but *curbing, restraining, repressing*. The verb from which it is derived, also signifies to prune, lop or cut off, and this is in harmony with what is written concerning the wicked in Psalm xxxvii, 9, and numerous other places: “Evil doers shall be *cut off*.” That there are those who are destined to entire extinction of being is clearly proved by the following passages: “For the day of the Lord is near upon all the heathen; as thou hast done, it shall be done unto thee, thy reward shall return upon thine own head. For as ye have drunk upon my holy mountain, so shall all the heathen drink continually, yea, they shall drink, and they shall swallow down, and they shall be *as though they had not been*.”—(Ob. 15, 16.) “For yet a little while and the wicked *shall not be*; yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and *it shall not be*.”—(Ps. xxxvii, 10.) “Let the sinners be consumed out of the earth, and let the *wicked be no more*.”—(Ps. civ, 35.) “Thus saith the Lord, who maketh a way in the sea, and a path in the mighty waters; who bringeth forth the chariot and horse, the army and the power; they (the Chaldeans) shall lie down together, they shall not rise; *they are extinct, they are quenched as tow*.” If these passages, and they are but a sample of many that might be brought forward, do not teach extinction of being in the case of certain of the wicked, I should be glad to know what they do teach, or how the idea of extinction of being, or ceasing to exist, can be expressed in

language? There is a very large class among those who live and die in their sins, who will never rise out of their graves to live again, either in happiness or in misery. Such are spoken of in the following passages: "O Lord, our God, other Lords beside thee have had dominion over us; but by thee only will we make mention of thy name. They are dead, *they shall not live*; they are deceased, *they shall not rise*: therefore hast thou visited and destroyed them, and made all their memory to perish."—(Is. xxvi, 13, 14.) "In their heat I will make their feasts, and I will make them drunken, that they may rejoice, *and sleep a perpetual sleep and not wake*, saith the Lord."—(Jer. li, 39.) "I will make drunk her (Babylon's) princes and her wise men, her captains and her rulers, and her mighty men; and *they shall sleep a perpetual sleep, and not wake*, saith the King, whose name is the Lord of Hosts."—(Jer. li, 57.) "The man that wandereth out of the way of understanding *shall remain in the congregation of the dead.*"—(Prov. xxi, 16.)

If it be true that the wicked are destined to a conscious torment of unlimited duration, it follows of necessity that they are endowed with *everlasting life* equally with the righteous; the difference being that while the latter live in a state of happiness, the former live in a state of misery. But where in the Bible is *everlasting life* promised to the *wicked*? That it is promised to the righteous there can be no dispute. Christ's words, speaking of his sheep, are, "I give unto *them* eternal life and *they shall never perish.*"—(John x, 28.) The converse of this of course teaches that those who are not Christ's sheep *will perish*. Those who take the *inherent immortality* of man for granted, are compelled, when speaking of the punishment of the wicked, to interpret such words as "perish," "destroy," &c. in accordance therewith, and such persons labour very hard to convince us that the wicked are both *imperishable and indestructible*; in fact, that though always perishing, they never do perish, and though subjected continually to the most destructive of all agents, they somehow survive and still live on in torments indescribable. The advocates of this theory admit that it is a most "awful doctrine." Let us, who know better, rejoice and thank God that it is *not true*. In endeavouring further to elucidate this much controverted subject, it may be remarked that if to *create* signify to bring into being, or cause to exist, it is surely a

fair inference that to *destroy* must signify to put out of existence, or to deprive of being. The advocates of eternal torment are very fond of employing the term annihilation in reference to this subject; but to this it is objected that the word not being in the Bible, it is better not to use it at all, but to confine ourselves as much as possible to scripture words and phrases. It is an axiom of philosophy that matter is indestructible, and this may be granted, so far, at least, as *human* power is concerned. But when God declares he will destroy the wicked, the destruction has no reference to the atoms of which their bodies are composed, but to the destruction of their *life*, as shown by the following text in Matt. x, 28. Much stress has been laid upon this passage by the eternal tormentists, but the fact is it gives no countenance whatever to their theory. Christ here counsels his apostles not to fear them who kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather to fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell, (*geenna*.) The parallel passage in Luke xii, 4, 5, reads thus: "And I say unto you, my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and *after that have no more that they can do*. But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: Fear Him who, after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell (*geenna*) yea, I say unto you, fear Him." Now what is it to kill the body, but to deprive it of present life; having destroyed that, there remains nothing more that man can do: his power does not extend beyond the life that now is. But it is far otherwise with God. He has power finally to destroy by casting into hell (*geenna*) where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. He has power not only over the life that now is, but also over that which is to come, and He has decreed that the wicked shall not see life (everlasting), but that His wrath shall abide on him (John iii, 36), and that he shall *utterly perish* in his own corruption.—(2 Peter, ii, 12.) The wicked dead who are resurrected at the period of the judgment will come forth to *condemnation*: they will be the subjects of a *second* death, from which there is no redemption.—(Rev. ii, 11; xx, 14; xxi, 1.) Thus will they be visited and *destroyed*, and the memory of them be forgotten.

Will those who uphold the theory of "eternal torment" contend that after a man has *twice died*, he is still *alive*, and in conscious torment?

He that findeth his life shall lose it;

and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it."—(Mat. x, 39.) In this passage, the word translated *life* is precisely the same as that rendered *soul* in verse 28, and there is no good reason why the Greek word *psuche* should not have been rendered *life* throughout. Loss of *life* or *destruction of being* is the teaching of this and other similar passages. "The Lord *preserveth* all them that *love* Him, but all the wicked will he destroy."—(Psalm cxlv, 20.) Here is preservation contrasted with destruction. Those that love God are to be preserved, whereas the wicked, on the contrary, are not. As it is written in Phil. iii, 9, their *end* is *destruction*. According to the theory of the eternal tormentists, the wicked who do *not* love God are also to be preserved; their *end*, according to such, is *not* destruction; they are, in short, according to this theory, indestructible, and, like the righteous, destined to be preserved for ever, in spite of their being enveloped in unquenchable fire! "If ye live after the flesh, *ye shall die*" are the words of the apostle Paul.—(Rom. viii, 13.) Surely it is a strange perversion of language to make this signify *ye shall live for ever in torments*! Is it not in effect saying, as the serpent said to Eve, *ye shall not surely die*?—(Gen. iii, 4.) Life and death are not convertible terms, but terms of opposition and of contrast. To live is to be—to have existence; and to die is to cease to be or to cease to have existence. The Hebrew word rendered death signifies to fail, to faint; death, consequently, must be a failure or cessation of life. The death threatened to Adam for his disobedience is defined in Gen. iii, 19 to mean a return to the dust of the ground. Adam would thus, so to speak, revert to his original nothingness.

He would become the subject of death unending, and, unless God raised him from this death-state, he must remain mere dust for ever. This view of the matter is fully justified by what Paul says in 1 Cor. xv, 17, 18. His teaching there is that *without resurrection* the dead saints are *perish'd*: that is to say, are dead and gone to dust, and never destined to come to life again—become, in short, *as though they had not been*.

In speaking of them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, the apostle Paul states (2 Thess. i, 9) "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power" This passage, even if it stood alone, would be fatal to the theory upheld by the eternal tormentists. If their view be correct, the punishment there threatened can never have its fulfilment; because, to be the subject of everlasting destruction and banishment from the presence of the Lord necessitates being put out of existence; otherwise the victim of eternal torment would literally live and move in God's presence. To be alive, or in conscious existence, and at the same time to be out of the presence of God, is an absolute impossibility; for He is everywhere present by His Spirit. Thus David writes, Psalm cxxxix, 7, 10: "Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from *Thy presence*? If I ascend up into heaven, Thou art there—if I make my bed in *hell*, behold Thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall Thy hand lead me, and Thy right hand shall hold me."

Jersey, March 16, 1868.

S. G. H.

## VISIT TO SWANSEA, DEVONPORT, AND YEOVIL.

THE Easter holidays affording an opportunity, the Editor arranged a visit to the three places named above. Swansea would have been omitted on the present occasion, in favor of Weston-super-Mare, but for a pressing invitation from the brethren at the former place, backed by the reasonable probability that an effective service would be rendered to the truth, after the recent agitation. The Editor arrived in Swansea on Tuesday, April 7th. Four lectures had been intended, but the Music Hall could only be had for three consecutive nights in the week; and conse-

quently, the programme was limited to three lectures. The subjects were as follow.

### THE BIBLE AGAINST CHRISTENDOM.

1.—The heaven of popular preaching not the kingdom promised in the scriptures.

2.—The immortality of orthodox belief, not the immortality brought to light by Christ.

3.—Modern theology, a system of fables, and the truth rejected by all the sects and denominations of christendom.

Fearing a repetition of the disturbances which marred the effort of last Christmas, the



brethren made bold to ask the mayor to preside at the meetings, as he had presided at other meetings of a religious nature. The mayor was scarcely prepared to accede to this request. Liberal though he was, he could not compromise his respectability so far as to appear kindly to the sect everywhere spoken against. He therefore declined to take the chair, but offered the services of two policemen! This was more than could be got from the authorities last time, so the brethren were thankful. By asking much, they got a little, when by asking a little, they might have got nothing. That little, however, was not wanted, as the event turned out. The congregations of the town (so we are informed) were warned to stay away, and they apparently took the advice; for the audience was only half the size it was on the last occasion. The consequence was, there was, nothing for the policemen to do; so after the first night, they stayed away. At the first meeting, there would be from 400 to 500 persons present. A few had come for the purpose of a row, armed with sticks, but as they were well watched, and the great body of the audience were bent upon hearing, their evil propensities did not get vent, and like the policemen, finding there was no fun, they absented themselves from the two last meetings. The audience was less by a third the second night, and less still on the third. But though the meetings were smaller and less exciting than those at Christmas, there was every reason to believe them more successful, as regards the real object in view. A quiet, interested class of people came to hear, and what was said was more hearable than when disturbers were in the meeting, and therefore more likely to penetrate the judgment and reach the heart, for "faith cometh by hearing."—(Rom. x, 17.) And when the hearing is interfered with, the work of inducing faith is arrested, and the salvation of men to that extent frustrated. "By continuing in the truth," Paul said to Timothy, "thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee."—(1 Tim. iv, 16.) A good many people are enquiring, and some are near the point of obedience. There are good prospects for the Swansea ecclesia. They now number 14 brethren and sisters, which, considering that three years ago there was none, is a goodly number; and there is every probability of an increase. This comes of the diligence of those who have accepted the truth. By talking to people, lending books, and providing facilities for the public proclamation of the truth, they are disseminating light in their town, and fulfilling their mission as children of the light. The next thing after acquaintance with the truth, is growth therein, to the putting away the old man of the flesh, and the putting on of the new man in Christ Jesus, in the development of affections which entwine not on earthly objects, but on Him who is in heaven, and for whose coming we long, that we may be delivered from the

bondage of this corruption, and set free in the glorious liberty of that promised future era, in which the divine will be paramount in every glorified saint, and enforced by the millennial government as the universal law of the world. At present, the object of the truth is to purify for Christ, out of the world, a peculiar people, zealous of good works—a people who shall understand the will of the Father, and be zealously affected in the good cause of performing it—who shall adorn the doctrine of God with a righteous and benevolent walk and conversation; walking worthy in all well-pleasing, that they may be found unto praise, and honour, and glory, at the appearing of Christ. If the truth fails of this, it leaves the believers of it in "the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity." May it effectually work its great work in the Swansea Christadelphians, that others may see and learn, and be attracted to truth, to the glory of Him who is Lord of all.

The fourth day, left free by the engagement of the Hall, was spent at Mumbles, where it was gratifying to witness the harmony of a restored ecclesia. A ramble among the picturesque valleys of that sequestered part of the kingdom, in the company of those who have learnt to rejoice in the promises of God, was brought to a fitting conclusion by a tea meeting, at which the brethren of both Swansea and Mumbles united in profitable intercourse. About 70 souls were present. After tea, addresses on the duties pertaining to our high calling were delivered, and between each address an anthem was sung. The day was a thorough enjoyment from beginning to end, one of those green spots in this dreary pilgrimage that relieve the monotony of laborious duty, and remind us that there is in existence (though now latent,) fountains of joy as well as springs of bitterness, and that when, in the purposes of God, sin disappears and righteousness reigns, we shall exchange "the oil of joy for mourning, and the garments of praise for the spirits of heaviness."

From Swansea to Devonport is a long ride, (over 200 miles,) and was accomplished in 10 hours. Devonport is one of several towns that cluster on the sea coast at the confluence of the two rivers Plym and Tamar, in the county of Devon. These towns, of which one is Plymouth, are in reality one great place with 140,000 inhabitants. Local government is, however, divided between two separate municipal bodies, and they have a separate parliamentary representation. Here there is a large field for the truth. The ground has been pretty well broken up one time and another, by the efforts of the Plymouth brethren, and other sectaries, who, though powerless to lead the people into the complete way of truth, have done good service in breaking off the trammels of religious conventionalism, and accustoming the people to independent judgment upon divine things.

They have also familiarised the minds of many to some extent with two leading features of the truth, viz., the second appearing of Christ and the mortality of human nature, and thus paved the way for the apprehension of "the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ." In Devonport, there is an ecclesia of over 20 souls. The introduction of the truth to the town dates from the visit of Dr. Thomas, in 1848-49. That visit was brought about by parties who had something else in view than the promulgation of the gospel of the kingdom, and it resulted differently from their intentions. By means of it, brother J. W. Moore, and others, got hold of the truth, and through many changing fortunes, the truth has kept alive since that time, and has at last assumed the concrete form of an ecclesia, set for the defence of the gospel. This result is greatly due to brother Moore, who has given both house-room and money to the truth in dark and discouraging days, carefully nursing the flame at times when it seemed likely to go out. For a number of years, a small company of brethren and sisters have assembled every Sunday evening in his sitting room, for reading and the breaking of bread. Latterly, the basement floor of the house has been fitted up as a meeting room, but, as may be supposed, though an improvement upon an overcrowded small room upstairs, it is not very commodious or comfortable. A low roof and bad light interfere with the full operation of the mental faculties, while its concealed and private location constitute a barrier between the meeting and enquiring strangers, who, as a rule, entertain great objection to going into a private house. The day of small things is, however, never to be despised. It is better than nothing, and for the time being is everything for the truth's sake. It may prove the stepping-stone to something better. There is a prospect of removal to a public room, where the meetings of the ecclesia will have a more useful bearing upon outer darkness. Whatever may come of this change—whatever increase in the number or spiritual power of the ecclesia, will be directly attributable to what has been done in the past. The future is the fruit of the present in all human action. We now lay the mould by which events to come are shaped. However strange it may appear, it is a fact that external circumstances have much to do with determining moral and intellectual issues. The fortunes of education shew this. The truth is the highest education. If the truth has no man and no place, the truth does not grow among men; with both, and wisdom to direct, the good seed gets scattered, and fruits come forth to the glory of God and the salvation of men.

The lectures announced for Devonport were as follow:

1.—The Gospel of the New Testament not

preached in churches and chapels.

2.—Christ's doctrine of immortality not received by Christendom.

3.—The second appearing of Jesus Christ to judge his people, destroy his enemies, and reign as universal king upon earth.

The first two were given on Sunday, April 12th, in the Temperance Hall, Devonport, and the last in the Mechanic's Institute, Plymouth. The attendance and interest on all three occasions were far beyond the anticipations of the brethren. On Sunday morning, about 500 were present, and in the evening, the audience was computed at from 800 to 1,000 people. It was proposed that questions should be allowed, but the suggestion was not acted upon. Experience has shown the wisdom of not allowing questions. Indiscriminate liberty of speech at such a time only gives the devil an opportunity of doing mischief. Vain talkers and deceivers, who speak great swelling words of emptiness, get up under the plea of "seeking truth," and emit clouds of smoke and dust, which obscure the vision elaborated before the mind of the audience. The audience, as a rule, are strongly prejudiced against the truth, and quickly sympathize with any opposition offered. The result is that any little good impression that may have been made is quickly scattered to the winds. Some think, on the other hand, that to refuse to allow questions makes a bad impression, creating the feeling that there is something behind, which, if exposed by questions, would place the matter in an opposite light. Perhaps the best plan would be to compromise the matter by offering on the placards to answer questions sent in a written form. There was a good deal of wrangling at the close of the Sunday evening lecture. When a man preaches the real gospel, it is at the risk of having to engage, like Paul, in "much contention."—(1 Thess. ii, 2.) A warfare besets him on every hand. There are so many "high thoughts" and "imaginings" in the minds of the very people who profess to be christians, that the first work is that of "casting down," and bringing into captivity the disobedient thoughts of those who think they are right. In this warfare there can be no cessation or compromise. The enemy is too numerous to be slain with the weapons now at command. The air is thick with his hosts. The most that can be done is to conquer a few of the rebels, and induce them to transfer their allegiance to the King. With these, we may retire off the field for a moment to enjoy the service of the Great Captain of our salvation, but it is only a moment. The battle again closes around, and the strife runs higher than before. When the King himself arrives on the field, the whole scene will change. The tide of victory will turn: the armies of the alien will take flight. Christendom will collapse before a returned Christ. Everybody

will open their eyes and see their mistake. "The Gentiles shall come from the ends of the earth, and shall say, truly our fathers have inherited lies and vanity; things wherein there be no profit."—(Jer. xvi, 19.) Till then, his servants must be content to fight against the fearful odds, enduring as seeing Him who is invisible, working patiently, and without wearying, in the work, the greatness of which will only be seen when Jesus comes forth to see of the travail of his soul in the great multitude that in the joy of eternal life, will ascribe "Salvation and honour and glory and power unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb."

The third lecture, occurring in the Mechanics' Institute, Plymouth, was also fairly attended. About 500 would be present. Great interest was apparently excited, and many regrets expressed that the stay could not be longer. The editor had no idea of the excellence of the opening that exists for the truth in the "three towns" as they are called. He had to go down to find it out; and for an experimental visit, he thought three lectures sufficient. Having found out the situation of affairs, he will know his duty at another time. It seems probable that a great work is to be done in Plymouth and Devonport. There appears to be a large element of honest anxiety to know what is truth, and more than an average capability, (as one would judge,) to perceive it when presented; God prosper his work, and send labourers to the harvest, that men and women may be delivered from the ignorance and death that now enshroud the world, and admitted to the glorious calling in Christ, which yields a measure of joy and peace even now, and everlasting life in the world to come; when the shades of the night that brood over the hapless family of man will vanish at the bright presence of the Sun of Righteousness. Then shall God's name be glorified in truth, and not in cant; his will shall be done on earth, as it is done in heaven. Every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess, and to his name shall praise resound.

The next place of call was Yeovil. This is a small country town, of 10,000 inhabitants, situate in the county of Somerset, about thirty miles from the English Channel. It lies in the midst of a farming district, but is to some extent devoted to manufactures. The occasion of the visit was an invitation from a merchant in the town, by the name of Mr. J. S. Aplin, who falling in with the *Lectures* about nine months ago, became interested in them from their correspondence with the views he had acquired on the subject of human mortality. He did not accept the whole truth, and did not invite the Editor to preach Christadelphian doctrine. He is one of those who repudiate sect in every phase, and stand apart from all denominations and bodies, making it a virtue to have "no

creed," and to belong to "no sect," but to welcome "all who love Christ," as such say, using a scriptural phrase with an unscriptural disregard to its meaning, by which they deceive themselves with a sweet deception, failing to perceive that no man can scripturally love Christ who does not understand and believe the scripture "doctrine of Christ."

Mr. Aplin, in a preliminary correspondence, said he did not want to make a sect, and would rather that the Editor did not preach certain doctrines he saw in the *Lectures*; he and a few christian friends, he said, wanted to hear about the kingdom and prophetic topics generally, and if the Editor would consent to lecture on them, they would be glad to pay all expences connected with a course of lectures. The conclusion the Editor came to, was that an open door, however small, was not to be despised; and that if strangers in a strange place were willing to pay for the truth being preached to their townsmen in any shape, it was the duty of a servant of the truth to turn the opportunity to the best account. On this principle, the Editor consented to deliver four lectures. Mr. Aplin drew the bill, heading it "Lectures on Prophecy," and describing the lecturer as a "minister of the gospel."

The Editor begged permission to alter both. He objected to being called a "minister of the gospel," because it would convey a false impression. He is not what people understand by "a minister of the gospel," but a destroyer of the gospel. He told Mr. Aplin that he had no standing; that he was nothing by birth, education or appointment, but simply a human being acquainted with the Bible, and believing all Christendom to be astray—that in this simple character he preferred to appear, without any title. He objected to the heading of the bill, because it tacitly countenanced the languid and patronising sort of interest which so-called "christians"—some of them—take in "prophecy." He refused to appear in the apparent attitude of soliciting attention to it as a matter "interesting" or curious to people erroneously considering themselves "children of God." He claimed to declare with trumpet tone and sledge-hammer stroke, that it was imperative; that it demanded their surrender to its teaching; that they were wickedly negligent of it, considering the Bible is in their hands; that they were all gone astray after fables, while the real truth they leave slumbering between the boards of their idolatrously-treasured, but misunderstood, misbelieved, and unread Bibles. He therefore, for "Lectures on Prophecy," substituted "THE WORD OF GOD, *versus* THE TRADITIONS OF MEN." Mr. Aplin thought it "rather strong," but let it pass. It requires "strong" things to rouse the people of these days. If they were irreligious or unbelieving, the simple statement of the truth would be sufficient; but instead of that, they are like the Pharisees of

old; they think they are the people of the Lord; they imagine they are accepted before Him; they are many of them conscientiously walking in the wrong way, they are therefore difficult to bring to a sense of their true position. They are under the power of the strong delusion, believing a lie; and their attention can only be secured by at once impugning their position—speaking faithfully, whether they will hear or whether they will forbear—instead of saying “peace, peace—all right,” like the false prophets of this and other times. It is very disagreeable to do so; but there is no alternative. The duty of God’s servants has, in all ages, been, in this respect, disagreeable, and in times gone by, has cost them their lives. As to the subjects announced on the bills, they were worded abstractly, so that needless violence might not be done to the prejudices of an untried and conservative place. They were drawn up as follow:—

1.—“The Position of Prophecy in the New Testament.”

2.—“The Kingship of Christ in Relation to the Future History of the World.”

3.—“The Past and Future of the Jewish Nation Considered in the Light of What is Written in the Scriptures.”

4.—“The Second Appearing of Christ in Relation to the Hope of the Christian.”

When the Editor got to Yeovil, he found himself in very unusual company for a Christadelphian. Mr. Apin, who turned out to be “a devout man, and one who feared God,” and apparently desiring to know “what he ought to do,” though unfortunately confused with Plymouth doctrines of “receiving Jesus,” “the witness of the Spirit,” “the new birth,” and so on—had, like Cornelius, sent for certain “friends and kinsfolk,” several of whom came all the way from Weymouth, thirty miles distant. Among them was a state church military chaplain, having charge of three garrisons, in the south of England. A peculiarity in his appointment is, that he holds it under the special condition that he shall not introduce controverted topics in his ministrations. This is a condition which specially disqualifies him from being a minister of Christ; for no man can be a faithful witness for Christ, without testifying the truth, and no man can testify the truth without largely dealing with matters of controversy. The testimony of the truth in Paul’s day, was a continual controversy against “imagination and every high thought,” among both Jew and Gentile. The nature of this warfare—the weapons of which are not carnal, has not changed. The great apostacy predicted by the apostles, has filled the world with fables under the guise of truth; and a faithful testimony for the truth largely consists in attack upon these fables. But how can a man wage war against these fables, when he has, so to speak, bound himself to the devil to keep the peace toward them? The gentleman in

question, however, has got beyond his professional breeding in some things, and inclines to repudiate the name of blasphemy which those of his craft are in the habit of prefixing to their names. He also inclines to doubt the immortality of the soul. May his wholesome inclinations grow wider with enlightenment, and ultimate in his final repudiation of all connection with the Mother of Harlots, whose eldest daughter he is bound by law to serve. He appears to have a good and honest heart. If the seed enter, a good harvest may be expected. But there are mighty obstacles in a case like his; and in addition to these, he edits a religious publication, which in order to ensure a circulation, has to keep up some show of orthodoxy. Yet all these obstacles may be overcome, if a complete enlightenment be attained, and a right disposition exist. There were others, who with their wives and daughters, met under Mr. Apin’s hospitable roof during the Editor’s stay. They formed an admirable company of God-fearing people, but were strongly tainted with the spirit of “piety,” which is one of the powerful ingredients in the wine of fornication with which the great Romish whore has made drunk all nations. To define this spirit in literal and precise terms—it is the morbid action of the moral sentiments, under the excitation of false doctrine. Piety is a partial and unhealthy thing. It practically assumes that God has nothing to do with anything but religion, and that man can only serve him with long faces, holy tones, and severe exercises of the mind. It ignores the fact that “God has made heaven and earth, and all that in them is,” and that everything has a legitimate and a noble place. It forgets that God made our mouths to eat, as well as our brains to think; that sleep is as much a divine institution as praise; that rest and laughter are his appointments, as much as labour and sorrow; that all things are of God, and there is no such thing as essential evil—evil being relative, and arising only from excess, or a wrong use, or divine anger with sin. One can see the origin of this. Piety is a product of orthodoxy; and orthodoxy is founded on the assumption that there is a God of evil as well as a God of good; and that the God of evil holds sway in the body and in the earth, while the God of good reigns, or desires to reign, in the presumed immortal soul, and in heaven. It is therefore imagined that God can only be propitiated by exercises of the soul. Oh, the mental rack and weary penances that have come from this heathen doctrine! The gloom of orthodoxy vanishes before the truth. God is to be served in the obedience of the commandments he has given us for the regulation of the faculties and instincts with which he has endowed us. In this there is sobriety without dejection; submission without bondage; obedience without superstitious servility; oftentimes sorrow and pain, but always joy

underneath. In proportion as a person gets hold of the truth, he loses the piety of orthodox religion, which is the mere exhalation of a perverted brain. For the mawkish, self-conscious, soul-narrowing, superstitious, ignorant, spirit of "piety," he exchanges the free, healthy, vigorous, joyful spirit of the scriptures, which is a spirit of knowledge, a spirit of wisdom, a spirit of true benevolence, a spirit of true self-abnegation without fulsome sentimentality; a spirit of the true love of God, without wordy protestations; a spirit of true reform, without much talk of "a change of heart," "the new birth;" a spirit of true prayerfulness, without devotional long-windedness; a spirit of true sonship to God without making broad the phylacteries—a sensible, cheerful, dignified, intelligent, spirit, from which the purifying influence of the word has expelled the murky vapours of sin, and which is silently aglow with the hope enkindled by the divine promises, and a love of God which is largely and deeply shed abroad in the heart. As a rule, piety is a strong obstacle to the entrance of the truth. In some cases it gives way before conscientious anxiety to know the will of God, where there is capacity to perceive the truth when presented. In the present instance, there is some reason to believe that this will be the case, but time must be allowed, to know. For four days, the questions referred to engrossed attention, and excited continual controversy. A worthier company of people could not be met at an English table; but a sturdier opposition could not be offered to the truth than they brought to bear in their courteous way. Even the word "blasphemy" escaped a lady's lips, in reference to the proposition that if people were ignorant of the kingdom of God, they could not believe the gospel; and that unless a man believed the gospel and was baptised, he could not be saved. The great contention of the company was, that men were *now* saved, and made to "feel" their salvation, by the indwelling and witnessing of the spirit, upon their reception of the truth of "the atonement." They did not object to the doctrine of the kingdom as a matter of teaching; but they strenuously opposed its being made a part of the gospel. The Editor, on the other hand, contended that such a thing as a man "feeling" that he was saved, was an impossibility, till after the resurrection and judgment; that his only ground of hope (never amounting to a certainty,) was the knowledge that he believed the gospel preached by the apostles, and had been baptised, and was walking in the steps of Christ's commandments; that the witness of the spirit was not a fact in the present day, except in so far as the written word was the expression of its mind; that in the days of the apostles, the spirit bore witness in divers manifestations of power to the divinity of what they did, and strengthened the answer of a good conscience, which they derived

from the knowledge that they were walking in the path of obedience; that thus the spirit witnessed with their spirits; and lastly, that the gospel preached by the apostles, which, while it included the (scriptural) doctrine of the atonement, was largely related to the kingdom of God, announced by the prophets. The friends objected to the judgment. They were shocked at the proposition that we should not know until Christ proclaimed it at the judgment-seat, whether we should be accepted or not. They contended that every "child of God" knew it now, and should not come into judgment. The Editor could but quote the word, to which they made no effectual reply. On the first night, perceiving preparation for "family worship," the Editor bade the company adieu for the night. He felt that to join with them in such an act would be to countenance a deception; since it would virtually be to sanction the proposition that men and women could be in Christ without believing the gospel and being baptised. On the next night, the company solicited the Editor to remain, and join in their devotions. The Editor said he could not, because they approached God, not as the recipients of His creature benefactions, but as His children in Christ; and as the Editor did not believe they occupied this position, his participation in their devotions would not be a kindly act to them, since it would only tend to confirm them in their self-deception; neither would it be acceptable in the sight of God, since it would be uniting in the dishonor of His way of salvation, made known through preaching. The company appealed to their own confidence, which they styled "the witness of the Spirit." The Editor replied that it was necessary to try the spirits. There was always a doubt as to the spirit that inspired the sentiments of any human mind, however beautiful and ecstatic they might be. There could be no doubt about the things written in the scriptures being the teachings of the Spirit; hence the only sure way of procedure, was to abide by the teaching of the word. The company instantly began to quote phrases occurring in Paul's letters. The Editor, getting them to admit that these letters were written to people that believed Paul's gospel, and had been baptised upon believing it, denied that they had any right to apply them to themselves unless they were in the same position. God had made no communication to men since the days of Jesus and the apostles, and the way of salvation promulgated by them was the belief and obedience of the gospel. Our only safety, therefore, was to adhere rigidly to this way, with regard both to ourselves and others, strictly subordinating all notions we might form of "sovereign grace," "divine foreknowledge," &c., to the incontrovertible fact that the gospel was the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth; that "it hath pleased God by the foolishness of

preaching ("the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ") to save them that believe;" depending upon it that all God's arrangements would work one into the other. Now the position of the company confessed, was that they had not been baptized after believing the gospel of the kingdom and the name, and, therefore, on their own premisses, their claim to be considered adopted children could not be sustained. Finding the Editor immovable on this ground, they said "Well, if he wouldn't pray *with* them, would he pray *for* them, that they might be guided into the right way?" This was another matter. If they were willing, for the time, to take the position of being in the wrong way, the Editor could not object (believing them to be honestly desirous of doing the will of God), to pray that their sincere endeavours might be prospered. They expressed assent, and, accordingly, he complied with their request. On subsequent

evenings, he was allowed to retire without taking any part.

The lectures in the Corn Exchange were not numerously attended, but, considering the small population of the place, there was no reason for complaint. Audiences varying from 70 to 150 attended during the four evenings, and were apparently interested. Results must be left to the future. One immediate effect is a pressing invitation to lecture in Weymouth and Dorchester. God grant there may be some more substantial fruit than this, and that the sincere, God-fearing men and women, who, under partial enlightenment, are even now outcasts from orthodox communion, may progress to the full apprehension and efficacious obedience of the truth, and constitute themselves a pillar of testimony for the world of God against the traditions of men, in the midst of benighted Yeovil. By so doing, they will both save themselves and those that hear them.—The Editor returned home on Saturday, April 18th.

## THE POLITICAL HEAVENS AND THE SIGNS THEREOF.

SUSPENSE and preparation are the features of the present situation on the Continent. There is no special "question" immediately on hand. Outwardly there is an appearance of peace, with much talk of peace, but there is no confidence. A complication of "difficulties" embitters diplomacy; and the immense efforts put forth on all hands to perfect national armaments, inspire a universal feeling of distrust which re-acts on commerce, and produces stagnation of trade. The comments of the press best illustrate the crisis. The Paris correspondent of the *Globe*, writing Mar. 4, says,

"Will the appeasement that has suddenly taken place in the political situation be lasting, is a question much discussed. The general impression appears to be that it must be decided in the negative. For, in the first place, it is remarked that none of the difficulties which the situation presented have been removed; in the second, no government has stopped, or even lessened, military preparations of all kinds it was making; and thirdly, it is considered a most suspicious circumstance that the appeasement coincides with the need the French government has of launching its new loan of £17,600,000, and of getting its new Mobile National Guard duly organised."

The *Telegraph* says,

"That to talk of nations disarming is a vain waste of words. If real confidence

existed among the nations, they would disarm without any solemn convention. Immense armaments are the cause of ceaseless suspicion; but what is the cause of the armaments? Suspicion. We are further than ever from the days when comparative confidence and small armies existed in Europe; and no one can tell when those happy times will return. The vast and progressive accumulation of war apparatus, and the existence of many disturbing causes, render a conflict possible at any moment."

—*Pall Mall Gazette*, April 17th.

"The *Constitutionnel* confirms the denial already given by minor semi-official journals of the existence of any negotiations for a mutual disarmament between France and Prussia; in fact, there are no negotiations at all going on at present between the two courts, "but their relations continue to be excellent." It follows from this that both nations continue to cultivate excellence in their Chassepots and needle guns just as much as if they were on bad terms."—Paris Correspondent of *Express*, April 20th.

"The pacific declarations made by M. Baroche, Minister of Justice, at a dinner at Rambouillet on Tuesday last, have been received with singular coldness by the public, and have produced no effect at all on the Bourse. The truth is that they are not in accord with "the situation"—with, that is, the immense warlike preparations that have been made, and with the various grave political questions that are awaiting a solution. Moreover, people know from long experience that the Government, thinking

with Talleyrand that speech was given to disguise one's thoughts, has repeatedly said the contrary of what it was doing or planning; and there is no evidence that the same may not be the case on the present occasion."

"The Prussian Government, says the semi-official Paris *France*, is making great preparations for maritime manoeuvres, which will take place in the course of the summer. With this object a considerable number of ships of war will collect in the Baltic, under the command of Vice-Admiral Kuhn."

"The Paris correspondent of the *Herald* says that, in spite of the drenching rain, Marshal Niel is hastening the formation of the camp near Paris, and already three battalions have been marched to St. Maur, where they will have to live under canvas and manoeuvre and practise with the Chassepot. Every brigade in Paris will take its turn for a fortnight at a time. By the end of June it is expected that either at St. Maur, Toulouse, Lyons, Chalons, Toulon, or the Pyrenees, the whole of the French Army will have gone through this preliminary preparation. What would the French say if Prussia were to follow their example?"

The Paris correspondent of the *Express*, April 17th, quotes a letter from a Frenchman at Munich, (M. Pierre Barragnon) written April 11, in which the following passage occurs.

"I cannot help observing a vague fear of a sudden attack from France. The Germans know, for she boasts herself that she is 'ready'—that her navy especially is ready—and they are apprehensive. It is known that Prussia has lately sent as many as sixty more military spies to Metz, Thionville and Strasburg. On the other hand, the Prussian government is well aware that numbers of French officers are making their observations on the Maine, and all the lines of defence of Northern Germany. The situation in this respect is so *tendre* on both sides, as to have produced a sort of reciprocal toleration. Neither Prussian nor French officers, employed in this secret service, are allowed to make photographs or drawings, but otherwise they are not interfered with. Whether war is at hand or not, of course I cannot say. But the preparations for it are very evident. At Strasburg alone, I counted four regiments of infantry, four regiments of artillery, two battalions of chasseurs, and two batteries of horse artillery. Although, moreover, Strasburg is, strategically speaking, only a reserve depot, I saw there a great many engineers and pontonniers. Fortifications are going on upon the whole Rhine frontier. In saying this, I betray no secrets, for the Prussian officers with their telescopes see what is doing from their own side the Kehl Bridge, and count every stroke

of the pickaxe. The Prussians admit that the Chassepot is superior to their needle-gun in length of range and precision; but they say the calibre of the bore is too little, and the wounds the bullets make are not effective. The Prussian soldier, they flatter themselves, will beat the Chassepots, by firing coolly, at short distances, and following up their fire with the bayonet, and even blows from the butts of their muskets at close quarters. They think the French Chassepots too light to resist a charge."

The *Globe* of April 21, has the following remarks, in an article on "The Napoleonic Dynasty:—"

"But, meanwhile, what is the actual condition of affairs? The Continent is full of rumours of war, and the opinion that there is no ground for these rumours, is one easier of assertion than of contradiction. It is, however, difficult to believe that a simply defensive policy should call for the armament which is now going forward on so gigantic a scale. True M. Baroche, the Minister of Public Worship, has recently given the most explicit assurances that the policy of the Emperor is peace, and these assurances are said to have been authorised by his Majesty himself. But M. Baroche's is not the imperial mind which sways the empire, and cannot truly and fully inform us of the intentions of his master for any lengthened period. Again, how have the Minister's assurances of peace been met by the financial and commercial classes of Paris? They have not had the effect of allaying public anxiety, or persuading the French people that war is indefinitely postponed. This is abundantly proved by the fact that the bank reserve for the past week, exhibited an enormous increase, whilst the paper offered for discount decreased by nearly six millions of francs. Further, another proof that the situation is not considered pacific, is the desire manifested for urging on the organisation of the French National Guard. Naval and military preparations are continually going forward, and the hammer of the smith, the manufacturer of the weapons of warfare, resounds through France."

#### THE EASTERN QUESTION.

Under the heading "The Eastern question again," the *Express* of March 11th has the following:—

"It would seem by the following extract from a Servian journal, that the lull in the agitation in the east of Europe was only temporary. The *Nupredac* admits that the Servian government is not only arming, but armed, and that its object is to take the principal rôle in the events which

are at hand. It says: 'Serbia is independent, and can freely develop her force without asking permission from any one. The Skouptchina—or rather, the Servian people, have expressed their unanimous opinion as to the necessity of arming and making military preparations. Every Servian beholds with joy the action of the sovereign, who, by these military measures, has given Serbia quite a new importance, and raised her to the height of the mission which she is destined to fulfil as a principal in the changes which are on the eve of accomplishment in the East. A short time ago we had but 2,500 guns for the whole of Serbia; we have now more than 300,000 of the best pattern.'

"The *Monde*, referring to the pacific assurances given to the legislative body by M. Rouher, on Wednesday, during the discussion on the bill for calling out 100,000 men, makes the observation, that if a grave conflict is to break out in Europe, it must have its origin in the affairs of Turkey. The restless attention of Russia to the affairs of Greece, to the island of Crete, and to the Turkish empire generally, indicates the real situation."—(*Globe, March 7th.*)

"The warlike preparations in Russia are going on with unabated activity. The construction of the railway from Moscow to Warsaw, *via* Smolensk, which is regarded by the military authorities as indispensable for the prosecution of a great war, is being vigorously pushed forward, and the gun factories promise to turn out at least 600,000 breech-loaders by the beginning of next year."—(*Pall Mall Gazette, April 17th.*)

#### THE ROMAN QUESTION.

A letter from Rome states that the Pope has been "surprised" by a suggestion from Paris, made suddenly and with emphasis by the French Minister at Rome, acting on special orders. The Minister, says the letter, demanded "that the Romans should have a representative Government composed of one Chamber, which should name the Ministers, and have the direction of all affairs not strictly ecclesiastical. The cabinet of the Tuileries threatens to withdraw the expeditionary force if the Holy Father rejects this proposition."—(*Birmingham Journal.*)

"The *Monde* and other clerical papers pretend to know that a Garibaldiian movement will shortly take place against Rome, and that it will be supported by the

regular army, which will, however, this time, take care not to come into collision with the Garibaldians, as it will operate on the north, while they will attack from the Neapolitan States on the south."—(*Express, April 20th.*)

#### THE ARMAMENTS OF THE CONTINENT.

Among the latest news from Paris, we find an announcement that the Emperor has been experimenting at Meudon, with a new engine of war, which is said to possess destructive powers of the most terrific kind. The fact is significant, and the omen is bad. It is not a mere scientific experiment, such as may be made at any time, simply with the view of testing what chemical and mechanical invention can achieve. It is but one more step in the development of the enginery of war, with a view to coming battles, of which Prussia set the example. Prussia stole a march upon the Powers with the terrible needle-gun; and since then she has been busy in supplying herself with still more destructive weapons, with a view to future Sadowas. \* \* \*

It is only natural, then, that the French government should follow suit. Some months ago, reports found their way into the newspapers, of trials made of a new cannon invented by the Emperor; and it was alleged that this new gun could be so rapidly transported from place to place, that a few men armed with it, could mow down a whole battalion in a few minutes. And now, if we are to believe the reports, the new engine of war tried last month at Meudon, is found greatly to exceed in rapidity of fire and destruction, the former 'secret gun' of the Emperor, which was believed to be unequalled in destructive power. The trial was strictly private; but it is affirmed that a general officer who was present, declared that it is the most powerful weapon he ever saw, and that 'a battle now could not last longer than half-an-hour.'

It is a sad thing to say, but from St. Petersburg to Constantinople, from the Black Sea to the Bay of Biscay, the nations are disquieted with the apprehensions of a coming war. France has now an available military force of 1,250,000. Prussia has a force still more numerous. Armament is the order of the day on the Continent. And when battles come, they will last just as long as before, because there will be so many thousands more to be placed *hors de combat*. A melancholy prospect, truly!



If war breaks out between France and Prussia, it will not be a mere war of governments; the nations on either side will fight with their whole force: neither German nor Frenchman will submit to defeat until they have fought with their last man and their last musket. If this war on the Rhine—a calamity most earnestly to be deprecated—break out, it

will certainly be complicated and aggravated by a war on the Danube. Russia will then see and seize her opportunity for attacking Turkey: way will then become general on the Continent, and who shall say how long it will last, or how enormous the disasters which Europe will suffer in the strife?”—*Globe*, April 21.

## INTELLIGENCE.

**BIRMINGHAM.**—There has been one immersion during the month, viz., Mrs. MARY ANN LOWE (41), formerly Independent, who has been in attendance at the meetings of the brethren for a considerable period.—The quarterly tea meeting of the ecclesia for the transaction of business was held on the first Monday in April. After tea, the usual reports were presented, shewing the following facts: the average attendance at the morning meetings for the breaking of bread during the quarter was 56; highest attendance 65; lowest 47. Total amount of the weekly collections for the same period, £24 9s 7d.; the highest collection being £2 15s 9d., and the lowest £1 8s 7d. The disbursements for the same period, for rent, current expenses, aid to poor, &c., amounted to £24 7s 6d. No. of visitors for the quarter 6; no. of children on the books of the Sunday School, 63; average attendance, 45. Brother Geithin reported 38 subscribers to the cheap tract fund representing a total of about £10. This has reference to the following fact. A number of the brethren have formed themselves into a committee, for the purpose of assisting in the work of disseminating the truth, by promoting the publication of cheap and good tracts. Their plan is to raise a certain capital, by each subscribing a stipulated sum, and to apply it in the issue of tracts at about cost price; upon the sale of which, the money returned to be instantly reinvested in other tracts. Each tract to set forth the place and hour of meeting, and the works in which the truth may be found at greater length. Sets supplied to other ecclesias, with addresses to suit.—The total amount raised during the quarter, by the weekly collections, for the visit of Dr. Thomas, is £9 8s 3d. In the absence of definite information as to the probable period of the Dr.'s visit, it was discussed whether the collection should be continued. The question was decided affirmatively, a decision in harmony with the letter which afterwards came to hand from the Dr. Someone objecting to the continuance of the box for strangers, the matter was argued, when finally it was decided to open the box, and let the decision abide the result. The box was accordingly brought to the table and opened, when it

was found to contain £1 2s. 8d., as the result of the quarter's exposure under the printed card. This was considered to justify its continuance, and the contents having been handed to the treasurer, the box was replaced.

**HALIFAX.**—Bro. R. Whitworth, writing April 2, says “On the 15th ult. we had an accession to our number, by immersion, in the person of Mr. FREDERICK BREAD (51), grocer, 22, Fleet Street, Crossfields, Halifax. On Sunday last, also, we had an addition by the immersion of Mrs. MARY ANN STANSFIELD, of Ripponden, formerly Baptist.”

**HECKMONDWIKE.**—A letter from brother G. Armitage announces two additions by immersion to the small ecclesia existing in this place. The obedient believers are HENRY PARKER (32), of no previous religious profession, and JOSEPH ATKINSON (30), in the same category. They were immersed by brother Rhodes, of Huddersfield, on the 5th of April. Both cases are the result of labours in times long gone by, justifying to brother Armitage's mind the sage advice: “Cast thy bread on the waters, and thou shalt find it after many days.”

**HUDDERSFIELD.**—Brother John Mitchell writes on March 28th as follows: “It is with much pleasure that I announce the intelligence that Mrs. Rhodes, wife of brother Rhodes, of this place, became endeared to us as a sister by immersion into the name of Christ, on a satisfactory confession of her faith in the things of the kingdom and the name of Christ. The immersion took place at the Lockwood Baths, on the 12th inst.”

**JERSEY.**—Brother Hayes, writing from this place on March 22nd, says “I have stirred up the adversary in Jersey to denounce me as a Unitarian and the *Declaration* as “Mormonism.” This came about through sister H. and myself attending a bible class meeting a few times. Matters went on pretty smoothly for a time, but one evening, a lady present proposed the reading of the 1st chapter of John, which was accordingly done. A few observations of mine on the 1st verse caused her to ask me rather sharply if I did not believe that Jesus was co-equal and co-eternal with the Father?”

On my replying in the negative, she instantly closed her book and rose to depart, saying she would not remain to hear such a doctrine as that. On being remonstrated with, she very reluctantly took her seat again, but remained, for the most part, with closed book, for the remainder of the time. In vain I quoted passages, and commented on them. My voice was drowned in clamour, and the serpent policy prevailed. Only one person present—a poor blind woman—took our side of the question, as far as she understood it, and contended I had stated nothing but what was in the bible. The master of the house said he was sick of it, and wanted no more. I had previously grievously offended this gentleman by telling him that a man must first come under a constitution of righteousness before he was in a position to offer acceptable worship to God. Among other charges, I am accused of studying the scriptures just for the sake of holding an argument about them. So ended our attempt to introduce the truth, at a bible class meeting, in this good town of St. Heliers, a result which will not surprise you.

NOTTINGHAM.—Brother Phelps writes (April 19) that the advertised lectures (which concluded April 12) having created much interest, it was resolved to hold a social meeting on the 13th, to give interested persons an opportunity of asking questions. About sixty were present, and, after tea, several questions were asked and answered, brother E. Turney, acting as spokesman for the truth. Another course of lectures has been announced by handbill, as follows:—  
“People’s Hall, Beck Lane, Nottingham. Six lectures will be delivered in the above hall, on Sunday, April 19th, 1868, and following Sundays, at half-past six each evening. The lecturer will deal with the undermentioned subjects:—

1.—The covenant made with Abram: its confirmation by Jesus.

2.—The two natures; or Jesus before and after crucifixion.

3.—The name of the Lord is a strong tower; the righteous runneth into it, and is safe.—(Prov. xvii, 10.)

4.—A declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us.—(Luke i, 1.)

5.—A scriptural protest against the leading doctrines of Christendom.

6.—(By special request.) A mixed lecture, or many difficult passages considered.

All honest earnest people are invited to attend, bible in hand, as nothing will be advanced that is not in strict harmony therewith. No collection.

OLDBURY (near BIRMINGHAM).—A Methodist local preacher, by name T. Watton, having become convinced of the truth, writes to ask what course he ought to take. He has been preaching the truth instead of Methodism, and was, in a few days from

writing, to be brought before the district authorities to answer for it. He says there are others in the congregation besides himself who have embraced the truth, and are determined not to flinch from it. The question was, should they come out at once or stay to be excommunicated. The latter course was recommended, as likely to afford them the best opportunity of raising an agitation in the congregation in favour of the truth, and giving them an opportunity of defending it before the Sanhedrim.

SWANSEA.—Brother T. Randles, writing April 24th, says “I have the pleasing duty of reporting three additions to our ecclesia during the last month, viz., on March 28th, DAVID SLOCOMBE (30), railway guard, formerly Campbellite; on March 30th, JOHN REES (34), shoemaker, formerly Wesleyan; and on April 22nd, SUSAN TUCKER (24), domestic servant, formerly Campbellite. All three made an intelligent confession of their faith in the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus, and were immersed into the “Christ,” for the remission of sins, and an inheritance in the kingdom of God. I need scarcely add that all the brethren greatly rejoice in being thus cheered on the way. The ‘picking-out process’ is slowly but surely going on in *dark Swansea*; our duty being in the meantime to sow the good seed of the word, leaving results with God; patiently continuing in well-doing, thereby seeking for glory, honour, incorruptibility and life.”

TURRIFF.—Brother Robertson announces a lecturing visit to Fetterangus and Lonmay, on the 20th and 22nd of March, there being, on the latter occasion, a full and attentive audience, in a school-house near the station. On the 12th of April, CHRISTINA CLARK, seventh daughter of brother Clark, of Balfaton, was immersed at Turriff, on making the good confession. On the 19th, another believer, MARGARET LOWE, servant at the North of Scotland Bank, High Street, Turriff, was immersed and welcomed to the fellowship of the ecclesia. Brother Robertson has had encouraging news from Grantown, as to the results of his late visit. Brother Gordon’s wife has been brought to a knowledge of the truth; one or two more are “halting between two opinions,” and others are enquiring. From present appearances, opposition is likely to be shewn on the next occasion.

#### CHINA.

HONG KONG.—Brother Lilley writes on the 24th of February to say that the friends of the truth in Hong Kong have taken a small room in that far-off town “wherein to set forth the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ.” The room costs £3 per month, and there are only two, at present, to find the money. They are only babes in the truth, he says, and wish to be instructed how to proceed.

Their desire is to imbibe the sincere milk of the word that they may grow thereby. They can as yet do next to nothing for the truth, but, on the principle of exercising their one talent, they have taken the room referred to, and have issued small handbills. Others are interested, but only two have been immersed. Discussion meetings take place every week in a minister's house, in the town.

#### CANADA WEST.

**GUELPH.**—Brother H. L. Drake, writing April 5th, reports the successful continuance of the lectures mentioned last month. The brethren find many difficulties to contend with: and where do these not exist in the present state? Three-fourths of the people in the neighbourhood are Catholic, and the remaining quarter are thoroughly priest-ridden or indifferent to all religion. Nevertheless, several honest minds began to give heed. It is a matter of common remark that there has been more reading and studying of the bible since the commencement of the lectures than was ever known in Guelph. Brother Drake says the brethren—seven in number—have circulated the *Lectures* pretty well. There plan is to mark those who show their interest by frequent attendance or otherwise, and opening conversation with them, induce them to read as well as listen. Brother Drake sends two specimen handbills, announcing lectures. The subjects are stated as follow:—

“THE GLORIOUS THINGS SPOKEN OF JERUSALEM.—The Literal and Symbolical—shewing their bearing and connection with the true hope of a christian.” “Glorious things are spoken of thee, O city of God.”—(Psa. lxxxvii, 3.)

#### REFERENCES:

Isaiah lii, 1, 2, 7-9; xl, 2. Zech. viii, 3. Rev. xxi, 2, 10. “Pray for the peace of Jerusalem; they shall prosper that love thee.”—(Psa. cxxii, 6.) “Be ye glad and rejoice for ever in that which I create, for behold I create Jerusalem a rejoicing and her people a joy.”—(Isaiah lxxv, 18.)

“THE DESTINY OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE.”—The daughter of Tyre and the Tarshish of the latter days, as revealed in the Bible. Her work in the restoration of the Jews, and her subjection to the kingdom of Israel in the age to come, shown by the prophets.

#### REFERENCES.

Isaiah xvii, 12 to 2 of xviii; lx, 9; lxvi, 19. Ezek. xxxviii, 13. Psa. xlv, 12; lxxii, 10, 11. Isaiah ii, 10-18. Psa. xlviii, 7.

A local paper, under the head of “Town Matters,” has honoured the brethren with the following somewhat sarcastic, but with some qualifications, truth-spoken-in-jest notice of their proceedings:—

CHRISTADELPHIANISM IN GUELPH.—*Philosophy of Devildom—Comfortable Doc-*

*trines.*—The local public are generally aware that a new religious sect has sprung up in our midst, under the title of “Christadelphian Brethren.” (Brother Drake says this is a tautological amplification of the reporter, the brethren being known simply as Christadelphians.—Ed. *Ambassador*.) Failing to obtain the use of the South Ward School, they hold free lectures, every Sabbath afternoon, in the Old Masonic Hall. Mr. Evans, their leader, is an interesting speaker, and with numerous scripture texts, some Greek, Latin, and Hebrew phrases, and a good stock of sarcasm and ridicule for the “popular ‘Christianity’ of the creeds,” contrives to produce quite an effective address. The novelty of the dogmas propounded and their agreeable nature, add to the charm: so that it is not strange that they succeed in getting a full and attentive congregation. The absence of prayer, praise, and collections is another incentive to many non-worshippers of the town, who become such easy converts to anything that does not appeal too hardly to their conscience or pocket. *The new denomination is at present very prosperous.* (Brother Drake says the newspaper writer has fallen into this mistake, by judging from the appearance of the audience at the lectures.—Ed.) Several of our most respectable church-goers do not disdain to give them a hearing. Among their tenets, we find the speedy termination, or rejuvenation rather, of all earthly things—

“’Tis plain enough

The day of judgment’s not far off.”

The millennium approacheth, when all who die in the Christadelphian faith will arise kings and priests to reign with Jesus for evermore. The world will then have ceased to be worldly; nations and peoples, principalities and powers will be extinguished in an ineffable paradise of saints, and one supremely-glorified humanity. Inasmuch as “The wages of sin is death”—not a brimstonian “hell”—bad men will die as the brute. There is no after existence for them. They do not “shuffle off their mortal coil,” but become nonentity itself. “The wicked cease from troubling” in annihilation; their life is a vapour; it is gone out like the blaze of a candle. The devil, their master, is sin—the King of Terrors, the Spirit of Death. Imps and demons are not. Hell all a farce. Mephistophiles is a myth, Pluto a fancy. Ahriman and Belial, Beelzebub, and Apollyon, Satan and Antichrist, Lucifer, and the Old Serpent, the Adversary and the Great Red Dragon, are synonyms of a *principle*—not a monster, hydra-headed and scaly, cloven-hoofed and fork-tailed, but Sin—lust and wickedness personified. He never fell from Heaven, for he was “bad from the beginning;” he will not be “bound in chains,” or lord it over an eternal hell, but go out in everlasting darkness and oblivion.

INNERKIP.—The following communication speaks for itself:—

Innerkip, February 9th, 1868. The ecclesia of East Zorro to R. Roberts, Birmingham, England. Dear Brother.—We write these few lines not only to assure you of our hearty support as regards *any* price it may be necessary to charge for the *Ambassador*, but to encourage you in your ardent efforts to make known the truth. However, this may be looked on by the world, it is a glorious work, co-operating with the Deity in bringing about his just and glorious purposes. It must be a great work that will end in such glorious results: "They that be wise, or teachers (margin) shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars, for ever.—(Dan. xii, 3.) So that it is evident that *knowing, making known*, and occupying that high position in the future heavens, are inseparably connected with each other. Although the taking out a people for the name of the Deity is attended with difficulties, suffering, and trial, it is just as it should be—a part of the divine arrangement. "If one member suffer, all the members suffer with it." The head has suffered; and, before that glorious Son of Man, symbolized in the first chapter of Revelations, is revealed, all the members will have suffered with it; then that suffering head will be honoured, and all the members will rejoice with it.—(1 Cor. xii, 26.)

We are few in number (eight), the parents of four households, and scattered from two to ten miles apart. We are sorry to say that most of us came into the Lord's service late in the day; but we hope we may be able so to work that we may show a good account at his coming, and hear that cheering sentence: "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

And now, dear brother, accept our thanks, and may the Lord reward you for the benefits we have already received from your teaching, and be assured of our hearty co-operation in sustaining and circulating the *Ambassador*.

Signed on behalf of the ecclesia,  
FRANCIS MALCOLM,  
Innerkip P.O., County of Oxford, Ontario.  
R. Roberts, Birmingham.

The foregoing was unavoidably left over from last month, for want of space. Brother Malcolm has again written to say that since his last communication, two have been immersed into Christ, and several others are expected to follow soon. The brethren are thinking of extending their operations on behalf of the truth, which he says, appears to be spreading and taking deeper root in the community. He takes notice of this fact, however, that a good many while repudiating the dogmas of orthodoxy, evince no desire to connect themselves with the ecclesia, styling the truth "a new religion got up as a speculation [a poorly-paying one certainly—see 1 Cor. xv, 18—EDITOR] by the Yankees and the devil."

---

## THE THIRD VOLUME OF EUREKA.

---

### *NOW READY FOR THE PRESS.—SUBSCRIBERS WANTED.*

---

At the last hour, we gladly make room for the intelligence contained in a letter this day (April 28th) to hand from Dr. THOMAS, to the effect that the MS. of the third volume of Eureka is now finished, and that the time has come for those who have appreciated the first and second vols. of the work, to subscribe for the third *and last*. The Exposition of the Apocalypse is completed in the third volume. Those who have read the exposition contained in the two published volumes (covering the first eleven chapters of Revelations), will be eager to possess the conclusion, now within their reach, embracing as it does the more immediately interesting and debateable portions of the Apocalypse, having reference to our own century, and the glorious era beyond.

It is needless to seek to excite a favourable opinion of what the forthcoming volume will contain. The published works of the author, with which most of the readers of the *Ambassador* are familiar, are the best guarantee that all that human exposition can do to elucidate the meaning of Apocalyptic symbolism, will characterise the new work. We will only call the attention of British subscribers to the fact that the period of the Dr.'s visit to England depends upon the publication of it. If the requisite number of subscriptions be quickly realised, the Dr.'s visit will come all the sooner. This is an extra incentive to promptitude. The Dr. cannot leave the other side of the Atlantic until the book is out; and being a poor man, he cannot publish until the money to pay the printer is found by the subscribers. Hence the best thing now to be done is, for those who mean to have the new work, to tell their mind quickly and accompany their order with the price, without which nothing can be done. When 514 copies are ordered and paid for, the Dr. will put the MS. into the hands of the printer; and the sequel will quickly follow. The new volume will contain about 50 pages more than the second, and will be got up to match.

**TERMS.**—The terms of subscription will be the same as for the second volume, viz., **FOURTEEN SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE** sterling per copy, exclusive of freight and duty, which will come to about 18s6d. per copy extra.

#### ORDERS AND REMITTANCES.

**BRITAIN.**—Subscribers in Britain may send their orders and remittances to the Editor of the *Ambassador*, (Athenæum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham); or to W. Ellis, 3, Primrose Place, Lochend Road, Leith, Scotland.

**CANADA.**—Orders will be received by J. Coombe, 104, Yonge Street, Toronto.

**UNITED STATES.**—Subscribers in the States should remit direct to Dr. John Thomas, West Hoboken, Hudson Co., New Jersey.

#### A FEW WORDS ABOUT THE FIRST VOLUME.

The first volume is "out of print." There are some who have the second volume who would like to possess the first. If a sufficient number of orders to pay the cost of publication should be received, the Dr. will republish the first volume, at three dollars per copy, or 8s6d. English money, at the present rate of exchange.

#### A WORD ABOUT THE SECOND VOLUME.

There are still 250 copies of vol. II on hand, and anyone having the first, who has not got the second, has now an opportunity of supplying himself while ordering the third.

☞ After the third volume is issued, *single volumes will no longer be supplied*. Those who may desire the Dr.'s exposition of the Apocalypse, will thenceforth have to purchase the three vols. together. The advantage in ordering the second volume now, will be that those already having the first, will not have to repurchase it with the second and third.

All which is commended to the special attention of the reader, in the hope that he will be incited to participate in a work which will not only secure a great boon to those who love the truth, but strengthen the agency now in operation, in the work of preparing a people for the name of the Lord, not only through the publication of a new work, by which the cause of the truth will receive new strength, but through the personal labours of one so greatly qualified to give an effective testimony for the truth.—EDITOR.

# THE AMBASSADOR

## Of the Coming Age.

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

---

No. 48.

JUNE, 1868.

Vol. V.

---

BY DR. THOMAS :

### CATECHESIS; OR SCRIPTURAL INSTRUCTION ON MORTALITY, IMMORTALITY, AND JUDGMENT.\*

*This is Eternal Life, to know the only true Deity, and Jesus Christ whom He hath sent.*—John xvii, 3.

- 1.—*What was "the first man Adam," and where did he come from?*  
He was dust "formed into a living soul," and came "out of the ground."—Gen. ii, 7 ; iii, 19.
- 2.—*What does Paul term "a living soul?"*  
"A natural body:" *σωμα ψυχικόν*, *soma psuchikon*.—1 Cor. xv, 44, 45.
- 3.—*What does Paul term a body, or nature, that comes out of the earth?*  
His words, in 1 Cor. xv, 47, are *εκ γης χοϊκος*, *ek ghēs choikos*, "out of the earth, EARTHY."
- 4.—*What does experience teach are the characteristics of a body, or nature, created out of the dust of the earth?*  
That the earthy body is corruptible, without honour, or "vile," weak, and natural.
- 5.—*Was the earthy body of the first man before he sinned like what experience teaches us our bodies are?*  
Paul, speaking of Adam at the epoch of his creation, says, "As the earthy, such are they also that are earthy," or earth-born (1 Cor. xv, 48): hence his earth-born body was capable of corruption, weak and natural, soulish or sensual; yet, as an earthy body, "very good."—(Gen. i, 31.)

---

\* Published in pamphlet form, by the Baltimore ecclesia.

6.—*Does the fact of a body, or bodies, many or few, being created out of dust some 6,000 years after the creation of the first man from dust, destroy the principle contained in Paul's words, "out of the earth, earthy?"*

Certainly not: time works no change in the principles of the Deity. Hence the new creations of dust, when they "come forth" from the earth to judgment, are "earthy," and being earthy, their earthiness is corruptible, honourless, weak, and soulish or sensual.

7.—*If all come forth from graves "earthy bodies," do they come forth to one and the same end?*

No; some come forth to justification of life; and others of them to condemnation.—(John v, 29.)

8.—*What causes this divergence of results?*

The accounts rendered by each class at the judgment-seat of Christ. Those who, in the present state, have become saints, but, instead of patiently continuing in well-doing, and so seeking for glory, honour, incorruptibility and life, (Rom. ii, 7), have turned aside to "live after the flesh, shall die," and "reap corruption" (Rom. viii, 13; Gal. vi, 8); while those saints who "walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit," "shall not come into condemnation; but of the Spirit shall reap everlasting life."—(Rom. viii, 1, 13; Gal. vi, 8.)

9.—*What is MORTALITY?*

An earthy body in living action; or life manifested through an earthy body; and therefore from constitution of the body, terminable life.

10.—*Does mankind in particular stand related to any other kind, or sort, of body or nature, than to the earthy? If so, what is it?*

Yes, a portion of mankind is related to what Paul terms the spiritual body, or "quickening spirit."—(1 Cor. xv, 44, 45.)

11.—*Where does the spiritual body come from?*

"Out of heaven:" εἰς οὐρανόν, ex ouranou; "the Second Man is the Lord from heaven."—(1 Cor. xv, 47.)

12.—*Does not the spiritual body come out of the grave?*

How is that possible, in view of Paul's principle, that what comes "out of the earth is earthy," not spiritual; and that the spiritual body is "our house, which is FROM HEAVEN?"—(2 Cor. v, 2.)

13.—*Is there any principle involved in the development of the spiritual body? and if so, what is it?*

There is: as contained in the words, "that is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward, that which is spiritual."—(1 Cor. xv, 46.)

14.—*What is to be understood by this?*

The meaning obviously is, that in the development of a spiritual body there must FIRST be an earthy body as a BASIS for the spiritual. A man must first exist, before the tailor can make a gentleman of him by clothing him in broadcloth.

15.—*But could not the Deity make a spiritual body in the grave, and bring it forth a finished creation?*

There is nothing impossible with Him. The question, however, is not what He can or cannot do; but about what He has revealed He will do, and upon what principles He will develop His work. According to the principles Paul has laid down, the spiritual body cannot come out of the earth. It must come “*out of heaven.*”

16.—*Why must an earthy body be first formed?*

Because of the existence of an earthy body in a previous state. To restore a person, who has no present existence, to identify him with a former self, he must be created anew after the old model, and be impressed with the mental and moral characteristics thereto belonging.

17.—*What is that which comes “out of heaven?”*

All-subduing energy, or power, (Philip. iii, 21), styled in Rom. viii, 11, “*Spirit of the Father.*”

18.—*When this power operates upon an earthy body, or basis, what is the result?*

“*In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye,*” it changes the “*vile*” or earthy basis, or body, into a like form with the body of Christ’s glory; in other words, it transforms the earthy body into a spiritual body; which becomes thus “*a house which is from heaven.*”

19.—*What are the characteristics of the spiritual body?*

It is incorruptible, glorious, powerful, and immortal “*flesh and bones.*” —(1 Cor. xv, 42, 43; Luke xxiv, 39; Eph. v, 30.)

20.—*What is IMMORTALITY?*

Incorruptible body in living action; or life manifested through an incorruptible body. The Deity, who is the life, is the only being in the universe who has it *underived* from anything exterior to Himself.—(1 Tim. vi, 16.)

21.—*What is the relation of the resurrection-earthy body to the resurrection-spiritual body?*

Its relation is that of a “*terrestrial*” *inferior* body to a “*celestial*” *superior* body; bearing a similar relation the one to the other, that the acorn does to the oak.

22.—*What is the transition from the lower terrestrial body to the higher celestial, or heavenly, termed?*

It is an *ascent*, in which the subject of the *ascension* is exalted and “*RAISED*” from the one to the other.—(John xix, 17.)

23.—*What was the Body that came out of Joseph’s sepulchre?*

The same that was crucified, died, and was buried there—“*out of the earth, earthy.*” An earthy body is not consubstantial with the Father, who is Spirit. At the emergence from the tomb, there was *inequality of substance* between the Father and the Son.

24.—*What was necessary in order to remedy this imperfection?*



It was necessary that the Body which had come forth, and which is the example that illustrates "*the Way*," should be "made perfect" by *ascending to the Father*, in the twinkling of an eye.

25.—*Are the ascent and the assumption of Jesus the same?*

No; they occurred forty days apart. The assumption of Jesus was the *taking of him up* into heaven, where he now is.—(Acts i, 11.)

26.—*What did the crucified body become on its instantaneous ascent to the Father, on the third day?*

It became "the last Adam for a spirit-imparting life."—(1 Cor. xv, 45.) He was "made both Lord and Christ."—(Acts ii, 36.) He became "the Lord from heaven."—(1 Cor. xv, 47.) "The Lord the Spirit"—(2 Cor. iii, 17); and "the exact likeness of the Father's substance."—(Heb. i, 3.)

27.—*What is it to be "clothed upon with the house which is from heaven?"*

To be "swallowed up of life."

28.—*At what time does the swallowing-up of life occur?*

After the coming forth of the earthy body from the grave, and after it has subsequently passed the scrutiny of the judgment.

29.—*What does Paul say it is that, after coming forth from the grave, is swallowed up of life?*

"THE MORTAL"—*το θνητον*, *to thnēton*: his words are, "that *the Mortal* might be swallowed up of life"—(2 Cor. v, 4.)

30.—*By what other form of sound words does he express the same thing?*

By the words in 1 Cor. xv, 53, "*this corruptible must put on incorruption*, and *THIS MORTAL (to thnēton touto) must put on immortality*:" incorruption and immortality are vestments to be put on to a corruptible and mortal thing.

31.—*What is "the mortal" and "the corruptible" he refers to in these texts?*

It is not to dust and ashes in the grave, for they are neither corruptible nor mortal. He refers to what he plainly expresses in Rom. viii, 11, where he says "The Spirit of Him who raised the Christ from the dead, shall also *quicken your mortal bodies*:" *τα θνητα σωματα, ta thnēta sōmata*. Dust and ashes resulting from decomposition, are not mortal bodies.

32.—*Has the aforesaid promise to the saints in Rome, of quickening their mortal bodies, ever been fulfilled?*

Instead of their mortal bodies having been "*quickenened*," they paid the debt of nature, and have been dead ever since.

33.—*Where are the mortal bodies of the saints to whom Paul wrote?*

There are no such bodies in existence, upon the earth or under it. The mortal bodies to whom Paul wrote are now *no bodies*, and nowhere. There is nothing left of them but dust and ashes, and their record written in the Lamb's book of life.—(Mal. iii, 16; Rev. xxi, 27)

34.—*Hath the promise failed, then? if not, what must ensue to make its fulfilment possible?*

The Roman saints must be recreated from the dust, and come forth with the same kind of bodies that were laid in the grave, namely, with earthy bodies. Being earthy bodies as they were when Paul wrote to them, that part of their number which, at the judgment-seat of Christ (see Rom. xiv, 10, 12; 2 Cor. v, 10,) in the account rendered, shall be able to make it appear that they have "walked after the Spirit," will be "quickened;" but those of them who have "lived after the flesh," (and many we know do this, who profess to be saints,) will remain earthy bodies, as they came forth, and "die" a second time, and "reap corruption of the flesh."—(Rom. viii, 13; Gal. vi, 8.)

35.—*What is it for a living, earthy body to be "quickened"?*

It is for "the life of Jesus to be made manifest in our mortal flesh."—(2 Cor. iv, 10, 11.) That is, for those saints "who are alive and remain for the presence of the Lord, to be changed in a moment."—(1 Cor. xv, 51, 52; 1 Thess. iv, 16.) It is a change of body, nature, or substance, by the transforming power of Spirit, which makes the earthy, living body so intensely viviscent, that all its earthy properties are "swallowed up," or obliterated; in other words, its *earthiness* is superseded by incorruptible, glorious, powerful, and deathless consolidated spirit. This being the result of the energy of Christ, "who is our life," "the Lord from heaven," the body into which the earthy body is *transformed by quickening*, is styled "the house which is from heaven."

36.—*Seeing that Jesus came forth from among the dead, why is he styled "the Second Man, the Lord from heaven"?*

The earthy body that came forth from the tomb, was not "the Lord from heaven." The Lord from heaven was the Father, by whose Spirit the earthy body was *anointed* with incorruption, power and deathlessness, in its instantaneous transformation or ascent into the Divine Nature; and by which it was "made Lord and Christ."

37.—*What relation did the first man sustain to mortality and immortality?*

That of a *candidate* for the one or the other. If obedient to the law, he would obtain *the right* to eat of the tree of life, and live for ever.—(Gen. iii, 22; Rev. xxii, 14). If disobedient, he would incur *the penalty* of the law, which consigned him to the dust from which he was taken.—(Gen. ii, 17; iii, 19.)

38.—*Having come under the penalty of the law, when did it begin to take effect?*

After he had given account of himself at the judgment which sat upon his case, and sentence of *death* was pronounced upon him.

39.—*What is DEATH?*

The cessation of the life of an earthy body.

40.—*What is CORRUPTION?*

The returning of a lifeless earthy body to its primeval dust.

41.—*If the first man by obedience had obtained a "right" to immortality, when would he have realized "the gift"?*

After giving account of himself at the tribunal of the Life-giver, and

receiving permission to eat of the tree of Lives.

42.—*What effect would the eating from the tree of life have produced upon his earthy body?*

The effect produced by *quickenings*, has already been stated in answer to Question 35.

43.—*Does this order of things, in regard to the first man, vary in relation to his posterity who may hereafter be re-created from the dust?*

Not in the least. They come forth earthy bodies; they then appear at the judgment seat of the Spirit; they there give an account of themselves to Christ, who, according to the account rendered, sentences them to life, or condemns them to "fiery indignation" (Heb. x. 27), death, and corruption.

44.—*What follows the pronouncement of the sentences according to the verdicts rendered?*

The *execution* of the sentences pronounced. The righteous saints have "the Father's Name written upon their foreheads" in being quickened (Rev. iii, 12; xiv, 1); the others continue bound hand and foot in their primeval earthiness, are exiled from the King's presence, and driven into the darkness of the outer Babylonish world, then still subject to "the Devil and his angels,"—(Matt. xxv, 30, 41; xxii. 13); where, in the judgments by which the Beast, False Prophet, kings of the earth and their armies, are destroyed, they are subjected to the punishments decreed, and which end in the corruption of "THE SECOND DEATH."—(Rev. xix, 19, 20; xx. 15.)

45.—*But if a man believe the gospel of the kingdom of the Deity and Name of Jesus Christ, and upon this belief have been duly immersed, is he not "IN CHRIST JESUS," and therefore free from all liability to condemnation?*

Such a person is, without question, "*in Christ Jesus*;" and, on being introduced into him, the sinner, who *out of Christ* is "*condemned already*" (John iii. 18), passes from that condemnation, and comes under the sentence to "*justification of life*"—(Rom. v, 18; viii. 1.) Being "*purged from his old sins*" (2 Pet. i. 9), he is no longer liable to punishment *on their account*; he has "*passed from death unto life*," in the sense of having obtained a "*right to eat of the tree of life, and to enter through the gates into the city*,"—(Rev. xxii. 14.) But Paul teaches that this right may be forfeited by saints; and that persons in Christ Jesus will be condemned if they walk after the flesh; for, in writing to saints, he says, "*If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die*."—(Rom. viii. 13.)

46.—*But does not Paul say that "there is now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus?" How, then, can there be condemnation to any such in a judgment?*

Such quotation, as used in this question, is "*handling the word of God deceitfully*," and making the apostle stultify himself. When the whole verse is quoted, it is seen to contain two statements: *first*, that there is no

condemnation to them in Christ Jesus *who walk after the Spirit*; and, *second*, that there is condemnation to them in Christ Jesus *who walk after the flesh*.—(Rom. viii. 1.)

47.—*What is to be understood by Rom. xiv, 10, in connection with 2 Cor. v, 10, in reference to the judgment-seat of Christ?*

In Rom. xiv, 10, the apostle says to the saints, including himself, "We must all *stand before* the judgment-seat (*βημα, bema*, not *θρονος, thronos*) of Christ." If it be asked, what are they to stand there for? he answers in 2 Cor. v, 10, saying, "For it is necessary that we all be *made manifest* before the judgment-seat of Christ." They stand there to be made manifest; that is, for it there to be made known whether in their former life they "walked after the flesh" or "walked after the Spirit."

48.—*How is this manifestation to be made?*

"Whatsoever doth make manifest is light,"—(Eph. v, 13.) The light which manifests character at the tribunal, is the account which every one will give of himself; for, says Paul, "Every tongue shall confess to the Deity,—every one of us shall give account of himself to Him."—(Rom. xiv, 11, 12.)

49.—*Why are the respective classes of character to be made manifest before the judgment-seat of Christ?*

"That every one may receive things according to what he has done, whether good or bad."—(2 Cor. v, 10.)

50.—*Through what medium are the things to be received?*

"Through the body," *δια του σωματος, dia tou somatos*,—(2 Cor. v, 10): the man who hath done well, will receive "glory, honour, incorruptibility, and life eternal;" but he that hath done bad, will remain an earthy body, and through it receive "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish." Thus, "the Deity renders to every man according to his deeds."—(Rom. ii, 6-9.)

51.—*What is to be understood by "the Deity justified by the Spirit," in 1 Tim. iii, 16?*

To be "*justified by Spirit*" is the second item of the "GREAT MYSTERY OF GODLINESS." The flesh in or through which the Deity was manifested was, for the brief space of thirty-three years, *inferior* to the angelic nature, which is Spirit. It had been "*purified*" by the sprinkling of its own blood on the cross; it came forth from the tomb an earthy body, which, in order to become Spirit, and so "*equal to the angels*," had to be "*justified*," rectified, "*made perfect*," or quickened, "*by Spirit*." (See answer to No. 35.) The flesh of manifestation, justified by Spirit, is styled by Paul in Rom. i, 4, *πνευμα ἁγιωσύνης, pneuma hagiouunes*, "Spirit of holiness," or spirit-nature, which is essentially holy. The Jesus-Body was "*justified by spirit*" on being *raised* from the earthy nature to the Divine, by *ascending* to the Father on the third day (see answers to Nos. 24, 25, 26, 22; Heb. ii, 7, 9;) and, forty days afterwards, was received up again in glory.—(1 Tim. iii. 16; John xvii, 5; iii, 13.)

**THE GOOD CONFESSION,**  
**ELABORATED IN A CONVERSATION BETWEEN A BROTHER AND**  
**A STRANGER APPLYING FOR IMMERSION.**

A CORRESPONDENT writes in something like the following strain: "I see by the *Ambassador* that it is customary among you to require a confession of faith, before you will baptise anybody applying for immersion. Now this seems to me to be contrary to New Testament example. There do not appear to have been long conversations in apostolic days before obedience. If a man professed his belief in Jesus as the Christ and the Son of God, in so many words, it seems to have been sufficient, without the ordeal of examination that seems to be in vogue among the Christadelphians. I should like to know what you have to say in defence of this practice. It seems to me you have no right to examine a man who wishes to be baptised, after he has once professed his faith in Christ."

ANSWER.—The real question upon which the objection urged by our correspondent hinges, is—Is it necessary that a man should believe the truth of the gospel (summarised as "the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ") before he is immersed? If it is, and we don't suppose our correspondent will demur to the proposition—then it must be necessary to ascertain whether this belief exists on the part of anyone applying, and whatever process may be necessary to this end, is legitimate. It is a mistake to draw a parallel between the apostolic era and our own time, as to the particular method of procedure to be observed toward those desiring baptism. The circumstances are so totally different as to preclude a comparison. The apostles came on the ground

with a fresh, and (among those receiving it) uncontested doctrine concerning Christ. There was a direct issue between them, and all who opposed them. The question was one upon which a wide and palpable difference existed, and which led to widespread agitation. The apostles proclaimed that Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ on the strength of his having risen, of which they declared themselves the personal witnesses; the enemy contended that Jesus of Nazareth was an impostor—that his alleged resurrection was a contrivance by which his dead body had been stolen. There was no middle ground in such a controversy. A man was either a friend or an enemy. If he was a friend, few words were needed to define his position, because the simple statement that he believed Jesus to be the Christ, the Son of God, covered all the ground occupied by "the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ."

But the case stands very differently when all men (nominally believing in Christ) associate with their historical belief, doctrines incompatible with and subversive of the scheme of truth with which the name of Christ was, without question or the possibility of mistake, identified in apostolic days. It ceases to be sufficient for a man to say he believes in Christ, because this statement does not bring with it the guarantee it did in apostolic times, that the doctrines embodied in Christ are received. It had ceased to be sufficient so early as the close of the apostolic era, for we find John in his old age, laying it down as a necessity to "try

the spirits, whether they were of God or men;" and insisting upon it as a duty to receive no one in fellowship who did not bring with him the truth involved in the profession of faith in Christ. These exhortations of his had reference to those professing a nominal belief in Christ. In our day, the necessity for acting on John's principle is imperative. The apostacy has held sway for centuries, and still reigns with undiminished power; and through its influence, there exists around us a state of society, in which, while so far as words go, there is universal profession of belief in Christ, there is an absolute and virulent rejection of the truth of which Christ is the centrepiece and embodiment. We must therefore dispense with mere forms and phrases, and address ourselves to the work of gauging the actual relation of things. We must find out the truth of a man's profession when he claims fellowship with us, and the genuineness of his faith when he asks to be immersed; and this now-a-days cannot be done without crucial test; for words have become so flexible, and mere phrases so current, that it is easy to practise upon ourselves and others a complete deception.

To illustrate the process as applied to those who have arrived at the stage of desiring to obey the truth, we subjoin a conversation, which, in substance, has taken place scores of times, between individuals in the position indicated in the heading of this article.

#### CONVERSATION.

1.—*So you have come to the conclusion that the Christadelphians have the truth, and that orthodoxy is wrong?* I have.

2.—*What step does this conviction lead you to desire to take?* To be immersed.

3.—*Why do you desire to be immersed?* Because it is Christ's commandment

4.—*But what do you think immersion will*

*do for you?* It will unite me to Christ. I believe it is the way appointed for men to put on the name of Christ, and obtain the remission of their sins.

5.—*Then you do not suppose you have any connection with Christ at present?* No; I consider I am in Adam in my present position, and therefore under condemnation to return to the dust for ever.

6.—*Do you suppose baptism will unite an ignorant person to Christ?* No; we must believe the truth.

7.—*Then it is not the mere act of immersion in water that does anything for us?* Oh, no; it is its connection with our belief of the truth.

9.—*But even where the truth is believed, you don't suppose there is any virtue in the water of baptism?* No; I look upon it as an act of obedience which God has appointed as the ceremony by which a believer may be united to Christ.

9.—*Yet you do not imagine that union to Christ can take place in our dispensation without this ceremony?* No; I believe whatever God appoints is essential.

10.—*The importance of such a matter you would consider to arise from the fact of God's requiring it, and not on account of any inherent quality?* Precisely so. Whatever God might appoint I should consider necessary. I believe, as Paul says, he appoints foolish things in the working out of His purposes toward men. Baptism I believe to be the way He has appointed for those who believe, to pass out of Adam into Christ; and it is for that reason that I desire to be baptised.

11.—*You use the term "believer:" what do you mean by it?* I mean a person who believes the gospel.

12.—*You are aware that orthodox bodies of religious people profess to preach and believe the gospel?* Yes.

13.—*Do you think they do so in reality?* No; I thought they did at one time.

14.—*Then the question for us to consider on the present occasion will be, what is the gospel that a man must believe to make baptism of any use to him?* Certainly, that is what I desire to come to.

15.—*To assist you in coming to it, allow me to call your attention to the gospel men and women believed in apostolic times before baptism; I suppose you would admit that to be the gospel we ought to believe in our day?* Certainly.

16.—*I refer to what is said of Paul when a prisoner in Rome, viz., that he 'preached the kingdom of God, and taught those things that concern our Lord Jesus Christ'*

(Acts xxviii, 31); and, as shewing that faith in these "things" was pre-immersional, we read in Acts viii, 12, that "when the people of Samaria believed Philip, preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, THEY WERE BAPTIZED BOTH MEN AND WOMEN." Now, do you recognize the necessity for believing "the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ" before immersion? To follow apostolic guidance, which I believe to be the only safe guide in the present day, I am bound to say I do.

17.—Then the object of our conversation this evening will be to ascertain whether you, desiring immersion, believe these things? That is what I desire to be put to the test.

18.—Do you suppose a man can believe what he does not know? Certainly not.

19.—So that the enquiry to-night will necessarily be as to the state of your knowledge? I have come here to-night with that idea.

20.—To proceed to this enquiry; you will have observed that there are two classes of "things" in the summary of the gospel given us in the apostolic record? Yes; the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ.

21.—Now suppose we take these two departments of gospel truth separately? I should think that would be the best plan.

22.—You will observe the things concerning the kingdom of God are put first? Yes, always.

23.—Let us, then, give attention first to the things of the kingdom. And first I would ask, what idea is represented to your mind by the phrase "kingdom of God?" Of course, I have been accustomed to look upon it very differently from what I do now. I used to consider that it meant the reign of God in the heart, and had no reference to the state of affairs existing among mankind. If I were asked by my former religious associates what I understood by it now, I should say that I expected God to set up a kingdom on earth, at the coming of Christ, that should destroy all other kingdoms, and last for ever.

24.—You understand the kingdom of God to mean a political institution, by which all the earth will be divinely governed, when it is established? Precisely; that is my idea: that it will be a real literal administration of divine authority in political affairs, and indeed in all matters that affect the well-

being of man and the glory of God.

25.—This idea you have formed from the reading of the Scriptures? Yes; if necessary, I could refer to portions of scripture which plainly teach it.

26.—There will be no necessity. The object of this conversation is not to try if you can demonstrate the truth, but to find out if you believe it. For once, assertion without proof will be conclusive. You may well say "for once;" for I assure you I don't find it so among my friends, who think I have gone wrong in my mind for embracing such a doctrine.

27.—Our next enquiry must turn upon the "things concerning" the kingdom of God, which, of course, can only mean the particulars about it, or the details that God has been pleased to disclose on the subject? Yes, I presume, "the things concerning" can have no other meaning.

28.—On that presumption to begin with let me ask, has the kingdom of God any relation to what God has done in the past? Do I quite understand the question?

29.—Is there any connection between what God is going to do and what he has already done? I understand the kingdom will be quite a new thing in the earth.

30.—You will understand me better, perhaps, if I ask if God has at any time in the past, in any part of the world, interfered in the affairs of men? Do you refer to his dealings with the Jews?

31.—I do? Oh yes, I believe he formed them a nation for himself, by calling Abraham and multiplying his posterity, suffering them to be enslaved in Egypt, and afterwards redeeming from the bondage of Pharaoh, and putting them through a forty years' discipline in the wilderness, and settling them in the land of promise, under laws delivered by the hand of Moses.

32.—Were the Israelites obedient to the laws thus given them? For a while they were, but afterwards they were disobedient, observing the manners and customs of the heathen nations.

33.—What was the consequence? God gave them over to great calamities of famine and war.

34.—Did these calamities destroy them? Not all at once. They were many times delivered on becoming repentant. For hundreds of years, God had patience with them, chastening and succouring them according to their condition.

35.—*What ultimately became of them?* After the rejection of Jesus, their nation was entirely broken up by the Romans, and they were scattered to every part of the globe.

36.—*While they occupied the land of Canaan as a nation, under the constitution of things delivered to them by Moses, how would you describe their kingdom?* The kingdom of Israel, wasn't it?

37.—*I mean, would you consider it was a human kingdom?* It was a kingdom composed of human beings, but I should certainly consider it a divine kingdom, seeing its laws, and origin, and kings, and people were of God.

38.—*Then it would be a kingdom of God on the earth?* Certainly; I now see your meaning. It would be that to which Jesus refers when he said to the Pharisees, "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof."

39.—*Now my question is, will the kingdom of God, to be set up at the coming of Christ, have any connection with the kingdom of God that has already existed?* Now I see. Certainly. The kingdom of God to be set up at the coming of Christ, will be the kingdom of Israel restored. I did not at first perceive your meaning.

40.—*To try you a little: how can the ancient kingdom of Israel be restored, when Paul says that the first covenant (by which of course he means the constitution of things in Israel, based upon the covenant made with them at Sinai) was to pass away as a thing that had waxed old, and for which there was no more use?* There you place me in a little difficulty [Pauses]. Let me think a moment. The prophets plainly foretel the return of the Jews from their present captivity. It cannot be that Paul would say anything inconsistent with the prophets.

41.—*No; he quotes the prophets as his authority for the statement I have referred to?* It is in Hebrews, is it not?

42.—*Yes; Heb. viii, 1-13; x, 15-17?* (Turns to the references.) Oh; I think I see it. The first constitution of things under which the Jews existed as the kingdom of God has been done away with, and will not be re-established. When they are restored, a new covenant will be made with them, "not according to the covenant," as God says by Jeremiah, "that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring

them out of the land of Egypt.

43.—*That suggests another point on which I would ask a question or two. You are aware that God made certain promises to Abraham?* Yes; I now see those promises to be the basis of the gospel.

44.—*Can you name the features or points in the promises?* That he should have all the land of Canaan for an everlasting inheritance.

45.—*Do you think that is the literal land of Canaan?* I do; because Paul, referring to Abraham coming into it, calls it "the land of promise" (Heb. xi, 9), and says he should after receive it for an inheritance.

46.—*Did Abraham receive "the land of promise"?* No: he was a stranger in it all his days; and Stephen says (Acts vii 5) that "God gave him none inheritance in it, not so much as to set his foot on;" although he promised he should get it for a possession.

47.—*Then what should you say must happen before the promise can be fulfilled?* Abraham must rise from the dead, and inherit the land of promise. Then it is, I believe, that he will be seen in the position depicted by Jesus when he speaks of many coming from the east, west, north, and south, and sitting down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of God.—(Matt. viii, 11).

48.—*What else was promised to Abraham?* According to my last answer, it would seem that resurrection and eternal life were in substance included in the promise of the land?

49.—*Doubtless; but my present question relates to what is expressed in the promises?* That all nations should be blessed in him and his seed.

50.—*You are of course aware that his seed is conjoined with him in the promise of the land as well?* Yes, I have distinctly noticed that.

51.—*Whom do you understand by "his seed"?* Well, Paul leaves me no room for a mere opinion on the subject. He says "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made, and he saith not 'And to seeds,' as of many, but as of one, and to thy seed, WHICH IS CHRIST." I am, therefore, bound to believe that the promise unites Jesus with Abraham in the assurance of a future possession of the land of Israel, and a blessing of all nations in them.

52.—*Have you observed the statement in the promise, "Thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies?"* I have.



53.—*What do you understand by it?* That Jesus should take forcible possession of the power of all who are opposed to him.

54.—*Do you see any parallel in it to the statement in Revelations: "The kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ?"* I do indeed. The statement in Revelations seems to me a very good amplification of the meaning of the pledge given to Abraham, that his seed should possess the gate of his enemies.

55.—*Can you recal any other feature in the promise to Abraham?* I cannot, for the moment.

56.—*Anything as to posterity?* Oh, yes, that his seed should become more numerous than the sand of the sea. There would seem to be an individual seed and a multitudinous seed mentioned in the promises.

57.—*No doubt it is so, just as there is an individual Christ and a multitudinous Christ, in the "one body" of his people, when perfectly made one with him at the resurrection?* But I suppose the promise that his seed should become numerous refers to the Jews in the past?

58.—*No doubt it includes them in their past increase, but it also extends as far as the promise itself is intended to reach, and we have seen that that goes into the endless future?* I can see that that must be so, so that the Jewish nation is destined to become a very numerous people.

59.—*When you consider the great multitude of them destined to be raised to inherit the kingdom under Christ, and the great increase that will take place among the Jews after the flesh, when their kingdom is restored, it follows that the promise to Abraham of an incomputable progeny, will be fulfilled in the absolute sense. This will appear in a still stronger light when we come to consider what will take place beyond the kingdom. The immediate question I wished to bring under your notice was this: When Israel was settled in the land of promise as a nation, did that settlement have its basis in the promise made to Abraham?* No; I should scarcely say it had, although God did promise that they should be released from the bondage of the Egyptians. My reason for saying so is that their settlement took place under the law that came into force by Moses, and the stability of it was made

dependent upon obedience to that law. When they were obedient, they prospered; when they disobeyed, they were driven out. This was the very bargain that was made between them and Moses. It seems to me that if it had taken place under the promises to Abraham, there would have been no such conditions, and no failure in the blessings promised.

60.—*You reason rightly in the matter, and I should like to call your attention to the exact coincidence between your reasoning and that of Paul in Gal. iii. Paul says "If the inheritance be of the law, then it is no more of promise, BUT GOD GAVE IT TO ABRAHAM BY PROMISE." You perceive how completely this proves that the promises to Abraham are to be fulfilled in the kingdom of God?* Of that I have not now the slightest doubt. I have noticed that Paul says the gospel was preached unto Abraham, and I can see with the new view I have received of the gospel, how the promises made to Abraham are in reality the very gospel preached by Christ and the apostles, only in a more condensed form.

61.—*Before going further, I would call your attention to another promise—another covenant in fact—which has a bearing upon the kingdom whose establishment we are considering. You have noticed in the New Testament the statement, occurring several times, that Jesus is to sit on the throne of his father David?* I have; and before I heard of the Christadelphians, I never could understand it.

62.—*Have you noticed any connection between this statement, and any covenant that God ever made with anybody?* I have noticed that Peter says God swore to David with an oath that of the fruit of his loins according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ, to sit upon his throne.

63.—*Are you aware of any covenant to that effect having been made with David?* Yes, I read of it in the history of David, and several times in the Psalms.

64.—*What do you understand it to mean?* Why, that David was to have a descendant who should be Son of God, and who should occupy David's throne for ever.

65.—*That descendant you understand to be Jesus Christ?* Yes, it is so declared, and I believe it.

66.—*Then what idea is represented to your mind by the proposition that Jesus is to sit on David's throne?* The idea expressed by the words: I can give no better answer. Perhaps I don't understand what

you mean.

67.—*You are aware that orthodox teachers explain it to signify the position Christ now occupies at the right hand of God?* Yes, I am aware of that; but I no longer receive that view. I understand that Jesus will occupy the throne of David in a literal sense.

68.—*You don't, of course, suppose that the veritable seat, called a throne, upon which David used to sit, will be occupied by Jesus?* No; I don't understand the word throne, when used in the political sense, to apply to a bench or seat of any kind, but to the royal position. I believe, as applied to Jesus, that the phrase throne of David, has the same meaning that I find it has in other parts of scripture, where it is said that Solomon sat on the throne of his father David. They did not use the same seat, but they occupied the same position.

69.—*Then you expect Jesus to occupy the same position as David occupied?* I do.

70.—*What position was that?* King of the Jews.

71.—*Was he king for himself or by his own appointing?* No; he was king for God's nation, and was appointed to that position by God.

72.—*You are aware of the present position of the kingdom of David?* Yes; it can scarcely be said to exist. The land, of course, is there, and the nation exists in a state of dispersion; but there is no kingdom.

73.—*Then what do you consider must happen before Jesus can sit on the throne of David?* I consider that in the first place, Jesus must return from heaven and appear on earth, and take possession of the power that belongs to him as a king. Then, there must be a restoration of the Jews, and a re-organization of the ancient kingdom in the land, which we are told will be reclaimed from the desolations of many generations, and made like the garden of the Lord. Indeed, I don't know that I can express it in better language than that which says: "I will return and build again the tabernacle of David that is fallen down, and close up the breaches thereof, and build it again as it was in the days of old."—(Amos ix, 11.)

74.—*You consider then, that the setting up of the kingdom of God on earth, of which you spoke to commence with, will be the re-setting up of the kingdom that God had before?* Precisely, that is my idea, but of course, as you pointed out,

under a new and different order of things.

75.—*Can there be any kingdom of God, then, without the restoration of the Jews?* It is not for me to say what God can or cannot do, but it is quite certain that the kingdom he has promised cannot become a fact in the earth without the restoration of the kingdom again to Israel; for that is the kingdom promised.

76.—*Will Jesus be no more than David was?* Well, the Son in this case, I believe, is greater than his Father, as is shown by the Psalm which Jesus quoted to the Pharisees: David, in spirit, called him Lord.

77.—*But I mean with regard to the office which he will exercise in the kingdom when established?* Well, David was simply a king. I believe Jesus will be a priest as well as a king; that he will be at the head of the religion of the whole world, and officiate between God and the nation of Israel.

78.—*Will his exercise of the priesthood require the offering of sacrifice?* Well, he is a priest now, and has offered the one great sacrifice in his own death.

79.—*I will come to that presently; my question relates to the seat of things that will exist when the kingdom of David is restored?* With regard to Israel and the nations of the earth you mean?

80.—*Yes?* I believe the sacrifice of animals will be reinstated. This is plainly taught by the prophets. It seems a little incongruous with the fact that Christ has accomplished the one great sacrifice, but I have no doubt it will serve a wise end.

81.—*What will be the object of Christ's rule in Israel?* To bless them, I suppose, in everything, to give them good laws, to enlighten them, to teach them the truth, and bring them nearer to God, and make them fit for eternal life.

82.—*What will be the relation between the restored kingdom of Israel and the other nations of the earth?* I don't think I quite comprehend your meaning; as I take it, there will be no other power in the earth.

83.—*That was the point I wished to bring out: do you suppose the kingdoms of the Gentiles will continue to exist after the kingdom of Israel is restored?* Oh no. I believe they will all be destroyed by Christ at his coming, and that the nations of the whole earth will be under the government of Christ.

84.—*Where will be the seat of this government?* I believe in Jerusalem, from

which we are told the law is to go forth to all nations.

85.—*How will the world be governed by the King of the Jews?* We are told that his people will reign with him. Therefore, I conclude, he will send out his people as governors in all the earth, to rule them, judge among them, enlighten them as to his law and the truth, and generally to bless them with the benefits of the kingdom of God established in Palestine. In this sense I can see that the kingdom of God will fill all the earth, while in one sense located in the land of promise.

86.—*Are you aware of any law with reference to Jerusalem that will come into force?* Yes; I read that the nations will go yearly to Jerusalem to worship.

87.—*In what condition of nature do you suppose Christ's people will be when thus ruling the world with him?* I believe they will be in the same condition as himself: immortal.

88.—*Who are Christ's people?* All, in every age, who believe the promises, and are obedient to the commandments of God?

89.—*As the majority of them are dead, what must occur before they can be installed into the position you have described?* They must be raised from the dead and glorified.

90.—*What part do you desire to have in the kingdom?* I hope to be accepted by Christ as one of his people, and to share with all the rest, the glory and honour of his position as king and priest of the whole world.

91.—*What will be the condition of Israel and the nations ruled?* I believe they will be mortal and subject to death as we are now, only that life will be longer.

92.—*How long will this state of things continue?* A thousand years

93.—*Then the kingdom of God is only to last a thousand years?* It is testified that the saints will live and reign with Christ a thousand years.

94.—*Then is it so that our salvation will only last a thousand years?* Oh no; it will last for ever. The kingdom will have no end; only the state of things that you asked me about—the ruling of mortal nations on earth—will come to an end after a thousand years have rolled past.

95.—*Then what will be after the thousand years?* There will be no more death, and no more curse. All things on earth will be new. Christ's mission to take away the sin of the world and its

consequences will be accomplished.

96.—*How will this change be brought about?* I believe at the end of the thousand years, there will be another resurrection and judgment, and that all who are not found worthy of eternal life will be destroyed; and that all others, living and dead, will be made immortal.

97.—*Do you suppose the earth will then be destroyed?* No; it would be strange if it were destroyed just as its redemption is complete. It may be changed in some respects to adapt its condition to the new kind of inhabitants that will thereafter occupy it, but that it will ever be destroyed, I do not believe. I believe it is appointed the eternal dwelling-place of the redeemed of our race.

98.—*These then are the things concerning the kingdom, which you will observe, have mainly to do with the second coming of Jesus?* So I clearly perceive.

99.—*We have now to deal with the second part of the apostolic summary of the gospel: THE THINGS CONCERNING THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST, and these, we shall find, have mainly to do with the first coming of Christ. You have observed the statement that there is NONE OTHER NAME given under heaven among men whereby we might be saved? I have.*

100.—*This you believe?* I do.

101.—*None other name than what?* Than Jesus.

102.—*Then Jesus is a name given to us as a means of salvation?* Obviously.

103.—*That is Jesus as a person—as a reality—not as a mere word to pronounce?* Quite so. The name of Jesus clearly stands for Jesus himself.

104.—*That is shewn by the fact that what in one place is worded "the things concerning the name of Jesus," is, in another place, worded "those things that concern our Lord Jesus Christ." So that you will perceive that the things concerning the name of Christ are, in plain terms, those things that concern the Lord Jesus in his manifestation, as a means of our salvation. I see that quite clearly.*

105.—*Then the way being thus paved, let me ask, for what purpose did Christ come the first time?* He came to take away sin.

106.—*How did there come to be sin for him to take away?* Through the disobe-

dience of our first parents in the garden of Eden.

107.—The “*things of the name,*” you see, begin a long way back? So I see.

108.—*What was the consequence of Adam’s disobedience?* Death.

109.—*What do you mean by death?* Dissolution of being.

110.—*What was the nature of Adam’s being?* I believe he was formed from the dust of the ground, and made alive by the breath of life that comes from God.

111.—*Then you don’t consider he was immortal?* We don’t know what he might have been if he had been obedient, but after disobedience, he certainly was not immortal but mortal.

112.—*Then you no longer believe in the immortality of the soul?* Certainly not. I consider that it is the beginning of nearly all the error that exists.

113.—*You consider that death destroys a man?* I do, for the time being, that is until he is raised from the dead, if he ever is raised.

114.—*You do not believe he is conscious in any sense in death?* I do not.

115.—*You have discarded the idea that when a man dies, he goes to heaven or hell?* Quite.

116.—*This mortal state you say came through sin?* So the scriptures inform us, and I believe them.

117.—*Have you considered Paul’s statement that the devil has the power of death:* (Heb. ii, 14)? I have.

118.—*And that Jesus was manifested in the flesh and blood to destroy him through death?* I have.

119.—*And also John’s statement that for this purpose the Son of God was manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil?* I have considered that also.

120.—*What do you think is meant by the devil in those places?* I believe it means sin in the flesh.

121.—*Do you believe in the existence of a personal supernatural devil?* I do not.

122.—*You are aware that the word devil is applied in a personal sense in the New Testament?* I am. I have considered the matter thoroughly, and am persuaded that all its uses come within my first answer, so far as the origin of the word is concerned. I believe in human devils, political devils, disease devils, but I do not believe in supernatural devils. I believe the great devil of all, the source of all other evil, is the principle of disobedience embodied in the present evil

world. I find no other devil in the bible, and I believe in none else. This devil Jesus came to destroy by death. He did it, and the human race will reap the fruits by and bye, even as Jesus himself now reaps it.

123.—*How do we suffer the consequences of Adam’s transgression?* Because that punishment was a physical one, inhering in his flesh, and we, as his descendants, necessarily inherit the qualities of his nature.

124.—*Are you aware of any other reason why death reigns over us?* I suppose you refer to our individual sins?

125.—*I do. You perceive that we are all transgressors from the womb?* Yes: I believe all have sinned, and are, therefore, as Paul would give us to understand, under the curse of death for our own sins, as well as through connection with Adam.

126.—*Under these circumstances, how can we escape from death?* Christ has opened a way for our deliverance by death and resurrection.

127.—*That we may understand the matter, let me ask who was Christ?* The Son of God.

128.—*What do you intend to express by that answer?* I derive my idea on the subject from the words of the angel to Mary, in which his birth was announced: “The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the highest shall come upon thee. Therefore, also shall that holy thing that shall be born of thee be called the Son of God.”

129.—*Then you mean to say that Jesus was the Son of God in the sense of owing his begetting to the operation of the power of God upon his mother Mary?* That is what I mean.

130.—*You do not believe Joseph, Mary’s husband, to have been his father?* I do not.

131.—*You are aware of the orthodox view that he was Son of God from all eternity, pre-existing for ever as one of three Gods existing in one?* Yes, but I have come to see that it is a false view.

132.—*You do not believe he existed before he was begotten?* I do not. I believe his existence as the Son of God dates from his birth of Mary. The passages that appear to teach his pre-existence I believe to arise from the fact that the Father spoke through him in the days of his flesh, and spoke in parable of the mystery of his origin, and the purpose of which Jesus was the Father’s manifestation.

133.—*You no longer believe in the Trinity? I do not.*

134.—*You believe in one God? Yes, the Father, of whom are all things.*

135.—*And in Jesus his son? Yes, whom he has created by his spirit.*

136.—*And in the spirit from whose presence we cannot flee? Yes, I believe the spirit to be everywhere present, and that by this the Father sees, and hears, and knows all things, and through it, when he wills, impels men to speak his mind as in the case of prophets and apostles.*

137.—*You do not believe the spirit to be a separate personal God? Discarding the Trinity, I do not. I believe in only one great Increate Personality, and that is the Eternal Father. The spirit is his power, and His son, the mediator, whom he hath appointed between himself and us.*

138.—*Though believing Jesus to be the son of God, you do not deny that he was a man? By no means. I believe him to have been bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. I believe that he was a partaker of flesh and blood through Mary, that he was made in all things like to ourselves, and tempted in all points like to his brethren. I could not conceive of his being our saviour unless he had been a man.*

139.—*Why? Because he could not have suffered the condemnation due to human nature unless he had been human nature under condemnation.*

140.—*Could we not suffer the condemnation due to ourselves, then? Yes, but in that case, being sinners, we could not have escaped it. We could not have risen again. We must have perished.*

141.—*Then was Jesus no sinner? No, He was holy, harmless, and undefiled, separate from sinners. Though tempted in all points like unto ourselves, he was without sin. He never transgressed. Being the son of God, he was enabled to continue from the beginning in the path of obedience.*

142.—*And yet he died? Yes, but not for himself. He died for us. God laid upon him the iniquity of us all.*

143.—*Did he continue in death? No, God raised him from the dead, because he could not suffer an holy one to see corruption.*

144.—*Did he continue, after his resurrection, in the mortal nature he had before his death? No, God exalted him and glorified him, changing him from a natural body to a spiritual body, so that he became "the Lord, the Spirit."*

145.—*Did he remain on the earth?*

No, he ascended to heaven, and is now in the presence of God.

146.—*What is his function there? To act as high priest and mediator between God and man.*

147.—*Is he a mediator for all the world? All the world are at liberty to avail themselves of his mediatorship, but actually he is not a priest for all the world, but only for his own people who are styled "his own house."*

148.—*Who are his own people? Those who believe the gospel and have been baptized, and are continuing in the path of obedience to his commandments.*

149.—*What is the object of his intercession? That the sins of his household may be forgiven and their prayers may be accepted.*

150.—*Is any worship acceptable that does not come through him? No, God heareth not sinners, and all are sinners that are not covered with his name.*

151.—*Are all who take on the name of Christ by belief of the truth and baptism destined to be saved? No, only those who are faithful and bring forth fruits unto eternal life. Some walk after the flesh, and some after the spirit.*

152.—*How will the two classes be dealt with? Those who are pronounced acceptable will receive eternal life and be made to inherit the kingdom of God, and those who are found unfaithful will be rejected and given over to destruction.*

153.—*When will these decisions be enforced? At the coming of Christ. He will gather together his household to judge them, and to give to every man according to what he hath done, whether good or bad.*

154.—*When you say that, do you mean to include the dead? Certainly. It is testified that he will judge both the living and the dead.*

155.—*Then it is your belief that all amenable to his judgment, whether faithful or unfaithful, living or dead, will stand before him for judgment at his coming? That is my belief.*

156.—*Do you suppose any one will receive eternal life before judgment? I do not, for that would be to supersede the judgment.*

157.—*Then in what state do you suppose those will be who stand before him at that time? In a neutral state, I should say.*

158.—*Mortal or immortal? Mortal, I should say, so far as you can say a person is mortal whose fate is undecided.*

159.—*I mean what order of nature—*

"natural" or spiritual? Natural, certainly, for if they were spiritual, the rejected could not die, and the accepted would already be judged.

160.—*Then you do not accept a common idea that the resurrected will come forth from the grave in an immortal state? I do not.*

161.—*Coming back to the present bearing of the christian calling, have you realized the position to which a man is introduced by baptism? In what respect?*

162.—*As to his duty in this life? I think I have. I understand that a man or woman become Christ's, and cease to be any longer their own, and are bound to place upon him their chief affections as Christ's servants. It is their duty to spread a knowledge of the truth by every means in their power, to regulate their lives in conformity with his precepts, to obey him in all things, to do good to all, especially to those of the household of faith.*

163.—*How do we get the benefit of Christ's priestly office? I understand we get it by connection with him.*

164.—*You do not quite understand me. Suppose a believer falls into sin and repents not, and approaches not God in prayer, but abandons himself to heedlessness, do you think such a man will receive the benefits of Christ's priestly office? No.*

165.—*What would be necessary for him to do? To confess his sin in prayer to God and ask forgiveness through Christ.*

166.—*Do not all believers come short and offend more or less? Yes, I believe they do.*

167.—*What is their resort for remedy? Prayer and confession through Christ, whose blood cleanseth from all sin.*

168.—*Is there no other subject of prayer? Yes; we ought to pray always giving thanks for benefits enjoyed, making request for such things as we require, doing homage to the greatness of God, and praying for the fulfilment of his promises?*

169.—*Has Christ left any commandment for the assembling of his people? Yes; in the appointment of breaking of bread in remembrance of him, he has enjoined a periodical assembly of those who love him, that he may be brought to their recollection, and that they may be mutually exercised and strengthened in things pertaining to their most holy faith.*

170.—*How often should they meet for such a purpose? Following the example of the early christians, I believe they ought to meet once a week, and that on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday.*

171.—*Should they on such occasions fellowship those who deny the truth or who walk disobediently in their daily life? No; I believe they should have no fellowship with those who either reject the truth, or behave in opposition to the commandments of Christ.*

172.—*Have you counted the cost, and are you prepared to become a Christadelphian, or brother of Christ? Yes.*

## WERE THERE HUMAN BEINGS ON THE EARTH BEFORE ADAM?

A SISTER wants to know how the idea apparently entertained by some, that there were races of men on the earth before the creation of Adam, can be reconciled with the account in Genesis; that previous to that time, "the earth was without form, and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep." The answer is, the two things cannot be reconciled. It is evident that prior to the six days re-arrangement of things, the earth was submerged in water and enveloped in vapour so thick that darkness prevailed; and of course human life, or any other kind of life, (for even aquatic life requires the sun) was impossible. The differences of race now existing, are without doubt, owing to differences of circumstances and climate, operating upon scattered families. We all know the change that comes with education and a change of country. A red Indian, brought to this country as a child, and brought up in the

ways of civilisation, turns out a very different being from what he would in his native wilds. An English child, brought up in the woods of America, getting subsistence by fishing and hunting, will develop very differently from a member of the same family, living indoors and devoting himself to study, in the mild and humid climate of England. The one will become swarthy, tough, tall, strong, bony, angular and bluff, while the other will stop at middle size, attain but a moderate degree of physical strength, grow light-complexioned, smooth-featured, plump, full-brained and refined. This process continued in the line of posterity for centuries, would show apparently two distinct races of men; especially if the hunting family shifted to the tropics. Now such changes as these took place in the commencement of man's career. The human family has radiated from the east, as is shown by

course of history and civilisation, and by the architectural traces of his path. Forced asunder by the confusion of tongues, families migrated in primeval times, according to taste and necessity; and acted upon by the dissimilar circumstances to which they were severally exposed, they soon presented through all the earth, those diversities of colour and shape that now constitute the basis of natural divisions. To suggest a difference of origin, on the ground of difference of type, is to ignore the operation of this law, and to construct a theory both without logical foundation, and in opposition to the scriptural record that "God hath made of one blood all the nations of men, to dwell on the face of the earth."—(Acts xvii, 26.) There is no necessity for such a theory. The natural variations of species produced by the universal law of development according to condition, is sufficient to account for the different races of man. That the earth had a history anterior to the six days' work, is certain, from both scripture and nature. Geology proves the existence of forms of life long before the Mosaic creation; and the Bible tacitly affirms

a pre-Adamite order of things, in the words addressed to Adam and Eve "replenish (or fill again) the earth," which are the words made use of to Noah, when the world had been cleared of its antediluvian inhabitants. It is probable that the fallen angels referred to by both Peter and Jude were related to this period. The Mosaic narrative goes no farther back than the Adamic era, immediately prior to which, the world was in a state of chaos, as the result of a catastrophe akin to the Noachic deluge, but aggravated by the addition of Egyptian darkness. The human era certainly commenced no longer ago than 6,000 years. The present number of the human race is a proof of it. If the rates of increase now going on, (making due allowance for the ravages of war and catastrophe) had begun say twenty thousand years ago, as some of our scientific speculators wish to make out, there would have been a far vaster population than now exists. It is a simple question of figures. The same calculation excludes the idea of mankind having had more than one father and mother to start with.

## THE ATTACK ON THE TRUTH AT SWANSEA,

OR rather it ought to be "The Resistance to the Truth at Swansea," for the enemy there is in the position of a beleaguered garrison who will not any longer endure the attacks of the foe outside the walls. They have made a sortie upon their Christadelphian assailants. The "Rev." J. P. Barnett has led the attack, and the local press has mounted the walls and cheered the gallant captain with cap in hand, as he has dashed himself against the lines of the besieger. But it is all in vain. The lines of the besiegers are impregnable. Besides the formidable batteries of direct testimony in front, there are the invincible ranks of historical analogy, Mosaic typology, prophetic burden, doctrinal congruity, collateral necessity, moral fitness, human experience, "line upon line and precept upon precept," drawn up in the rear. The occupants of the fortress are, however, ignorant of the strength of their weapons, which are "mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds, casting down imaginations and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God." They shout in derision as if their swords were wooden. The *Cambria Daily*

*Leader*, mounted on the walls, indulges as follows:—

"The inhabitants of Swansea in particular and the public generally, are under great obligation to Mr. Barnett for exposing one of the silliest heresies which has emanated from the brains of any man, who has not passed the bounds of sanity into the regions of incoherent lunacy. The ability of a man to utter his thoughts in the language of his country, with ordinary grammatical precision, is no great feat in the present day. Mythologies and heresies of every class and hue, and every form of infidelity, have been enrobed in a language which, in many cases, has not only been readable, but, to a great extent fascinating. The mere ability to speak or write something is no guarantee of ability to reason. If Mr. Roberts ever thought that he was capable of reasoning, just because he was able to use the English language in writing and speaking, he only made that kind of mistake which agrees with the incoherencies and chaos of his notions on religious points. We could understand the consistency with itself of a system of idealism like that of Hegel, in which all objective entities would be set forth as unreal. On the other hand, we could see the coherency of a materialistic philosophy, which would ignore the authority of the Bible and the doctrine of immortality; but such a hybrid jumble of a

coarse specimen of Hegelianism, with Mormon notions about the Godhead, &c., as the theory of Mr. Roberts—if it may be called a theory at all—is not worthy to be classed with any consistent scheme of thinking, however erroneous that scheme might be. The acceptance of the Bible as a revelation by Mr. Roberts, causes all the arguments to be not only absurd, but many of them little less than blasphemous. His reference to the bible is more like Satan quoting scripture, in order to mislead the more effectually, than any attempt of respectful ignorance to find out the truth by searching the scriptures. \* \* \*

\* \* \* The absurdity of the views of Mr. Roberts respecting immortality, is set forth by Mr. Barnett in unanswerable arguments, and in eloquent language. The idea of Mr. Roberts, that the soul ceases to be at the death of the body, is just like the Pantheism of Germany, a cheerless theory to afflicted mortals. Mr. Barnett expresses the very instinct of our nature when he says, "I thank no man who tries to shake my faith in that magnificent idea—(immortality). I shrink from the possibility of extinction as one of the dreariest of all possibilities." For a man like Mr. Roberts to appear in any community in Wales, at this time of day, as the apostle of the extinction of the soul, expecting to make converts to his tissue of icy negations, full of absurdities and contradictions, uttered in the style of random assertions, without the smallest rag of evidence to cover their naked dogmatism, is one of those marvels of selfish blindness, which is found too frequently in this age of hunting after novelty, whether it be true or false, in philosophy or religion. The tendency of theological writers and speakers, in handling the bible, to say "thus saith man," especially some neological German critic, instead of "thus saith the Lord," lead congregations, and the Christian public, to expect some new feat of the human brains, rather than divine truth in its own transforming power. The vitiated taste thus created gives hearers and disciples to such apostles of rhodomontade as Mr. Roberts. By writing thus strongly we mean nothing disrespectful to Mr. Roberts as a man. We characterise his heresies. There is no condemnatory language upon them that can be too strong. They tend to render the bible a collection of absurdities. They loosen the moral sanctions which give power to the voice of conscience. They make a wreck of our hopes of a glorious immortality after death, and substitute for them a deceitful *mirage* of the imagination, as little proved by reason and scripture as it is arrogantly and dogmatically raised up. Faith in the *ipse dixit* of Mr. Roberts is demanded instead of faith in God and the bible. Any one who may wish to see a logical and scriptural exposure of the heresy of Mr. Roberts, would do well to peruse Mr. Barnett's pamphlet.

The *Swansea Journal* follows suit. It blows Mr. Barnett's praises as if it really were a judge of his performances. Newspaper editors, as a rule, are no more capable of forming an opinion on such a matter than they are of performing the impossible; and no better example of it can be found, perhaps, than the *Journal's* verdict on Mr. Barnett's pamphlet, which is as weak and flimsy, and illogical as a serious and educated man's argument on any subject could possibly be. It says—

"The last few years have witnessed the formation of a sect in this town, the members of which style themselves christadelphians, . . . . It is surprising what shallow reasoning will suffice to convince some, especially when the argument is one which the hearer wishes, or finds it to his interest to believe. . . . We welcome, therefore, with pleasure the book which the Rev. J. P. Barnett has published, in which he places these matters before the public in their true light. . . . More has been done in this pamphlet than might have been anticipated, considering its compass; but so compact and concise is the style, and so well selected and admirably put are the arguments of the rev. gentleman, that there are few points left unnoticed. Short though Mr. Barnett's reply to Mr. Roberts may be, more than enough is said to convince any candid and unprejudiced person of the falseness of much of Mr. R.'s teaching, or at least to very severely shake the reader's faith in christadelphianism. It is eminently opportune at the present moment, and cannot fail to check, to some extent, further additions to the sect, and to cause some of its members to pause and consider whether, in trusting to the doctrines taught by Mr. Roberts, they are not resting a matter of tremendous importance, affecting their eternal welfare, on foundations which are false and rotten."

These high-flown praises of the pamphlet, and fierce denunciations of the truth, will have the contrary effect from that intended; they will help the agitation which has arisen. They will call people's attention to the subject, and keep it in their minds, and pave the way for a better and more effective display on the side of the truth. If the matter were to drop where it is, doubtless, the result would be against the truth and not for the truth, but a repulse of Mr. Barnett's sortie is in preparation. The Editor is busy on a reply to the "rev." gentleman, which will appear in a short time. No argument is unanswered, no point untouched.



The battle is carried within the walls, resulting in the capture of the fortress, and the slaughter of the enemy. Particulars as to price, &c., will appear in due course. Meanwhile, the reader is furnished with the title page.

### A DEFENCE

#### OF THE FAITH PROCLAIMED IN ANCIENT TIMES

*By Jesus and the apostles, and all the prophets,  
who previously arose in Israel; a faith which was*

*submerged and lost in fable soon after the death  
of the apostles, but is now revived in*

### THE CHRISTADELPHIANS

*(or brethren of Christ), scattered throughout  
England, Scotland, Wales, the United States, and  
the British Colonies: being*

### A REJOINER

*to the published criticisms of the Rev. J. P.  
Barnett, of Swansea, (late of Birmingham), on  
"Twelve Lectures."*

## JESUS IN THE TEMPLE WITH THE DOCTORS.

*(Addressed to the Birmingham Ecclesia, Sunday Morning, April 26th.)*

BELOVED BRETHREN AND SISTERS, I shall read to you this morning a few reflections on the childhood of Jesus, and the probable conversation he had with the doctors in the temple. The materials for such a subject are very scanty; nevertheless, sufficient to suggest a few things to the reflective mind. The birth of Jesus was unlike the birth of every other child in this respect, that he was born of a pure virgin who conceived by the power of the Almighty. He was the Son of God; and a bright star in the horizon heralded an event so great and so much out of the ordinary course of things. Wise men directed by that bright orb came with their gifts and laid them at his feet. Ambassadors from heaven revealed the birth of him who though laid in a manger was destined to occupy the throne of the world; and chorused the glorious achievements he was destined to accomplish: *Glory to God in the highest, peace on earth, and goodwill toward men*

When a blasted earth shall brighten  
Underneath a bluer sphere,  
And a softer, gentler sunshine  
Shed its healing splendour here;  
When earth's barren vales shall blossom  
Putting on her robes of green,  
And a purer, fairer Eden,  
Be where only wastes have been;  
When a King in priestly glory,  
Such as earth has never known,  
Shall assume a righteous sceptre,  
Claim and wear a holy crown.

The birth of Christ not only kindled enthusiasm in the wise and joy in the pure, but it called into action the cruel and vindictive passions of a jealous tyrant. "O

my soul! come not thou into his secret; unto such company, mine honour, be not thou united;" for in his anger he slew the innocents, and in his self-will he would have slain the Christ. "Cursed be his anger, for it was fierce, and his wrath for it was cruel." Yet, God maketh the wrath of man to praise him; though this wicked prince but followed the bent of his own evil mind, yet his cruel action developed the circumstances that brought about the fulfilment of three prophetic declarations. First, (Hosca xii, 13) "Out of Egypt have I called my son." While Joseph and Mary were with the child Jesus, in Egypt, the second was fulfilled (Jer. xxxi, 15), "In Rama was there a voice heard; lamentation and weeping and great mourning, Rachel weeping for her children and would not be comforted because they were not." They were in Egypt between three and four years, when an angel appeared unto Joseph in a dream, saying, "Arise, and take the young child and his mother and go into the land of Israel, for Herod is dead;" but, on their journey, they heard that Archelaus did reign in his father's stead, and being afraid, they turned aside and went into Nazereth, a city of Galilee, that the third prophetic declaration might be fulfilled, "He shall be called a Nazerene." From his fourth to his twelfth year, all that is recorded of him is the statement of Luke in the 40th verse of the 2nd chapter of his gospel. Yet how full and comprehensive is the little summary that Luke gives of those early years of him who came not to do his own will but the will of him that sent him. We can easily understand from experience what his physical development as a child

from four years to twelve would be ; but we can not so readily understand his moral development as expressed in the "filled with wisdom." We can understand what is meant when it is stated of him that he "waxed strong in spirit." This evidently expresses the idea that his will-power, or energy, was early manifested and quickly grew, so that when a youth he was master of himself. But what shall we say of "filled with wisdom?" What an elaboration of his mental development is contained in these words. In view of the precocity, mental and physical, expressed in the brief records of his early growth, we may infer that he had heard of the mystery of his birth, and would doubtless dwell instinctively upon those passages of scripture that related to his humiliation. Hence would arise the desire to meet the leaders of the people, to hear and to ask them questions concerning the mission of the Messiah. We can picture to ourselves "the child Jesus" standing with becoming modesty in the presence of those learned teachers of the law, asking those questions upon which his developing mind would dwell, and which became the all-absorbing theme of his life.

"Do you expect a great deliverer?"

"Yes," they would answer, "of the house and lineage of David."

"Will there be anything remarkable about his birth?"

"Yes," the prophet says, "behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel."

"Will he live in obscurity and poverty, or at once assume the high position for which he is born?"

"The prophet says that he shall grow up before God as a tender plant and a root out of a dry ground. He will likely be poor at first."

"How then shall you know him?"

"Because the prophets declare that a messenger of the Lord shall go before him and make him known whom the Lord shall choose to be anointed like Samuel. He shall make no mistake, but the one whom he shall proclaim, upon him shall the spirit of God rest from that day forward ; and he shall come forth like David from obscurity and poverty. He shall destroy the god-defying hosts of the enemy, for the prophet says, 'Awake, awake, stand up, O Jerusalem which has drunk at the hand of the Lord the cup of his fury, thou hast drunken the dregs of the cup of trembling, even the dregs of the cup of my fury. Thou shalt no more drink it again, but I will put it into the hand of them that afflict thee, who have said to thy soul, 'Bow down that

we may go over (Isaiah li, 17-23), for behold I will make Jerusalem a cup of trembling unto all the people (Zech. xii, 2), and they shall be as mighty men who tread down their enemies in the mire of the streets in the battle. They shall fight because the Lord is with them, and the riders on horses shall be confounded (Zech. x, 5), for in that day, saith the Lord, I will smite every horse with astonishment and his rider with madness, for the Lord shall defend the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and he that is feeble among them at that day shall be as David, and the house of David shall be as God, as the angel of the Lord before them (Zech. xii, 4, 8). Arise and thresh, O daughter of Zion, for I will make thine horn iron, and I will make thine hoofs brass, and thou 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 (Mich. iv, 13), and the Lord shall be king over all the earth, in that day shall there be one Lord and his name one." (Zech. xiv, 9).

Then Jesus answered and said, "Is it not written, 'Rejoice, O daughter of Zion, thy king cometh unto thee, just and having salvation, lowly riding upon an ass'" (Zech. ix, 9).

Is it not written, "He shall not cry nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench?" (Isaiah xlii, 3.)

Is it not written, "He is despised and rejected of men. He is led as a lamb to the slaughter?" (Isaiah liii, 3-7).

Is it not written, "Smite the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered?" (Zech. xiii, 7.)

Is it not written, "The Messiah shall be cut off, but not for himself?" (Dan. ix, 26)

All that heard him were astonished at his understanding and answers. Be it ours, beloved brethren and sisters, to emulate the character of our Lord Jesus in the love and understanding he established towards the truth while yet a child, and be it ours also to avoid the mistake of the learned doctors who rejected him. The scribes and pharisees stumbled at the sacrificial and mediatorial character of the Messiah. The modern divines (so-called) and their followers stumble at his kingly and sacerdotal character, while even the sacrificial they do not understand. Let us take warning and avoid these two extremes, and study to show ourselves approved unto God, workmen that need not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth. W. SHELTON.

## INTELLIGENCE.

† BIRMINGHAM.—During the month, there have been two immersions, the obedient believers being WILLIAM JENNINGS, (22,) chaser, formerly Church of England; and MARY ANN WHITCOMB (38), wife of brother Whitcomb.

## THE TRUTH IN THE PETERHEAD DISTRICT.

We clip the following letter from the *Peterhead Sentinel and Buchan Journal*, of May 8. The writer is brother Hall, of Crimond. The occasion and object of the letter will appear on the reading.

## "THE REVIVAL AT THE FISHING VILLAGES.

Sir,—There are many people who contend that a newspaper is not the place for discussing religious subjects, and, in common circumstances I would agree with them. But the laws of this country are so framed, that we cannot—like the apostles of old—'go into the synagogues and reason and dispute' with the preacher, let his doctrines be what they may, without incurring the pains and penalties of fine or imprisonment. But in the present case, had the leaders of this movement wished to exhibit their light outside the walls, where the law affords no such protection, I should not now have had recourse to the press. And, as I shall only state the simple truth, I trust my 'revival' friends will not consider that I subject *them* to any bad usage, when I proclaim to the world that which they also proclaim as the means of salvation. I simply revert to their conduct and teachings in the light of that Book, which they say they believe to be the word of God, and which *only* unfolds christianity in truth. Peter exhorts the disciples to whom he writes his first letter, chap. ii, 15, to 'be ready *always* to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear; therefore I have a scriptural warrant for asking a reason of any man's hope, who professes christianity; more so to him who assumes the position of a teacher: one who calls himself a *soldier* of the cross, but who nevertheless retreats at the first fire of the enemy. If he is too proud or too ignorant, (without confessing it), to say a word in behalf of their avocations, we then rejoice in having a medium whereby we can bring them to their senses; and where they must fight for their principles, or allow them to be 'trodden under the feet of man.' We can recur to the columns of a newspaper, and have 'the liberty of the press,' when a liberty of speech is denied us. It is for those

reasons I ask the medium of your journal for the following remarks, which I hope, in this land of boasted 'christian light and liberty,' may not be considered out of place or unprofitable.

Having read in one paper that the movement in these parts was scarcely in accordance with the spirit of true Christianity; in another that it was doing a vast amount of good, many having become possessors of 'present and eternal salvation!' and thirsting after the *Word of Life*, &c.; while a third wrote in very doubtful language, I resolved on satisfying myself of how matters stood—an outline of which I shall now endeavour briefly to state. One of the leaders of the movement, knowing that I did not endorse all the wild notions of revivalism, sent me a message, which, in my simplicity, I understood as a challenge to meet the missionary. This I accepted; and, in company with a friend, I walked down on an afternoon lately to the fishing village of St. Combs, when we met our friend already mentioned, who asked us if we had got on the "armour," to which we replied in the affirmative. We were afterwards introduced to the champion—the missionary—who asked us if we were on the Lord's side, to which we again gave an answer in the affirmative. He then said we would be his brethren in the Lord, to which we replied that such was quite doubtful. He stated, with seeming reason, that if we were all on the Lord's side, we *must* be brethren. We pointed out the fact that we had as yet no other proof on either side but a bare assertion, and therefore the scriptural way was to "*try* the spirits whether they are of God; because many *false* prophets are gone out into the world"—(John iv, 1). We further pointed out the method of trying the spirit—"He that knoweth God, heareth us (the apostles and prophets); he that is not of God heareth not us. Hereby know we the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error"—(ver. 6). This was too much for our friend the missionary, and he seemed anxious for flight. But the other three on his side overruled that we should be allowed to be in their company, as they were about to try to raise a meeting in the country. We endeavoured to get a reason of their hope, but none was given; and we were willing to "contend for the faith," "in the spirit of meekness." But, finally, they got very angry, and told us we had no business to attack them in this way. We said that they were professing to be christians; and not only so, but going about teaching others, on pretence of offering them salvation; and, as they did so publicly, we had a right to satisfy ourselves whether they were competent for what they professed. And we added, that it did not look well for what they professed when they wished to keep it so veiled in dark-

ness, and were ashamed. "For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light lest his deeds should be reproved. But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God"—(John iii, 20, 21.) And we also reminded them of the saying of Jesus in Luke ix, 26, "For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him will I also be ashamed," &c.

I have heard it said that "without mystery there could be no religion." This was evidently the case with the subject before us. The men said they believed such and such things, but could not find a solitary passage in the Bible—which they professed to believe as the ground of their faith—to justify such beliefs. Moreover, they seemed to glory in their blessed ignorance, and gave us distinctly to understand that they despised knowledge. This was certainly not a thirsting after the word of life.

We went down a second evening, and listened to the missionary's oration. But, before going into this subject, allow me to say that I could have wished from my heart that I could have had to write favourably of it. I am no enemy either to revival of genuine christianity, or to these poor benighted men, although they may esteem me as their enemy, because I told them the truth, and write honestly concerning them. They may be sincere in their labours, but sincerity in an evil thing cannot constitute it good. Sincere darkness, is darkness still. Paul was as sincere a prosecutor, as a preacher, but the results were widely different; and thus, sincere ignorance is a poor substitute for knowledge. In the case of these revivalists, I can use Paul's words regarding the Jews, and say, "My heart's desire, and prayer to God for them is, that they may be saved. For I bear them record, that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge"—(Rom. x, 1, 2). That "while they attempt to teach others, they have need that one should first teach them, which be the first principles of the oracles of God,"—(Heb. v, 12). Because, in present circumstances, they are like the woman of Samaria, "Worshippers of they know not what"—(John iv, 22.) "Walking in the vanity of their minds, having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart"—(Eph. iv, 17, 18.) They seem to imagine that one solitary passage of scripture believed—without knowing anything about what it means—is quite sufficient for salvation; and, as a result, they reject all scriptural instruction. If this doctrine were correct, on what principle could we account for the wisdom and goodness of God in giving us so much of a revelation of his mind and will? Why should we be admonished to "prove all things, and hold fast

that which is good?"—(1 Thess. v, 21.) Or to "Search the scriptures,"—(John v, 39.) And why did Paul "Believe all things written in the law, and the prophets?"—(Acts xxiv, 14). And why did he declare himself to be "Pure from the blood of all men, because he had not stuned to declare unto them all the counsel of God?"—(Acts xx, 26, 27). And why did Jesus, in teaching his disciples, trouble himself and annoy his disciples, by "Beginning at Moses and all the prophets, and expound unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself?" If the revival theory were correct, that a few passages, little or none understood, were sufficient for salvation! well may we apply the words of God to Job (chap. xxxviii, 2), "Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge?"

I shall now briefly notice the kind of words and phrases by which the inhabitants of these fishing villages have obtained "present and eternal salvation." The missionary reminds one of Burns' "Holy Fair" preachers, who "speeled the holy door wi' tidings o' damnation." This was precisely the burden of his "gospel message" held forth that evening—the glad tidings of damnation! In the course of the first short address, the word "eternity" was uttered with great emphasis at least six times as often as it is mentioned in the whole scriptures; besides the phrases, "eternal ruin, eternal misery, and eternal damnation!" Such expressions as "judgment seat, judgment bar, the devil, Satan, gates of hell, everlasting burnings," were copiously used, with a liberal use of the interjections Ah! and Oh! I need scarcely mention that the expression, "born again," was abundantly used. And one of his teachings was that it did not matter what this part of scripture, or that passage might mean, all that constituted true christianity was the heart being right! It would be edifying to be informed how this could have come about without knowledge. I am glad in being able to agree with him in one expression, viz.—"That it was the duty of God's people to stand up and oppose the multitude;" but we would have believed the man's expression the more readily, had he shown this to be his principle when he met with us. He also said "they should have on the regimentals." In this I heartily concur, and would advise him to follow out his own precept, and not commence such an ignominious retreat before an enemy. If he intends entering the army of Jesus of Nazareth, a list of his outfit will be found in Eph. vi, 10-17.

In a second short address, he commenced by saying that the "Devil was rocking some of them on a downy pillow, wishing to drag them down to eternal ruin." The same sort of "good news" pervaded this and the other address, viz.—being damned; fit for eternal burnings; doomed to everlasting fire, eternal misery, eternal damnation, &c., &c. Verily

if these poor souls have been thirsting for the word of life as contained in the scriptures of truth, they got little to abate their craving. But if they desired to fill their bellies with the "husks which the swine do eat," certainly these were dealt out with no sparing hand. The revival in these fishing villages, I hesitate not to say, is not a revival of the religion of Jesus at all, but simply a blasphemous revival of superstition; an excitement caused by terrors—not of the Lord, but of human invention, and impiously called christianity. I affirm that *scripturally*, there is not a single element of the gospel message in all their preachings, nor in what they fancy they believe. They believe they are "born again." Now, it is evident, if this be true, they are no longer flesh but spirit. "That which is born of the flesh is *flesh*; and that which is born of the spirit is *spirit*"—(John iii, 6.) They believe that they are in possession of eternal life, and thus they cease to seek for "glory, honour, and immortality," that they may receive "eternal life"—(Rom. ii, 7.) They believe their warfare is accomplished without entering the service, and that they will be rewarded for obedience to a law they will neither consult for themselves, nor hear from another; and which they neither know nor wish to understand.

In hopes my pen may lead some to pause and consider, where my words cannot be heard when personally present, and craving pardon for asking so much space from you,

I am, yours truly, ARTHUR HALL.

Crimond, 6th May, 1868.

P.S.—I forgot that a fisherman triumphantly asked me why I delighted in their "revival meetings" some years ago, and despised them now. The man would not wait for an answer, but I hope he will get it now. I once attended balls, drinking companies, and revellings of many kinds, and if he thinks that my patronizing their meetings years ago is any proof that they were right, he may also prove the other meetings now mentioned to be equally so. I have renounced both, because contrary to the teachings of the Bible.—A. H.

CUMMOCK.—Brother Haining reports having rented an upper room, for the meetings of the brethren. He says they lost the same room two years ago, and since then they have been under the necessity of assembling in a private dwelling-house. The change he trusts will work to the advantage of the truth.

DEVONPORT.—Brother J. W. Moore writes on the 25th ult., that the brethren have procured a room in which to hold their meetings, in a public manner. He attributes their success in the matter to the energy of brother and sister Hayes, who visited the ecclesia during the month of April, and by whose presence brother Moore says the

brethren were much profited, refreshed, and encouraged. The new room is situated in the same locality as the former meeting place, and is, therefore, just as central, topographically, while much more accessible, and likely to challenge the attention of passers by. It is in a thoroughfare at the back of Fellowes' Place, Lower Stoke. The brethren have affixed the name "Christadelphian Meeting Room" over the door, with a statement of their hours of meeting, viz., 10 a.m., on Sunday morning, for breaking of bread, and worship, and exhortation; 2.30 p.m. for the instruction of the children; and 6.30 p.m., for the setting forth of the truth; also on Tuesday evening, at 7.30, for the reading and investigation of the scriptures. On the second Sunday after the opening of the place, the room was filled in the evening. Since then, there have been occasional visitors. Brother Moore adds that an addition to their number has taken place by the immersion of James Matheson, residing at Turn Chapel, about five miles distant, after an intelligent and scriptural profession of faith in the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ.

OLDBURY (near Birmingham).—Mr. Watton, the local preacher referred to last month, has sent in his resignation, and the consequence has been the division of the small Methodist body with whom he was connected into two bodies, the Methodist section withdrawing and those who sympathize with Mr. Watton, remaining in possession of the preaching room, which will henceforth be a Christadelphian synagogue. Our readers will probably hear more of them anon.

SCARBOROUGH.—Brother C. Walker writes, May 18, "On Sunday last, John Beever, M.D., of Nelson Villa, was immersed and added to the ecclesia in Scarborough. This fruit has resulted from your lecture at the Mechanics' Hall. I augur good results from this interesting addition. There are two or three others who are favourably impressed, whose interest also dates from your visit, and the way seems opening for future efforts as if the Lord were about to give us his blessing. Indeed, I am of opinion it comes now. May his name be exalted here and many saved. I enclose you a note of Dr. Beever's by which you will see for yourself the state of the case." In the note referred to, the Dr., referring to his study of the truth since its introduction to his notice, says, "The result of such study is to wipe out all previous ecclesiastical dogmas, and to desire, with child-like obedience, the express message of the gospel—to be immersed into the one fearful and only glorious name, that I may, as a new convert to the truth, be clothed upon with the righteousness which is alone of the obedience of faith, and as its consequence, the remission of all disaffection, and putting away all iniquity."  
\* \* \* Water seems a thing of no value—

so plentiful. Perhaps God has chosen it as nothing to bring to nought things that are, even man's foolish wisdom that no flesh should glory in his presence."

WHITBY. — Brother Shuttleworth announces the immersion of the following persons on the confession of their faith in the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ:—WILLIAM COATES (47), tailor, GEORGE TWEEDIE (28), jet worker, WILLIAM HENRY KIDSON (20), jet salesman. The last is located at Harrogate, his address being Somerset Cottage, Parliament Street. "We are about to commit to the earth (this afternoon) our beloved sister Clarkson, who died very suddenly whilst out on business on Wednesday last. It is probable a goodly number will muster to hear what is said at the funeral of a christadelphian. We shall turn it to account. In a small place like Whitby, nearly every little matter goes the town round. Our sleeping sister was one of a kind we can ill afford to lose, one who loved the brethren and the assembling and who would be present if possible when and where anything was to be said on behalf of our absent Master whose appearing she looked forward to with much joy."

WISHAW. — Brother Hodgson writes to say that the notice referred to last month, though sent to the local paper as an advertisement, was refused insertion. Consequently, the brethren have had 1,000 copies printed and circulated in placard form, along with the following questions:

"If Adam was in any sense immortal, what meaning is there in God saying 'Dust thou art and to dust thou shalt return?'—(Gen. iii, 19.)

If Abraham died, and was gathered to his people, (Gen. xxv, 8,) where were they? for they were idolators.—(Joshua xxiv, 2.)

If Job's soul chose strangling and death rather than life, (Job vii, 15,) how say you the soul never dies?

If a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast, as the one dieth, so dieth the other, (Eccles iii, 19,) why do you reject this declaration?

When God says "All souls are mine—the soul that sinneth, it shall die, (Ezek. xviii, 4, 20,) what are your reasons for contradicting this statement?

If Christ's soul and the thief's were in Paradise the same day they were crucified, reconcile this with Peter's statement in Acts ii, 27.

When Paul says (1 Tim. vi, 16,) that God *only* hath immortality, why do you believe that every man hath it?

Luther call these immortal-soul doctrines monstrous opinions, to be found in the Roman dunghill of decretals. Tyndale designates them fleshly fabrications of heathen philosophers, destructive of the doctrine of Christ. Those who teach them the Spirit through John calls merchants

of the earth, dealing in all sorts of merchandise: even the souls of men.—(Rev. xviii, 11, 13.) Paul and Peter predicted the time, when men would receive those fleshly fabrications in preference to the truth.—(2 Tim. iv, 1, 4; 1 Tim. vi, 3, 5; 2 Cor. xi, 1, 15; 2 Pet. ii, 3, 12.)

Can you believe that it is justifiable for ministers to be continually assuring their auditors that they have immortal souls—deathless spirits—indestructible souls—never dying souls—eternal souls, and souls that live eternally and die eternally at the same time: language never *once* found in scriptures, and only calculated to inflate and bewilder unenlightened hearers? Can you believe that when the Saviour said to his disciples, "because I live ye shall live also," (John xiv, 19) he did not declare that they, and *only* they, would inherit immortality and its associated honours and blessedness? Can you believe that life and consciousness of existence are *no* blessings in themselves, and that God is not to be praised for them, as every one consistently must, who holds that to have them taken for ever away, would be no loss—no punishment?"

The brethren have also published the following:

"I permit the Pope (Leo X.) to make Articles of Faith for himself and his faithful, such as the soul is the substantial form of the human body—the soul is immortal—with all those monstrous opinions to be found in the Roman dunghill of decretals; and that such as his faith is, such may be his gospel, such his disciples, and such his church."—LUTHER.

"In putting departed souls in heaven, hell and purgatory, you destroy the arguments wherewith Christ and Paul prove their resurrection. \* \* \* The true faith putteth the resurrection, which we be warned to look for every hour; the heathen philosophers together. And because the fleshly minded Pope consenteth unto the heathen doctrine, therefore he corrupteth the scriptures to establish it. \* \* \* If the souls be in heaven, tell me why they be not in as good case as the angels be?"—TYNDALE.

"God formed man out of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life.' \* \* \* 'Man having been created after this manner, it is said as a consequence, that man became a living soul; whence it may be inferred (unless we had rather take the heathen writers for our teachers respecting the nature of the soul), that man is a living being, intrinsically and properly one and individual—not compound or separable; not according to the common opinion, made up and framed of two distinct and different natures, as of soul and body, but the whole man is soul, and the soul man—that is to say, a body or substance individual, animated, sensitive and rational.'" —MILTON.—[The foregoing was held over from last month.—ED.]

## JOHN BOWES AND THE CHRISTA- DELPHIANS AT WISHAW.

### SATAN BELLIGERENT, BOASTFUL, POPULAR, BUT DEFEATED.

Bro. Hodgson writes:—The excitement which has been going on here for a considerable time past, among the various sectaries of religion in the place, in consequence of the efforts put forth from time to time, for the dissemination of the truth, has just reached what may be called a climax. Although all varieties of party agree in denouncing "Thomasism" and "Thomasites," as the most miserable system of "dogmatic and bigoted infidelity" in existence, the cudgels for our demolition have hitherto been publicly wielded only by the Methodist parson, Mr. Harrison. This he has been engaged in doing for a good while, slaying away in a most cowardly manner, characteristic of his caste. You and your readers are already aware of his miserable tactics, in firing all manner of Methodist missiles at us, from behind his trench, and refusing fair and open fight. We published in tract form, along with some questions relating to immortality, his non-acceptance of your challenge, and circulated them in large numbers among the people. This had the desired effect. Our adversaries were tormented, and gnawed their tongues with pain. But the desire to put us out of being extended to another community of comparatively considerable numbers here, namely, the adherents of John Bowes, of Dundee. This far-famed champion of debate was sent for, and the following advertisement appeared in a local paper.

"On Sunday night, (May 10) John Bowes of Dundee, will preach in the Public School: subject 'What is the Gospel that Saves? Is it the Hope of Israel as to the Kingdom?' On Monday evening, at Eight o'clock, he will lecture on 'Man's Immortal Nature, as taught in the Scriptures;' and on Tuesday evening, on 'Thomasism in general,' and reply to a paper circulated in the locality, headed 'Thoughts for Thinkers.' After each lecture, an opportunity will be afforded for questions, or for discussion, should any competent person seek it."

The Sunday evening's "preaching," at which, of course no question was allowed, was directed to prove that there were two gospels—the gospel that saves: "the blood of Christ," and the gospel of the kingdom. And then he finished up with attempting to ridicule what he was pleased to call the "Thomasite" hope of Israel. On the Monday evening, a large audience assembled, to hear his refutation of our belief in the scripture truth, that immortality is the gift

of God. We found out afterwards that his lecture was almost exclusively composed of an article published in his own *Truth Promoter* for 1851, under the title of the "Immortality of the Soul proved from the scriptures." From this he read fourteen arguments, which he took more than an hour and a half to elaborate, in the course of which, he denounced and ridiculed in the coarsest vulgarity "Christadelphians or Thomasites."

But Mr. Bowes is still full of energy and of great tact in debate, and, in his defence of the Platonic doctrine of human immortality, built up a tower of imagined strength, fortifying it with all the skill at his command, and guarding, as he thought, with his divisional forces, every avenue of approach to the great citadel. His full strength evidently was based on "the rich man and Lazarus," seeing that his confidence here was unbounded. He believes this portion of scripture to be a literal history, and *not* a parable, but assumes that in either, it is utterly irreconcilable with our views. He could afford to be quite magnanimous with his opponent, and allured him to choose his position before making his assault. He had his trusty weapon at hand, and so soon as the ground was chosen, he marched to the front with giant strides, and made a desperate rush to seize his enemy; but Mr. B. being a believer in ghosts (which is his hallucination), seized a phantom, which he proceeded to stretch upon his rack with manifest glee, screwing and torturing his victim until he arrived at a positive certainty that it was beyond the possibility of resuscitation. He seemed never to suspect that in his turn he was to be laid on the same rack: this, however, was done, and when completed, left no strength in him. He beheld his tower falling around him; and his case becoming desperate, resorted to stratagem to hide his discomfiture. The stronghold of Mr. B. was attacked, and I am persuaded he saw its impending destruction, so he called in the aid of the crowd to choke off his antagonist. The time at disposal after twenty minutes to ten o'clock, to take up the vast extent of ground he had traversed was, of course, absurdly limited, but we had to make the best we could of it. Brother Smith, of Edinburgh, immediately ascended the platform when Mr. Bowes had finished. He began by alluding to a gross misrepresentation of the Christadelphian faith, with which Mr. Bowes had begun his lecture. That gentleman had expatiated on (what he pronounced to be) the fact that we had no blood of Christ in our gospel. After Brother Smith had shown that the "blood of Christ," on its proper understanding, was an integral part of the faith, and that that and the glad tidings of the kingdom formed together the one gospel unto salvation, he referred to one or two of the passages adduced by Mr. Bowes in

support of the immortality of the soul—all the stale arguments, based on mere *inference*, which have been shewn up hundreds of times. There was not time, as I have said, to meet Mr. B. on equal terms; so the evening was finished after several of his positions were attacked and put in their proper light. But he proved himself a most unfair antagonist, taking every mean advantage of his opponent, meeting argument with bombast, throwing himself on the feelings of the audience, and always telling them how successful *he* was, and how much the reverse was his opponent.

A far larger audience assembled next evening—every corner of the building being crammed to suffocation—and the greatest excitement prevailed, a strong partisan feeling in B.'s favour predominating. The brethren who attacked the lecturer (C. Smith and W. Ellis, of Edinburgh) were received with hissing and hooting. The onslaught on the faith on this occasion was, of course, more general than the preceding night; but still the most prominent feature was man's immortality. Brother Ellis, on getting up to speak, contended that there was not in the scripture a word or an idea of immortality associated with the word "soul." Mr. B. replied with the extraordinary admission that he never said the soul was immortal, and that immortality applied only to the spirit. This statement, in view of the title of the lecture from which he read, and from what he himself said on the Monday evening, was thoroughly shuffling and dishonest, although a valuable admission for us, and it should be noted by those who follow him. But the door of escape which he tried to open was effectually closed against him; for it was shewn that the word "spirit" was applied to the lower animals, and, of course, proved too much for Mr. B., unless he inclined to take up John Wesley's ground, and say that all animal creation was immortal.

Brother Ellis, again alluding to the unequal opportunity we had of meeting the attack upon us, challenged him to public discussion on the Friday and Saturday evenings following; but this Mr. B., ever ready to meet almost any antagonist, declined. He who came specially to demolish us, would not even allow a Christadelphian, who, he pretended, was so miserably inferior to himself, the privilege of exhibiting his weakness in the presence of the people whom he wished to put on their guard! Ah! he had the "Gospel of the blessed Jesus" to preach. Yes, and he loitered in the district six days after! Failing in this attempt, we then challenged him to meet us in the pages of his *Truth Promoter*, or in those of the *Ambassador*, but this he also shirked, and endeavoured to cover his retreat by appealing to the decision of an audience of sympathizers as to the *competency* of the brethren: a mere trick, which he knew full well would

succeed. The whole affair terminated in the most ludicrous manner. Our adversaries had reckoned without their host. They evidently expected to be allowed to smash at us, without any resistance on our part. But they were mistaken; and this disgraceful retreat only gives further proof of how well they love the cowardly mode of attack which shuns fair and open contest.

I have only given you an outline of what took place. We shall continue to stir up the people; we will not let the matter drop, but will hereafter attend to Mr. B.'s rhodomontade on the subject of human immortality.—RICHARD HODGSON, Wishaw.

#### UNITED STATES.

PHILADELPHIA, Pa.—A communication, dated April 1, reaches us from this place, signed on behalf of the ecclesia, 'George Balmain, (1814, Wood-st.) Geo. T. Simpson, (906, Passyunk Avenue) and Justus R. Dull, sec. (3729, Market-st.) It is as follows:

To the Editor of the *Ambassador*.—It is presumed it will be interesting to the faithful in Christ Jesus on the other side of the Atlantic, to know that the Christadelphians in Philadelphia, are now worshipping in a very commodious hall at 725, Race-street, every first day, at half-past 10 a.m. We count twenty names in all, walking in fellowship with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ, and with one another, through the truth as relating to a belief in 'the promises,' and 'obedience of the faith,' as to the coming immortality, after the resurrection and aionian judgment. Grace, mercy and peace be with all the brethren."

QUINCEY, Ill.—Brother A. L. Sweet, writing March 4, announces the immersion of his wife, and takes occasion to make the following remarks: "If, as suggested in the March No. of the *Ambassador*, 'a Guide for Travelling Brethren and Friends of the Truth,' is published, a *Caution against Counterfeits* should also accompany the notice, for they will come in thick and fast. We have cast in our lot with 'Christadelphians,' and are willing to assist in bearing the reproach; but victimisers are so plentiful in this country, and are so zealous withal, that a caution in flaming capitals, can do no harm and might do good. Dr. Thomas's tract, *Yahweh Elohim*, ought to be in the hands of every brother and sister, who has felt, or may feel that 'good spirit,' (which would compromise the truth, and him who said 'I am the truth,' if he were here) called by the seed of the serpent 'charity coming over them, &c.' It assists wonderfully in casting out of such 'spirits.' It is the best calculated to 'strengthen the weak hands and confirm the feeble knees,' of any tract I have seen; being a very condensed and faithful exposition of the faith and practice needed in these Laodicean times in which we live."



---

## THE NEW TRACTS.

---

As a rule, a tract is 'but of little use in the work of disseminating the truth. The space is too limited for anything very convincing in the way of argument, and the mere quotation of scripture has but little effect where the veil of orthodoxy is over the eyes. Then there is a kind of antipathy to that form of literature which leads the receiver to throw listlessly aside what he may have accepted in courtesy. In everything, however, there is some good, and, it is possible, by a little contrivance, to make use of the good without the evil. Now, in the case of tracts, there is no doubt, much good might be done by them, if got up well and used wisely. The first drawback can easily be got over. Instead of relying on them for inducing conviction, let the aim be to arrest attention, by a striking presentation of the truth and a few bold strokes of logic, *inserting in each tract a reference to other works, where an interested reader may follow up the matter*, stating, of course, where they may be obtained. The second drawback will be met by getting up the tracts in a good style, on good paper, and heading each with a bold line, "CHRISTADELPHIAN TRACTS," No. so-and-so. A decent-looking tract will secure a readier attention than one that is shabby, and the head-line mentioned will always appeal to curiosity, and excite to a reading.

In the constant gratuitous distribution of such publications, the very least-gifted brother or sister could work effectively in the dissemination of the truth, and the smallness of the price would allow a pretty liberal employment of them. Some brethren may not have the time, but could find the tracts for those to distribute who have the time, but not the money. They would thus divide the labour between them. In some cases, the ecclesia could provide the tracts, and assign the work of distribution to those whose hearts inclined to the work and time admitted of it. Enterprise and co-operation can work wonders. Such a work, persevered in, could not fail to produce results. It would give scope to many a brother or sister, who now think they can do nothing for the truth.

In a case where an ecclesia is large enough, they could have their address on the tracts, which, as they will see below, they can have by ordering 250, which will cost just 5s. with the postage.

A few of the brethren in Birmingham have turned their attention to this matter' and if their efforts to provide tracts of the description mentioned be sufficiently supported, they will be able to do something effective in the way of cheapening their productions. At present, the terms are these :—

1 copy	...	...	...	...	½d.
12 copies	...	...	...	...	4d.
25 „	...	...	...	...	7d.
50 „	...	...	...	...	1s.
100 „	...	...	...	...	1s8d.

Postage at the rate of 4d. per 100. Local address printed on all orders above 250, instead of 500 as mentioned last month. Orders to the Editor.

---

# THE AMBASSADOR

## Of the Coming Age.

---

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

---

No. 49.

JULY, 1868.

Vol. V.

---

### STRONG DELUSION ;

OR, MODERN SPIRITUALISM IN THE LIGHT OF SCIENCE AND  
SCRIPTURE.

---

WE have two correspondents who are troubled to know the nature and origin of the phenomena upon which the modern and rapidly spreading system of spiritualism is based. They cannot believe in their genuineness in the face of the Bible, and yet they cannot satisfactorily explain them. One of them says :—

"I have till now been quite content to ascribe the 'manifestations' partly to cupidity, partly to deception, and, perhaps, in a measure to a kind of mental aberration under certain circumstances; but if any credence is to be given to persons of well-known character in private life, there is more *fact* than I have been wont to believe, and if what they relate be true, our doctrine of the unconscious state is not true. There are many here, though not caring to talk much on the subject, who have witnessed the rappings and moving of tables and chairs; but one person in particular with whom I have conversed, somewhat reluctantly told me how far he had gone, and what he had met with. He is a consistent professor of the orthodox belief, and a man of good general capacity. His experience just lands him in wonder and surprise, without satisfaction. He has elicited replies of various characters, by which it would seem that the *real* earth character is preserved and manifested. 'He that is holy, let him be holy still; he that is unjust, let him be unjust still,' appears to have its verification. This person, while sitting with others when a certain person was present, Cardinal Wolsey was sure to come, his name being announced by raps, when

the right letters of the alphabet were pointed to, spelling his name, and after many sittings they came to know who was coming by a peculiar motion of the table; but his communications were not at all dignified or courteous. Once he gave some information which the next post proved to be true; but he also told what was proved to be false, and generally concluded by telling my informant that he was to go to hell, and sometimes that he was to go to Rome. When asked if he could fetch anyone he liked, he said Yes, and often brought those asked for, and spelt out their names. Now these things were done without a 'medium,' through whom you may find room for many doubts, but simply take the fact that pieces of heavy furniture behave themselves in a way anything but consistent with their usual gravity, moving to many yards' distance out of the room, and there for a time being immovable, then sporting about the room. I have been invited to witness some of these things by a family who have often produced these manifestations, but I stand too much in doubt of the propriety of such things to consent, much less adopt, 'spiritualism' as a religion, which thousands are doing, especially in America. But if we cannot take the Bible as a basis for our faith and practice, what foundation can there be in the misty jargon of the new faith? They say they have visions of unearthly splendour revealed to and through their 'medium;' that the Bible is an allegory, no more inspired than, nor so much, as the utterances of their clairvoyant seers, &c., &c. Again I revert to the main inquiry; clear away all that might be deemed of doubtful character, and all the rubbish, and still there are a few startling facts left. What do they mean, and what use can be made of them?"

Another writes:—

May I ask "your opinion on what has already appeared to my mind the miracle of this age—'spiritualism.' My children are powerful mediums, whatever this word may mean. Certainly future events by the "Electric Table Telegram" are known and told; some things are misty; some apparently never did come true; others did. I copy one message, taken letter for letter, and so to words, with young children.

"TELEGRAM MESSAGE.—'I am your Christian guide and King of kings—father, mother, husband, sister, brother—I am God of the fatherless and widow, friend of dear children, and of virtuous men, and of women who love my word.—Signed, JESUS.'

"What can it be which moves the table to such a result? In passing your finger over the alphabet, it moves *strongly* at each letter, which letters give the words which constitute the sentence. If you are wrong, the indication is given, and you return to the wrong spelling. The clergy say it is the unclean spirits working miracles to deceive, under the sixth seal, with signs and lying miracles: and this is the devil which your appendix at once beholds. Can you help as many as are running about with their candles half lit, and their lamps scarcely burning. What was sorcery? Some say this is it; but the messages are so beautiful. The fruit is so good, can it come from a corrupt tree? Napoleon is, as they say, a confirmed spiritualist."

The doubts and enquiries contained in the foregoing communications, will doubtless occur to most minds, at the stage of only partial acquaintance with the subject. A close examination will dispel misgiving, and replace the Bible in the position of glorious pre-eminence from which it is sought by the system in question, to be driven. Spiritualism is a joint product of natural ignorance and religious superstition. This may be a harsh verdict; but it is justified by the evidence which we propose to submit, in the shape of an article republished from the *Herald of the Kingdom and the Age to Come*, (July number, 1852), edited by Dr. Thomas. Immortal soulism is its great parent. If men had not believed in the existence of disembodied human ghosts, they would have asked and found some other explanation of table-rapping, &c., than the one embodied in spiritualism. If there are immortal souls, it is only natural to suppose that after death, they would make some attempt to communicate with surviving relatives. Orthodoxy can make no reasonable objection to spiritualism in this aspect of the question. It is rather strange than not that deceased persons, if still alive, should make no sign after the method invented by spiritualism. Spiritualism is only orthodoxy made consistent: the one leads to the other. There would have been no spiritualism if there had been no immortal soulism; and when immortal soulism, stripped of its pretensions and exhibited in its naked deformity as a speculation of Pagan thinkers, whose wisdom Paul declares to have been foolishness with God—(1 Cor. iii, 19), spiritualism takes rank among the degrading superstitions that have marked the history of human ignorance.

Scripturally, the system is at once and for ever annihilated by the divine rule supplied to Israel for the test of all such pretenders in ancient days: "Seek not unto *wizards that peep and mutter*; should not a nation SEEK UNTO THEIR GOD? for the living to the dead? *To the law and to the testimony*, IF THEY SPEAK NOT ACCORDING TO THIS WORD, it is because there is no light in them."—(Isaiah viii, 20.) The modern "spirits," as our readers have evidence in the first of our correspondent's letters, not only speak not according to the law and the testimony, but they actually speak against them, declaring them to be a human fiction! It is as well to see the issue. The choice lies between the oracles of God, historically verified in a hundred ways, and the ambiguous nonsense decocted from inanimate furniture by the electrical fluid of the misguided people who assemble in dark chambers, to worship at the shrine of their own hearts. The fact that the majority choose the latter in preference to the former, is easily accounted for. That which appeals to the senses is easier to apprehend, and pleasanter to receive, than that which requires an act of the understanding; and when the views or lessons accompanying those appeals to sense, are in harmony with the natural likings, which the teachings of wisdom run counter to, the dead weight of natural bias is thrown into the scale, and the result is inevitable. This is the case with the question before us. The "manifestations" of spiritualism are to be seen and heard; while the Bible only sets forth a record of what has been, and what God declares shall be, leaving us to decide, by intellectual process, whether in view of the state of affairs in the world,

its historical record is true; whether, in the light of its own composition it is not worthy to be received, and whether, in view of all things, it is reasonable to put faith in the promises of God. Now with the low state of mental organisation that prevails, this is a very difficult and unrelishable task for the majority, while the other is easy and exciting. Then, the teaching of the Bible is distasteful to the fleshly mind. It places God first, obedience next, and human welfare in subordination to both. Spiritualism, on the other hand, inculcates doctrine highly agreeable to the fleshly palate. It discards God, enthrones pleasure, clears the universe for the creature, and opens a boundless prospect of progress on the democratic basis. The popularity of spiritualism is no mystery, in view of these facts.

Scientifically, spiritualism, like its mother orthodoxy, begins by begging the question. The table moves: it does not ask the cause of its motion; it affirms it is attributable to the presence of "spirits." Symptoms of intelligence are exhibited; it does not ask, as a scientific question to be pursued scientifically, what is the source of this intelligence—living brains in the "circle?" living brains elsewhere *en rapport* with the circle, through the conducting medium of the atmosphere, or any property in the apparatus? It affirms that the intelligence proceeds from disembodied spirits, presumed to enter the room at the bidding of the "medium." Everything is assumed. The whole theory is an assumption from beginning to end. The *facts*, in most cases, are undoubted; but the question is, what is the explanation of the facts? This question was proposed for discussion, some years ago, between two of the most capable of living men (one since dead) to discuss such a question, viz., Mr. Faraday, the great experimental philosopher and electrician, and Mr. Home, a leader among the spiritualists, whose name has recently been prominent in our law courts in connection with a case that has not brought him any increase of reputation. The origin and upshot of the proposal will best be learned from the following cutting from the *Morning Star*, of May 12th, 1868.

"In 1861, it seems Sir Emerson Tennent was anxious that Mr. Faraday should investigate personally, certain of the phenomena reported to have occurred in the presence of Mr. Home. Mr. Faraday had long before, as we all know, expressed his opinion on the general subject, and declared his conviction that the "phenomena" were due to involuntary muscular action. He felt a profound contempt for the whole thing, for which we are by no means inclined to blame him; and he seems to have been a little annoyed at the attempt to draw him again into what he considered ridiculous and futile investigations. It is likely that if Professor Owen were invited to lecture on and dissect Barnum's Woolly Horse, he might reply somewhat tartly; it is not improbable that Sir John Herschel would chafe at being invited gravely to investigate Parallax's theories about the shape of the earth and its relations to the planetary system. Mr. Faraday did reply, in language which was not encouraging. He prescribed certain conditions which it would have been utterly impossible for Mr. Home, whether that gentleman be the apostle of a new science, or a mere pretender and humbug, to accept. In fact, Mr. Home was invited, as a condition precedent to Faraday's entering on the investigation, to acknowledge that the

phenomena, however produced, were ridiculous and contemptible. He was also required to pledge himself to the most entire, open, and complete examination—a condition which, of course, Mr. Faraday knew quite well Mr. Home could never accept. So the gentleman who was apparently acting for Mr. Home—we believe, the late Mr. Robert Bell—declined going any further; and it does not appear that Mr. Home was particularly consulted in the matter at all. At the present moment, Mr. Tyndall offers to investigate the phenomena, but he offers to do so “in the spirit of Mr. Faraday’s letter;” and, of course, Mr. Home replies that “as such spirit not that of logic, nor according to the true scientific method,” he declines to lend any aid to the enquiry. And there the matter ends, as it always has ended and always must end.

We confess we think the scientific men look rather foolish when they get into such controversies at all. Does Mr. Tyndall really suppose there is the faintest chance of his being allowed to investigate Mr. Home’s ‘phenomena’ as he would inquire into a new astronomical or chemical discovery? If Mr. Home be not the sincere and supernaturally endowed personage he claims to be, then, of course, the idea would be out of the question. But if he be, it is hardly more reasonable. The manifestations, according to him will not take place, cannot anyhow be got to take place, under the conditions, which are absolutely essential to ordinary scientific inquiry. If somebody claims to have discovered a new planet, how does he go about establishing the genuineness of his claim? He says, ‘Here is my telescope, look through it—here are my calculations, take them and test them in any way you will—here is my note of the perturbations the planet’s presence produces, of the orbit in which it moves. You have, besides the evidence of the glass, a hundred different ways of putting my claim to the proof. I only beg of you to be patient, and try them all.’ So of everything else that science can inquire into. . . .

But Mr. Home’s revelation is something quite different. He does not even profess to know anything about it. The manifestations may come or they may not; they generally come in the dark; they rather often don’t come when any sceptical people are present; there is no way of telling beforehand whether they are likely to come or not. Now it is obvious, or ought to be, that such manifestations, whatever they come from, may defy scientific inquiry. Science had much better let them alone. You might as well start a scientific inquiry into the probable purpose of Mr. Home’s dreams the night after to-morrow. As yet, the spiritual manifestations have not added much to the world’s stock of knowledge on any subject relating to the here or the hereafter. If ever they do come to tell us anything worth knowing, we may be sure they will by that time offer themselves in a manner which will bear the most rigid investigation. Till then we would have the scientific men go their own way, mind their own business, and trouble themselves not with spiritualism.”

The following is the letter by Mr. Faraday, referred to in the foregoing remarks; it is republished in the *Morning Advertiser*, of May 12, from the *Pall Mall Gazette* :—

“Folkestone, June 14, 1861.

My dear Sir Emerson,—I cannot help feeling that you are indiscreet in your desire to bring me into contact with the occult phenomena which it is said are made manifest in Mr. Home’s presence. I have investigated such in former times, during some years, and as much as I thought consistent with the self-respect that an experimental philosopher owes to himself. It would be a condescension on my part to pay any more attention to them now; and I can only do so under the persuasion that all concerned wish to have the phenomena unravelled and understood, and will do all they can to aid in such a result. To settle whether I can go or not, I wish to put to

you the following points:—1. Who wishes me to go?—to whose house?—for what purpose? 2. Does Mr. Home wish me to go? 3. Is he willing to investigate as a philosopher, and as such, to have no concealments, no darkness, to be open in communication, and to aid inquiry all that he can? 4. Does he make himself responsible for the effects, and identify himself more or less with their cause? 5. Would he be glad if their delusive character were established or exposed, and would he gladly help to expose it, or would he be annoyed and personally offended? 6. Does he consider the effects natural or supernatural? If natural, what are the laws which govern them? or does he think they are not subject to laws? If supernatural, does he suppose them to be miracles, or the work of spirits? If the work of spirits, would an insult to the spirits be considered as an insult to himself? 7. If the effects are miracles, or the work of spirits, does he admit the utterly contemptible character, both of them and their results, up to the present time, in respect either of yielding information or instruction, or supplying any force or action of the least value to mankind? 8. If they be natural effects without natural law, can they be of any use or value to mankind? 9. If they be the glimpses of natural action not yet reduced to law, ought it not to be the duty of every one who has the least influence in such actions personally to develop them, and aid others in their development by the utmost openness and assistance, and by the application of every critical method, either mental or experimental, which the mind of man can devise? I do not wish to give offence to any one, or to meddle with this subject again. I lost much time about it formerly, in hopes of developing some new force or power, but found nothing worthy of attention. I can only look at it now, as a natural philosopher; and, because of the respect due to myself, will not enter upon any further attention or investigation, unless those who profess to have a hold upon the effects, agree to aid to the uttermost. To this purpose they must consent (and desire) to be as critical upon the matter and full of test investigation in regard to the subject as any natural philosopher is in respect of the germs of his discoveries. How could electricity—that universal spirit of matter—ever have been developed in its relations to chemical action, to magnetic action, to its application in the explosion of mines, the weaving of silk, the extension of printing, the electro-telegraph, the illumination of lighthouses, &c., except by rigid investigation, grounded on the strictest critical reasoning, and the most exact and open experiment? and if these so-called occult manifestations are not utterly worthless, they must and will pass through a like ordeal. As I do not want to debate this matter with those who have already made up their minds in a direction contrary to my own, but (if I see sufficient reason) only to work it out with such a desire to find incontrovertible proofs, independent of opinion or assertion, so I wish you would show this letter to Mr. Home, and those who want me to meet him on his own ground; after which you will know whether you should persevere in asking me. You will understand that I decline to meet any whose minds are not at liberty to investigate according to the general principles I have here expressed. Ever, my dear Sir Emerson, your very faithful servant, M. FARADAY."

We now propose to introduce our readers to an article by Dr. Thomas, published, as already stated, sixteen years ago, in the *Herald of the Kingdom and Age to Come*, in which spiritualism is exposed, with the relentless acumen of a mind well exercised in the discernment of things new and old. Both the scriptural and scientific aspects of the question are exhibited with a clearness and a fullness that leaves nothing to be done, and that, we should imagine, will speedily put to flight any lingering uneasiness that may be felt by those who, notwithstanding their acceptance

of the truth, are perplexed with the signs and lying wonders of the great delusion. The following is the article, which from the exigencies of space, we shall have to divide into two parts :—

### ODOLOGY ;

#### OR THEOLOGICAL MESMERISM, WITCHCRAFT REVIVED ANEW.

THE following correspondence will serve to introduce the subject which we have styled *Odology*, the derivation of which we shall give hereafter, when we come to treat upon the suggestions it contains.

“DEAR SIR.—I think you have done the ‘spirits’ too much honour in explaining their ‘rappings’ on philosophical principles. I believe they are a set of knaves, and their ‘rappings’ and ‘tappings’ mere tricks of legerdemain. I have seen the ‘Wizard of the North’ perform many more surprising.—E.Q.M.”

England, May, 1852.

“DEAR SIR.—In the *Herald* for April is a short notice of the remarkable phenomena which is now attracting so much notice in the Northern States, under the name of ‘Spiritual Manifestations.’ Your correspondent selected a very poor specimen as the subject of his communication. There are hundreds of ‘mediums’ in this region; and most of them are persons whose character for integrity has hitherto been unimpeachable. Their answers are often surprising to all who hear; and present the strongest argument for the existence of spirit separate from matter, that I have ever seen. For instance, two gentlemen called at one of these *Circles*, in a city where they were entire strangers, and where they stayed but a couple of hours. They went into the room where ‘the circle’ was already ‘getting responses.’ One of them asked if he might put questions at once, as he was going out by the next train. Permission was given; and in answer to his questions, he got in a few minutes all his past history, many circumstances of which he thought were only known to himself; and others which had been carefully limited to a small circle of his intimate friends. The other gentleman was almost equally successful; but one or two mistakes were made in their answers to him. The first gentleman had *all* his questions answered correctly and promptly, though some of them were asked mentally, and others by writing on a card, (taking care to conceal what was written from every person), and then pointing to a written question, (keeping the card out of sight,) he was at once answered, and always correctly. I might tell you a multitude of such instances, where there could be no collusion and no dishonesty.

And now, brother, I will give you to understand why I take the liberty of troubling you with this statement. I do not believe that these are the works of “disembodied spirits;” for I believe in no such existences. But what are they? These things *are facts*. How are



they to be accounted for? They seem to come into direct collision with views I have for years entertained, as you well know. But I must be able to explain them, *at least to myself*. I have exchanged farms with a man who was a "medium," and became crazy by it—"possessed of the devil," he says; and he is a very honest man. There are *forty* of these mediums in the village of Battle Creek near here; and there are some in this neighbourhood. Do you read any of the papers that are devoted to this subject? I wish you could read the past volumes of *The Spirit World*, published in Boston by Le Roy Sunderland. There are startling facts in it. Now what I want to say is that this new delusion is the most dangerous one you have ever been called upon to meet. The whole system promulgated in your writings goes down, if the claims put forth by these spirit-mongers are established. And it seems to me more important that you should attack and demolish this new opposition than that you should defend your position against any and all others. If you do not take up this subject and do it justice, you must not be surprised if your subscribers in these vicinities, where these things abound, fall away.

And now I am upon this subject, let me propound a few questions which have been put to me by believers in separate spirit existences:

- 1.—How do you account for the forms seen by the disciples on the Mount of Transfiguration? It is claimed that the souls or spiritual bodies of Moses and Elijah were seen there.
- 2.—How did the Lord's body, after resurrection, appear suddenly, and as suddenly vanish out of sight? Will it be so with our bodies in the resurrection? And why was he never seen except by the disciples?
- 3.—What did the young man with Elisha see? And what was done to him to enable him to see? What was that sight of the patriarchs and prophets which enabled them to see angels?
- 4.—Where was Paul caught up to, when he says he was taken into the third heaven? Where is the heaven of angels, and could Paul's body be taken to it?
- 5.—What does the Lord mean by his argument against the Sadducees? If Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are *already risen*, the argument seems to be merely a catch, and dishonest.

I send you some numbers of a Swedenborgian paper, which is sent to me; and call your attention to some passages by pencil marks. I remain, truly your brother, in the hope of the kingdom and age to come.—JOHN B. HOXIE.'

Marshall, Calhoun, Michigan, May 19th, 1852.

---

Professor Reichenbach, in his experiments on certain crystals and persons, through the *medium* of highly sensitive individuals, has ascertained that a fluid of a blue and yellow colour, more subtle than electricity, is thrown off from the poles of the crystals, and from the ends of the fingers. It is not visible to persons in a normal state of the nervous system, which is adapted only to the perception of ordinary

phenomena; but when the brain is exalted beyond what is usual, though short of actual insanity, things invisible to others are perceived, pertaining to this highly attenuated or rarefied exhalation, which is probably the electro-magnetic fluid reduced to an *aura* by the peculiar atomic organization of the bodies from which it is given off. On this fluid Reichenbach has bestowed the name of OD; I suppose for the same reason that Dr. Faraday styles the electrical poles *electrods* (electrodes) from *electron*, amber (by the friction of which electricity was first artificially discerned) and *odos*, a way—the poles being regarded merely as the doors or ways by which electricity passes. The *od* is the boundary of the decomposing matter in the direction of the electric current. Reichenbach's fluid passes off at the *ods* or poles; and as he regards it as something else than electricity, magnetism, or galvanism, he calls it by another name, even the Greco-chemical term for the extremity from which it exhales.

I have styled this article *Odology* (from *logos* a discourse and *od*) or discourse upon Od. Not that I am going to discuss the subject of Cd reichenbachically; but believing that the phenomena referred to in the foregoing communication are Odistic, if anything, I have chosen to denominate what I have to say upon the subject by *Odology*, rather than by Pneumatology, Psychology, or any other word which concedes the unproved and unprovable affirmation of the existence of supposed dead men's ghosts disembodiedly.

The electro-magnetic od is constantly passing off from the electrodes, or poles, of animal bodies and certain crystals. It is probable that our bodies are enveloped with a halo of it, for everything has its halo according to the following testimony. "It is well known," says Mrs. Griffiths, "that around and adhering to all surfaces there is a *halo of demi-transparent light*, seen only, however, when the object for experiment is in a certain position with regard to the eye, and the light which falls on it. This halo is not dependent on any peculiarity of colour or material, for it encompasses every object in nature, whether it belong to the animal, vegetable, or mineral kingdom; whether it be square or round, black or white, opaque or transparent, solid or fluid."\* The halo of our bodies, it is probable, consists of Reichenbach's odic fluid, the colour of which is visible to those who are highly odic, or in a state in which the *od* is abundantly generated. It is of a delicate blue when given off from the positive electrode, and yellow from the negative pole of crystal. From the finger tips of a male subject it exhales of a blue colour, about an inch long; but, from those of a female, the jet is inconsiderable, imparting, as it were, a luminousness to their extremities.

From graveyards this odic exhalation is abundant. It has been seen to cover a necropolis to a depth of four feet, as a lambent blue haze. This is doubtless the fluid generated by the decomposing animal matter beneath the sod. Like phantom-ships at sea, produced by refraction

---

\* Scribner's Journal, Jan. 1st, 1849.

of the light reflected on the firmament from real ships, *phantom appearances* are sometimes seen by sensitive nervous systems, produced by refraction of the odic rays in and upon the mirror formed by the magneto halo of the earth, which emanate from the *forms* corrupting in the dust thereof. These phantoms (in Greek styled *phantasma\**) are called "*separate*," or "*disembodied spirits*," by the ignorant and superstitious, under the supposition that they are the real men and women—boys and girls, who used to enact life's follies in the flesh! They are, no doubt, as real as phantom ships; and as awfully mysterious to the unphilosophical and scripturally unenlightened, as they are to the untutored barbarians of the forecabin. But real as the phantom ship spectres are, who would be so crazy as to maintain that they are the souls or spirits of the ships which gave them motion over the dark blue sea? or that they are the disembodied ghosts of the vessels caught up to the third heavens! Yet this would be just as rational, as the psychological theosophisms of the schools, pulpits, and "circles," about souls, ghosts, and spirit-worlds.

There are a few discoveries in electrical science worth knowing in connection with this subject. Professor Moser, as the result of his researches in Thermography, remarks that "*all bodies radiate light even in complete darkness*." Again, he says "the rays of this light act as ordinary light;" and that "two bodies constantly impress their image on each other, even in complete darkness." Thermographic experiments prove these principles, and lead him to the conclusion that there is *latent light* in certain vapours as well as latent heat. The ordinary condition of the human brain, and organs supplied by its nerves, is that of adaptation to the common exterior aspect of imponderable matters, such as light, heat, the grosser forms of electricity, sound, &c. But there is a more exalted or refined perception of these things, which the animal organization, of its own power, however intensified by inherent excitation, cannot attain to. Our perception of the *latent imponderables*, latent light, latent heat, latent electricity or *od*, latent sounds, &c., may be rendered more acute than ordinary; but it can never rise to the highest penetration which is possible, without the superaddition of something which the animal nature possesses only to a very limited degree. This something is *the Spirit of God without measure*.† All living animals have it in some degree; for "in God" they "live, and move, and have their being;" and if he were to "gather unto Himself *His Spirit and His breath*, all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust.‡ This minimum possession of God's spirit, possessed by quadrupeds and man, is just sufficient for the purposes of that peculiar constitution of things we call "*this life*;" but for the physical perception of things visible to beings of a more refined organization than ours, the sight of which will be vouchsafed at a future time,

\*Matt. xiv, 26; according to Griesbach, Luke xxiv, 37, 39, should read *phantasma* not *pneuma*.

† John iii, 34. ‡ Job xxxiv, 14, 15.

called "the world to come," the present amount of spirit is not sufficient. This can do for man what is proved, and what may yet be proved; but not what is randomly affirmed. He is not ordinarily in harmony with the latent imponderables; but God is intensely and completely so. Hence "the darkness and the light are both alike to him." If a man was imprisoned in darkness a thousand feet below the earth's surface, God would see him as distinctly as we see each other above ground in the light of noonday. Men *profess* to believe this; but upon what principle is it that God sees thus in darkness? Because His nature, every atom of which is, as it were, condensed lightning, glowing with such an intensity, that its radiation is felt throughout the boundless universe, penetrating through all substances, and developing life and motion in all things, from the minutest animalculæ to the globe of the vastest magnitude. Hence He is called "light," and "a consuming fire." The rays from His presence, called spirit, diluted with the grosser menstrua of the earth's products, place Him in inner relation to the imponderables, which are but one and the same principle, variously developed by the media through which it passes into the receptacle whence it came. Thus, for instance, the most subtle principle of the earth's halo is spirit, which is called by different names, such as electricity, magnetism, &c. This halo is its reservoir, as it were. It is diluted with atmospheric air. We breathe it. It pervades every atom of our bodies; and, having enabled our organization to perform its functions, it exhales from the electrodes of our system as *Od* into the reservoir, where we derive it by breathing. Thus a circle or circuit exists of the external atomic form-changing fluid, internal transformed matter, and nervous current, closing the circuit by *Od* (latent light radiating in darkness) exhaling into the outer fluid.

Now this outer reservoir of fluid may be regarded as a highly polished and extremely sensitive mirror, in which can be excited latent *odic spectres*, which become visible sometimes to those whose brains are subjected to *odic exaltation*. The spectral impressions may emanate from corrupting bodies, mineral or other substances, and from living brains acting upon other living brains. Reichenbach's graveyard experiments have demonstrated the first; thermo-electrography the second; and animal magnetism, in all its varieties, the third.

We may adduce here a philosophical experiment, illustrative of what we mean by latent spectral impressions. Take a piece of polished metal, glass, or japanned tin, the temperature of which is low, and having laid upon it a wafer, coin, or any other such object, breathe upon the surface; allow the breath entirely to disappear; then toss the object off the surface and examine it minutely; *no trace of anything is visible*, yet a spectral impression exists on that surface, which may be evoked by *breathing upon it*. *A form resembling the object at once appears*, and, what is very remarkable, it may be called forth many times in succession, and *even at the end of months*. Other instances of the kind have been subsequently described by M. Moser.\*

\* Draper's Text Book of Chemistry. p. 97.

M. Karsten placed a coin on a piece of plate glass, which being supported by a plate of metal not insulated, and the sparks from the conductor of an electrifying machine were made to strike on the coin, thereby causing them to pass simultaneously through the coin and the metallic plate. After one hundred turns of the machine, the coin was removed; *the glass plate appeared perfectly unaltered*, (the ghost was invisible,) but *when breathed upon*, a perfect impression of the coin in its most minute details *became visible*.

M. Karsten says, that the impression is not produced *by traces of the electric fluid remaining adherent* to the glass plate; because the impression still remains with great distinctness after all traces of electricity have disappeared, after the glass has been wiped with a handkerchief. And again, these impressions are neither destroyed nor even weakened by passing a stream of the opposite electricity over them.\*

From these experiments we see, *that a thing may exist, and yet be invisible*. Furthermore, *that by breathing upon the thing impressed, things hidden may be manifested*; thirdly, *that this can be effected at the end of months*; and fourthly, *that unseen, but real impressions of words and figures, can be made on surfaces by electricity*, and afterwards made visible by breathing. These principles are scientific demonstrations. And pray what is science? It is knowledge. Human knowledge or science, when it is really knowledge, consists of the little men have discovered—the few *general facts* they have found obtaining in the universe; and more especially in this terrestrial system, in relation to the earth, its substances, and man upon it. Men know but little of the laws to which God has subjected this earth and the things belonging to it, compared with what remains to be discovered or revealed. The most scientific of men are comparatively very ignorant. Their knowledge of general facts is exceedingly limited; and their reasonings upon them, and their deductions very often, more often than otherwise, remarkably illogical, and singularly absurd. The wisest among them are free to confess this. And if the wise be fools, in science, how grossly ignorant and foolish must the multitude be, which troubles not itself with general facts, right reason, or scientific principles at all! And yet it is the ignorant who undertake to draw conclusions from data the most recondite, and pronounce the Bible a cheat, if it teach not according to what they have predetermined it ought to teach. But after all, the multitude is not so much to blame for this as their guides. Like priests, like people. The theosophist reasons out from insufficient data a crude theory which pleases his fleshly mind, and then goes to the Bible to cull sounding epithets to sanctify it; instead of allowing God's holy word to teach him as a babe, and then to prove all things by its rule. This procedure is emphatically the folly of our age. All classes are guilty of it; and in consequence, rush headlong to the adoption of theories which destroy the truth, and stultify themselves.

(To be continued.)

\* Fisher's Photogenic Manipulation, Part ii, p. 39, 42—46.

---

SUNDAY MORNING AT THE CHRISTADELPHIAN SYNAGOGUE,  
BIRMINGHAM.—No. 7.

---

*From Shorthand Notes by brother JOHN BUTLER.*

---

RIGHTEOUSNESS, JUDGMENT, MERCY,  
AND WORKS.

ROMANS II.—There is no lesson more conspicuous in this chapter, than the one teaching that we are called to righteousness, and that our ultimate destiny in Christ will depend upon our relation to righteousness. It is very important to realise that lesson, for a variety of reasons. The first reason is, that our own natures continually incline to ways of unrighteousness: there is a struggle in ourselves: “when we would do good, evil is present with us.” The second reason is, that we are living in a very unrighteous world, where many things that are abhorrent in the sight of God, are considered to be not wrong; where indeed it is practically the case that evil is called good, and good, evil; light, darkness, and darkness, light. The third may be, that we live in a time when it is a religious sentiment that it doesn't matter whether we are righteous or not—that without any qualification, Christ has been made our righteousness, and, therefore, there remains nothing for us to do, beyond simply believing on him. These three things work together to make our walk in righteousness a very difficult thing. We require to be continually on our guard, to be diligent, to have our eyes open, and not for one moment to surrender the teaching of the word of God, to either our own desires, the pressure of current sentiment, or the vagaries of a perverted theology. It is worth while to stop and consider what righteousness is. The question admits of a simple answer, and that answer, though short, comprehends every phase in which righteousness may be contemplated; and that is, that righteousness is the doing of those things that God has commanded, and the avoidance of those things which God has prohibited. In itself, the word “righteousness” expresses in the abstract, those thoughts, words and actions that are right. It does not, of course, inform us what thoughts, words and actions are right. For this, we are referred to other sources. The world draws upon its own imaginations, reasonings and conclusions, in its efforts, so far as it puts forth any, to

ascertain what is right. And thus in the world, a devout mind has great difficulty in arriving at a knowledge of what is right. To us there is one very decided standard of right, and that is, the will of God. This in fact is the only standard of right: our conceptions of righteousness can only arise in connection with Him; for the very idea of righteousness implies a law or rule higher than ourselves, to which we are amenable. Therefore, our only course is to study what He has made known to be right, and to turn ourselves to the habitual doing of it, and to the eschewing of all those things He has declared to be wrong. Another fact is introduced to view in this chapter, that our righteousness or unrighteousness has relation to a time when it will be made manifest, and have effect in the fixing of our destiny. Paul says that “God will render to every man according to his deeds, in the day when He shall judge the secrets of men by Christ Jesus.” Now it is very important to realise this fact. It is one that is continually proclaimed throughout the New Testament scriptures; and our recognition of it is likely to have a very reformatory effect upon our minds. It enables us to see that the judgment to be disclosed will in one sense be no secret; that it will but be a disclosure of what is now true in every man's life. It will be a declaration of divine decision upon facts already existent, and known in every man's own bosom. The nature of the decision is the only thing we don't know. We know there will be no partiality, no favour and no disfavour; but a clear, impartial, just judgment, which takes its type, its cue, its result, so far as we are concerned, from *what we have been*. In view of this, the present time appears the most important time to us—a great deal more important than judgment itself; because the judgment is only a disclosure of the present—a judicial proclamation of what we are and how we actually stand. People sometimes forget this, and are all the while straining forward to the future. It is right to keep our eye on the future—we should never take it off the future; but we must never ignore the immense importance of the

present time. We are apt to think that the judgment will work a sort of miracle for us—as if resurrection will turn us up in a different state of character from that which pertains to us now. This is a very great mistake. It is one of the mistakes of orthodoxy. Orthodoxy is wrong in every thing, from top to bottom. This is one of its fallacies, which forces itself upon our attention this morning. It declares in so many words, “there are the elect and the non-elect; the elect will be saved—the non-elect won’t; or in another form, it says Those who believe in the name of Christ, will be saved, and those who do not believe won’t be saved; it is not a matter of works at all.” Under the power of these delusions, inherited by birth, we have been accustomed to blindly trust to the future, as if it would do a new thing for us; instead of which, there is nothing more true, than that we shall just stand at the judgment seat as we walk now in our time of probation. The routine of our daily life becomes interesting, when we remember this. Our daily life is the material out of which we are fabricating for ourselves the good opinion of Christ, or the reverse, for God will render to every man *according to his deeds*. Now we can only know what in our daily life will be well-pleasing to him, by studying the Scriptures, and particularly Paul’s letters. It would almost appear that these letters were written for the very purpose of instructing believers in the kingdom, as to what it is in their private lives that God requires. To get at this knowledge, so as to be available in daily actions, we must cultivate familiarity with these writings. By continual reading, we get to see many things we should not know. Some people, for instance, may have the idea that they are in such a position that it is impossible for them to do anything for Christ. It may be that they are exceedingly poor, and that, being poor, they are compelled to devote the greatest part of their time and strength to the duty of providing a livelihood, and this necessity presses upon them every day in their lives. The only day they have is Sunday, and they require that for rest. They may distress themselves with the idea that they have no opportunity for doing anything to work out their salvation. Now this is a mistake, a very great mistake. Those who labour under it do themselves an injustice; for we learn from the letters of Paul that in whatsoever condition a man or woman may be placed, he or she can in that condition walk

faithfully to the truth, and acceptably in the sight of God. The principle upon which they will be judged is:—“every man according to what he has received.” Jesus distinctly says that to whom much is given, of them much will be required; so that the principle of absolute justice will work in every individual case. Nobody should feel discouraged because their opportunities are few; all that is required of them is that they *do what they can; that they be faithful in the least*. There is one method of serving Christ that such mourners of small opportunity may not be aware of, and not being aware of it, they may miss the opportunity, although it is actually in reference to the thing they are doing everyday. A brother may be in the employment of a very hard master, whose service he finds to be very disagreeable, and in whose company he feels alienated from everything that pertains to Christ; and he may imagine that he is having a great deal of waste time thrust upon him. He may think to himself that if he could only get into a position where he would be able to visit the sick, contend for the faith, distribute tracts, or something of that sort, he would be of some use; but that as it is, his time is thrown away. Now Paul has given us to understand that a man in such circumstances may serve Christ by simply construing in his own mind what he is compelled to do for a taskmaster, as a thing done for Christ. He says: (Col. iii, 22-25,) “*Servants obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; not with eye-service as men-pleasers, but in singleness of heart, fearing God. And whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to THE LORD AND NOT UNTO MEN; knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance; for ye serve the Lord Christ. But he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done; and there is no respect of persons*” So that an individual may actually turn to spiritual account the apparently sin-defiled circumstances of his daily calling. The mistake would be for him to exclude Christ from his thoughts and only to think of his master, and only to serve him, as Paul here says, with eye-service, that is attending to duty so long as you are under scan, but doing your own way as soon as your master’s back is turned. And so with regard to other little matters—serving each other, waiting upon each other, doing good turns to each other, using hospitality without grudging when the occasion arises, ministering whenever there is an opportu-

nity—all these things can be done on a small scale by everybody, and it is not the scale that determines the acceptability of the act in the sight of God. It is most important to remember this—it is not the size of an action, but the spirit of it, and the relation of it to what is possible with us. We see this signally illustrated in the familiar case of the widow woman, who cast into the treasury her two mites. Jesus said she had cast in more than the rich people, because they had simply put in a little of their abundance, whereas she had given all the surplus she had remaining. Keeping this in view, everybody will realise his duty. There are no two persons with the same powers of mind, or with the same condition of circumstances, or the same opportunities, in a social point of view. Therefore the same rule of judgment cannot be applied to all. In one sense, every man is his own standard. If we fix our eyes upon a fixed standard that we must all come up to, we shall oftentimes be discouraged at the impossibility of coming up to it. What we have to do, is to come up to the highest that is possible with us—to do what we can,—to be faithful in that which we have. I do not mean in money alone; but time, strength, opportunity, everything that we possess. If this principle is acted out, there will be a place for the one-talent servants as well as the ten. The judgment of every one according to deeds, will not be a judging according to a fixed standard; but a judgment in the light of each man's capacity. It would not otherwise be a just judgment. "To whom much is given, of him will much be required." An account from one man may call for censure and condemnation, which in another man will be the basis of approval. The standard of the judgment will not be a fixed one. The scale is a shifting scale, according to the capabilities of the individual; and that is why the judgment will be conducted, and must be conducted by a Judge "who shall not judge after the sight of His eyes, nor reprove after the hearing of His ears;" but by divine penetration, will know what is in every man brought before Him, and give a righteous judgment to the utmost exactitude of infallibility. It is also a reason why we are not permitted to judge, because we lack the principal element of judgment, in our ignorance of those who may come under judgment. We may say "such a person has done so-and-so," and we may comprehend the nature of the thing done; but what we cannot understand is the relation of the thing done to the capacity of

the doer, and to his inclination to do other things from which he has refrained. This is exactly where Jesus is qualified to be our judge. "He knoweth what is in man," as John says; and he can discern the thoughts and intents of the heart. He can measure the exact capacity, and estimate the particular forces in play; and can therefore decide infallibly what ought to have been done, and what ought not to have been done. There is another thing that qualifies Jesus to be judge, and that is, "because he is the Son of Man."—(John v, 27) God has committed all judgment unto him, because he is the Son of Man. We can see great wisdom in this. An angel, or any being not touched with the feeling of human infirmity, would not have been qualified to sit as our judge, because he would not have been able to comprehend the exact relation between our ability and our performance. But Jesus was tempted in all points as we are. He was a man in every sense, though he was the son of God, and, therefore, when he judges men and women, he will be able to give a just judgment. He will take everything into account. There is great consolation in this view of the judgment. We shall have a merciful judge; it is distinctly stated that mercy will characterise his judgment; that mercy will rejoice against judgment. On the other hand, there is this to be considered: He says "With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again." We shall get at the judgment, the kind of usage we have dealt to others. This is evidenced by the parable of a certain man who owed his lord a sum of money; his lord said "Pay me what you owe me." He replied "I am too poor;" and his lord—who was a merciful judge—forgave him. The servant goes out and meets some one who owes him a trifling sum, and he demands the money, saying "I must have it immediately." "I cannot pay it," says the poor debtor. "You must." "I cannot." "You must go to prison, then;" and he sent him to prison. It is recorded that the servants of the lord were very sorry when they saw this, and they reported the matter to their master, who had the unmerciful man brought before him. The master said to him "Ungrateful man! Did not I forgive thee that which thou owedst me, and yet you have done thus harshly by a man owing so much less," and he delivered him to the tormentors. "So," said Christ, "shall your heavenly Father do unto you, if ye, from the heart, forgive not every one of you his brother his



trespasses." If we are not merciful in our judgment now, we must not look for mercy when Christ comes; but "Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy." Our judgment must be tempered with mercy. We ought to remember the weakness of those by whom we are surrounded. We ought to know our own weakness, and thus be prepared to extend consideration to those who are in offence. If we exact to the utmost farthing, letting nothing slip, but insist upon a precise and explicit confession from everybody who may happen to offend us, the judgment will be for ourselves a very dreadful visitation; because Jesus declares we shall be treated then as we treat now. So, although there is much cause for consolation in view of the judgment, there is yet the other side. Jesus will be merciful, as he was with his disciples in the Garden of Gethsemane, when he came and found them sleeping. "The spirit indeed, is willing," he said, "but the flesh is weak." He did not chide them, because it was an hour of the day when nature's forces were gone, and he excused them. Though we shall have the same consideration, at the same time, we must remember, that the judgment will be according to our deeds. Jesus will not pass over an unrighteous life. Christ's mercy will not go the length of ignoring the actual state of the case. He will not accept an individual who has proved himself unworthy. We must ever remember all sides of the question, that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God, that without holiness no man shall see God; that except we leave all that we have, we cannot be Christ's disciples. Our present duty is to surrender every other hope and scheme, and object of life, to give ourselves entirely to Christ. A man who has loved other things more than Christ—who has been ashamed of Christ in the day of Gentile prosperity—who has devoted his abilities to business more than to him—who has served himself and not Christ—must remember that Christ's mercy will not go the length of altering the state of the account. The account is of our own making; all that Christ does is to strike the balance: we cannot do that; We could not judge ourselves. We cannot say who shall be saved—whether we our-

selves shall be saved. We can only rejoice in hope and tremble whilst working out our own salvation. We do have hope in Christ's mercy, and consolation in the assurance that he will do that which is just and merciful, but there is a great deal to turn the scales the other way. Christ will only make manifest what exists now. So the present time is the time for us: the judgment will add nothing to the account. As at an examination in a school, the state of the prizes is an indication of what has been going on in the interval, so the disclosures at the judgment are based upon what is now in progress. But when we look beyond the judgment-seat, and imagine ourselves for a moment the blessed of God, we see something we very much burn to be—something to encourage us to continue steadfast. This is the great merit that will be recognized—a patient continuance in well-doing. We are to do as Paul says here: "*by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory, honour, and immortality.*" That implies a good deal of trouble; for a man's patience is not exercised when there is no trouble. A patient continuance in well-doing is a tenacious abiding, day by day, in the midst of discouraging circumstances, and in the face of trying difficulties, in the performance of those things that God has required of us. There is great consolation for those who are walking in this patient way, but none for those who live in pleasure—those who are dead while they live. We must fellowship the suffering of Christ, before we shall be privileged to fellowship his glory; but when the battle is over, we shall feel the truth of what Paul says "that the sufferings of the present time are nothing to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us." Just for the present, we are in the Valley of Humiliation; we are in a state of weakness and sin, but keeping our eye steadfastly fixed on the morning dawn that has been so long held up in promise to human view, we are enabled to persevere and work until the night comes, when no man can work—a night that has come to all who have gone before us, and may come to us, but which will quickly be ended by the bright rising of that Sun of Righteousness, who will usher in eternal day.—EDITOR.

"WHAT THINK YE OF CHRIST?"

REPLY TO AN ORTHODOX ATTACK UPON THE TRUTH  
CONCERNING THE NATURE OF CHRIST.

BY J. BUTLER, BIRMINGHAM.

In the May No. of an orthodox periodical, styled *The Voice upon the Mountains*, there is an article by a Mr. Govett, of Norwich, in which he attacks the views held by Christadelphians on the subject of the nature of Christ, and endeavours, in opposition to these views, to establish the doctrine of Christ's pre-existence and "Godhead." This article is perhaps as good a one as could be written on the popular side of the question; but, at the same time, to those thoroughly conversant with the truth of scripture, the writer miserably fails in proving his case; for like the majority of those identified with him in doctrine, he simply takes the passages that, on a first view, seem to favour the pre-existence theory, and bases his argument upon them alone, utterly ignoring the many texts which cut at the roots of his belief. One would have thought that while attempting to prove the fallacy of Christadelphian views, he would, at least, have attempted to reconcile the *apparent* contradictions on the question which appear in the Bible—that he would, as it were, have added up both the debit and credit side of the account, and struck a proper balance. But no! He simply adds up one side, and exclaims with exultation, "Christadelphians debtor to Orthodoxy." We shall endeavour to set forward the other side of the account, then to inspect the items on Mr. Govett's side, and having properly summed up the whole, to shew the actual state of the matter.

In order to comprehend the nature of Christ, it is absolutely necessary to understand his mission with reference to the position and nature of man since the fall of Adam. Our first parents were placed in the Garden of Eden on probation, with an intimation that in case of disobedience, they would forfeit the position of happiness they enjoyed, and be punished with death. Disobedience came, and the punishment inevitably followed. What the death threatened was, we may gather from the language addressed to Adam, when the sentence was pronounced: "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." No immortal-soulist, when brought to the test, can deny that this was the death threatened—a return to the dust—though they pretend, without a shred of scripture authority, that that which really constituted Adam—the immortal soul—was reserved for another punishment. Without wishing at present to

discuss this question, we may incidentally remark that it is strange on the "orthodox" hypothesis, that the sentence pronounced should have reference to the body only, and that no allusion whatever should be made to the punishment of the real offender, the immortal soul. From the words quoted, it will be seen that our first parents, after the transgression, became essentially mortal, and as a consequence, all who descended from them are likewise mortal, for every tree and every animal bears fruit after its kind. In this mortal state, arrived at by sin, men are sinners, and alienated from God. All claim to a future life has been forfeited, both through their first parents and through individual transgression, "all having sinned." Under this state of things generation after generation returns to dust, and if God had not devised a plan in accordance with the law which produced this result in the first instance, by which to reconcile man to himself, the whole human race must have passed away without any hope of an existence (in any shape or form) beyond the grave. How was this reconciliation to be effected? God has devised a plan by the simple inversion of the process by which alienation was brought about.—(Rom. v, 18, 19.) Mortality was introduced by sin; immortality must be introduced by righteousness. Death came by disobedience; life must come by obedience. But how could any obedience or righteousness avail a race already under condemnation, and in a state of hopeless defilement from sin? This question touches a principle having a most important bearing upon the question we are about to consider. The obedience of an angel might avail for the angel, but it could be no benefit to man. Condemnation ran in the human channel, and the current could only be turned in that same channel. The redemption of the fallen race could only be effected by a conformity to the divine law within it. Man was the cause of death, and man must be used as an instrument to bring about the banishment of death. This, we conclude, from the principles laid down in the scriptures on the subject, and it is in harmony with the facts declared by the apostles: "For since by man came death *by man came also the resurrection of the dead.*"—(1 Cor. xv, 21.) The man by whom resurrection came was Jesus, who inherited the condemned nature.—(Rom. viii, 3; 2 Cor. v, 21.) An angel could not have effected the work of

redemption (Heb. ii, 16, 17), because his righteousness would only have elevated his own nature. It could have no relationship to a separate race under condemnation; neither could a mere son of Adam have saved us, because corruption had so spread since the first transgression, that it was impossible in the nature of things to find a man who was without sin, and only such a man could have risen after suffering the death under which human nature was enslaved. The world was in the state described by the Psalmist: "There is none righteous, no not one; there is none that understandeth; there is none that seeketh after God; they are all gone out of the way; they are altogether become unprofitable; *there is none that doeth good, no not one.*" It was, therefore, necessary, if a reconciliation with God were ever to take place, and human nature to be restored to the position lost, that the Deity himself should interpose. And he did interpose in the fulness of time."—(Gal. iv, 4.) He raised up a man, possessing all the qualifications necessary to constitute him a redeemer. This was Jesus, who was a "Son of God," in a literal sense. He owed his origin to the Deity's creative power, which formed him in the womb of the Virgin Mary. But though descending thus directly from God, he was not merely constituted a divine being, for that would have placed him above the nature intended to be elevated; at the same time, he would naturally be endowed with higher moral and intellectual powers than those whom generations of sin had deteriorated. His mind germinally received the divine stamp at his conception by the Spirit. Yet this did not make him different from men. He was of the same nature, but higher in the development of that nature. We see in the world around us great differences in the same nature. Some men are superior to others in mental and moral capacity, and yet no one would attempt to deny that they are all of common stock with the uneducated and the idiotic. Jesus, doubtless, had the highest mental and moral capacity it is possible for a human being to possess, and yet he was not the less a man on that account. It may be said that Adam when fresh from the hands of his Maker, was equally good in kind, but then it must be remembered that Adam, when tempted to disobey, did not know the result of that disobedience. He did not know the misery he would bring upon himself and his descendants. He had not learnt that lesson of submission and faith which evil alone can teach, in the highest form, whereas the Saviour had before his eye a retrospect of four thousand years of sin and sorrow, and experience in himself of that evil that had resulted from disobedience. He had also the word that God has spoken by Moses and the prophets to go by, so that he was more qualified to resist temptation than the first Adam.

Such was the man raised up by the Deity for the redemption of the human race, a man who met all the requirements of the work he was sent to do, for he was "made of a woman, made under the law," (Gal. iv, 4); "Of the seed of David according to the flesh," (Rom. i, 3); "Sent in the likeness of sinful flesh (the condemned nature) and by a sacrifice for sin condemned sin *in the flesh,*" (Rom. viii, 3); yet he was "Holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners."—(Heb. vii, 26.) Introduced to the world, he prosecuted with zeal his redemptory work. This work was the developing *in the sinful* (or mortal) *flesh* which he possessed, the righteousness which was to result in justification of life upon all who should be included in his name (and should fulfil the conditions of their acceptance). This development occupied upwards of thirty years, during which period he increased in wisdom and in favour with God.—(Luke ii, 52.) These two facts—that he increased in wisdom and in favour with God—are totally inexplicable if we accept the Godhead of Jesus in the Trinitarian sense. An all-wise being could not increase in wisdom, nor would it be very possible for the Deity to increase in his own favour. Looking upon Christ, however, as a man walking perfectly before his Father, God, the statement becomes at once intelligible and reasonable. Having preserved his righteousness till he had become of ripe age, the time came for God (his Father) to manifest approval of his work thus far accomplished, and to prepare him for the completion of it; and he therefore declares, at his entrance upon his public ministry, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased," at the same time causing his Spirit to descend upon him. In the power of that Spirit, given without measure unto him, (Jno. iii, 34,) he carried on his work to its consummation, making proclamation and giving evidence of his Messiahship, speaking of the word of God and doing His work. The result of the possession of this Spirit, however, must not be misunderstood. It did not raise him above human suffering, as is evidenced from his agony in Gethsemane and on the cross. It was not God's design, for he was to be made perfect *through suffering,* (Heb. ii, 10; v, 9); and thus become captain and author of our salvation. But the indwelling presence of the Spirit enabled him to say what he did say with the authority of God. The Deity by His Spirit dwelt in him and worked with him. Christ declares the fact that it was not he who did the marvellous deeds that he performed, and thus most emphatically disavowing all Deityship on his own part. He says, "I came down from heaven not to do mine own will but the will of *him that sent me.*"—(Jno. vi, 38.) "*I can of mine own self do nothing; I seek not mine own will but the will of the Father who sent me,*" (Jno. v, 19, 30); "*I do nothing of myself,*

but as my Father hath taught me I speak,” (viii, 28); “My doctrine is *not mine*, but His that sent me,” &c. It was the close connection that existed between Jesus and the Father, through the Holy Spirit dwelling in him in its fulness that caused him to make use of those expressions which are so fondly hugged but entirely misunderstood by the popular belief. Those expressions are not incompatible with the views of the nature of Jesus which we have endeavoured to present. Trinitarians cannot say much for the passages opposed to its views. On the “pre-existence” theory the two classes of passages are perfectly irreconcilable, and “orthodoxy,” knowing this, generally attempts to escape the difficulty by avoiding discussion, on the plea of the sacredness of the subject and the sin of prying into mysteries that are evidently not intended to be understood. Such a policy will not satisfy those who are truly seeking salvation; they must compare scripture with scripture, (1 Cor. ii, 13,) prove all things and hold fast that which is good, (1 Thes. v, 21,) that they may be able to give a reason for the hope that is in them.—(1 Pet. iii, 15.)

That Jesus ascribed all the works that he did, not to himself, but to God, his Father, we have already shown, and Christ's own testimony of his subordination to the Deity is equally unmistakable. He tells us that the power which he possessed he possessed merely as a gift from the higher power who had sent him to do His will.—“All things are delivered unto me of my Father,” (Mat. xi, 27;) “All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth, (xxviii, 18;) “The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son;” “For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself.”—(Jno. v, 22, 26, 27.) See also Luke x, 22; Jno. iii, 35; xiii, 3; xvii, 2, &c. All these passages most clearly prove Christ's subordination to the Deity, and in face of them, how is it possible to declare that he is co-equal, co-eternal with the Father? In the last act of his career—when after a life of trial and suffering such as few, if any, besides him experienced—he was about, in the words of Daniel, “To make an end of sins, to make reconciliation for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness and to seal up the vision and prophecy:” we have the crowning proof of his humanity. Nailed to the “accursed tree,” in the agonies of death he utters the agonizing cry, “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?” The Almighty, all-wise God, uttering a cry like this! The thing is impossible. It was the *human son of God*—the only begotten son, whom He had in his love sent into the world to save sinners, (Jno. iii, 17,) and who was for the moment left to himself. He felt the agony of his last hour, but he drank the cup to the very dregs—he became obedient unto death, even the death

of the cross. And then he received his reward. God could not suffer His holy one—the only man who had developed perfect righteousness in sinful flesh—to see corruption, and so he restored him to life again.—(Acts ii, 24, 32; iii, 15; iv, 10; xvii, 31; Rom. vi, 4; viii, 11; 1 Cor. vi, 14; xv, 15; 2 Cor. iv, 14; Eph. i, 20; Col. ii, 11; 1 Thes. i, 10, &c.) But he now received a different kind of body to that possessed before. The first was a natural body, a mortal body; he now becomes a quickening spirit, (1 Cor. xv, 42-50;) he is highly exalted and given a name above every name, (Phil. ii, 9;) “Set at God's own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come,” (Eph. i, 20-2;) “Being made so much better than the angels as he hath by inheritance (begotten son of God) obtained a more excellent name than they.”—(Heb. i, 4.) Raised to this position, he receives the name of God—“Unto the son he (God) saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever, a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of Thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.”—(Heb. i, 8, 9.) How could such words as these be addressed by God to himself; and to whom can the words “thy fellows” refer but to those amongst whom His righteousness had been developed? Christ also becomes our high priest, and the mediator between God and man (Heb. viii, 1, 6); and as a mediator cannot be a mediator of one, and God is one (Gal. iii, 20); it follows again that Jesus and the Deity are two separate and distinct beings.—(1 Tim. ii, 5.) It is by appointing the name of Jesus as the only name given among men whereby we can be saved (Acts iv, 12); that he is constituted the resurrection and the life (Jno. xi, 25); and the only avenue (not God himself) of approach to God.—(Heb. vii, 25.) Having now, as we believe, adduced arguments and texts sufficient to shew the nature of our Saviour and the relationship subsisting between himself and the Deity, having endeavoured to prove the truth of the scripture statement that there is one God, the Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ (1 Cor. viii, 6); the latter begotten by the former of a human parent, and his God as well as our own (Eph. i, 3, 17)—it remains for us to consider the arguments and texts advanced in support of the popular doctrines of the Godhead and pre-existence of Jesus, and to endeavour to harmonise those texts with the testimony I have already quoted; for if they cannot be harmonised, then there is no truth in that which they profess to teach, and the word of God becomes nullified. It may, however, be well first to point out some of the logical inconsistencies, to which an adoption of the popular view respecting

Christ's nature must lead. We find in the account given in Luke of the announcement made to the Virgin Mary, by the angel, that the "holy thing" that was to be born of her was to be called the "Son of God." Now it is sometimes a very good thing to get an opponent to define his terms, and we would in this case ask the orthodox believers, amongst whom is Mr. Govett, to define the term just given—"Son of God." The name with them is entirely a misnomer, a contradiction; there is not in reality any such person. They believe and teach that God himself, the Almighty, eternal God, entered into the womb of the virgin to be born in human form (not in unclean, sinful, human nature, for Mr. Govett declares such a belief to be blasphemous) and that the issue of Mary to use truly "orthodox" words, was "very God." How could he be very God, and at the same time *Son* of very God? The thing is impossible. He must either be the one or the other. The Bible teaches that he is the Son, and that it was necessary for him to partake of our sinful flesh to effect the work he did, and therefore belief to the contrary thereof is itself blasphemous. Christadelphians quite agree with Mr. Govett, when he says, "Change our views of the godhead and you change our religion," and that "the true faith concerning the Father and the Son is a matter of eternal life or eternal death; it behoves us, therefore, to see that we are accepting God's testimony; not making it void, by fancies of unbelief," but that faith which can bring the greatest number of scripture proofs to support it and harmonise with them the few quoted on the other side, is not so likely to be a fancy of unbelief as that which *ignores* the greatest number. On that account we claim for the Christadelphian that it is the true faith. It is asserted that Christ was very God and yet man. Now, how could he at the same time possess the power and attributes of the Deity and yet experience the weakness of humanity, and at the same time declare that his power was not his own? God's nature and human nature are utterly distinct. Jesus himself said, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit." How, therefore, could they be identical in one person? The fact would involve two personalities, and Jesus would not be one being but two, in spite of the statement to the contrary.—(1 Cor. viii. 6.) It would be a union or amalgamation of the two natures before the atonement had reconciled them.

The passage just referred to shows that he possessed one personality. What then was it? The Bible states, as I have pointed out, that he was essentially a human person, with God for his Father, but the Roman Catholic Archbishop Manning declares (and the "Protestants" for the most part believe with him, thus identifying themselves with the great Mother of Harlots (Rev. xxvii, 5), that Christ's personality was the personality of "the eternal Son." Now the very word "son" implies derivation, and how can the son of anyone be eternal? If this be true, Jesus was not called Son of God in consequence of being born of the virgin by the power of God, as the Bible tells us, but in consequence of some other fact. What was that fact, and where in the Word of God is it made known? If Christ's personality were eternal, then he was not at all a man; Jesus misnamed himself "Son of Man;" the apostles egregiously blunder when they speak of him as such; and, above all, that passage is false which declares that "*by man* came the resurrection of the dead." It would, in such a case, not only be impossible for our Saviour to die, but even supposing that he could, his death would be unavailing to redeem us, for the condemned nature would not be redeemed. The heresy that Jesus Christ was not a man arose in the apostle John's days. Some persons believed that he was a superior being, and that his flesh was not like the flesh of other people, an error which Mr. Govett appears to share. The apostle, therefore, wrote to destroy the delusion. He says: "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is not of God; and this is that spirit of antichrist whereof ye have heard that it should come, and even now already is it in the world." This error, notwithstanding the efforts of John to extinguish it, grew rapidly, and combined with others to produce that great apostasy which we now witness in the Church of Rome, and the many offshoots which, protesting against some of her dogmas, still retain the fundamental heresies of her creed. If Christ were really the Deity, what need had he so frequently to engage in prayer? What sense was there in saying "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me," when he was imposing upon himself the task of drinking the cup. And if he were one in identity with the Father, how was it that he had not the same knowledge respecting future events that the Father possessed?

(To be continued.)

MIDSUMMER TOUR.—All being well, the Editor intends leaving Birmingham, on Tuesday, August 4th, and keeping appointments at London, Nottingham, the West Riding of Yorkshire, Beith, Paisley, Wishaw, Glasgow, &c. Experience on the last northern tour makes it necessary for him to refer to the paragraph headed "Bradford-on-Avon," page 161, *Ambassador* for August, 1866. He does so with reluctance, and only as a matter of arrangement to expedite a common object. "Many hands make light work."

## BAPTISM AND THE GOOD CONFESSION.

### A FRIEND'S DIFFICULTIES.

The "conversation" published last month, in connection with a friend's objection to the practice of examining candidates for immersion, has elicited from him the subjoined snatch of dialogue, in which he gives expression to certain objections that still linger in his mind. We quote the dialogue in full, and follow it with a few comments in the way of reply.

*Friend, may I ask you why you have never identified yourself with any religious body? I have never yet met with those whose faith and practice harmonize with the whole word of God.*

*Really, not any? Not one.*

*Not even the Christadelphians? Not entirely; though I think that they have, by far, the nearest approach to the Bible teachings.*

*What objection do you see to their creed? Some little, as also to their practice.*

*What may that be? That like John the Baptist, they come baptising with water, and make it needful to salvation.*

*But we read "He that believeth and is baptised, shall be saved?" Yes; but I don't read anything of water there.*

*But what else can baptism be but immersion in water? We read of baptism with fire, baptism of suffering, baptism of spirit, as well as baptism with water.*

*Then how about the positive statement, one Lord, one faith, one baptism? Why, that baptism into Christ's name and spirit is the one baptism, and that all others are subsidiary or emblematical of it.*

*But WATER baptism was practised? Oh, yes.*

*And enjoined? That I am not so sure of. I cannot see it.*

*Was not Christ baptised with water? Yes, into John's baptism, and to fulfil all righteousness, and with spirit.*

*Then have not we apostolic example? Little, but of a doubtful character. Paul was not sent to baptise, but to preach the gospel; and as many (of the believers) as had been baptised into Christ, had put on Christ, evidently leaving it optional.*

*The apostles certainly did baptise with water? Yes, in two instances.*

*I am glad you acknowledge it. I acknowledge all that is plainly revealed.*

*What cases do you refer to? That of the Eunuch, by Philip; and the Centurion, by Peter.*

*And at Pentecost on one other occasion? I cannot see it. The evidence of water being used is quite wanting.*

*Then what inference do you draw as the scriptural idea of baptism? That baptism, or immersion if you will, into the spirit and teachings of Christ by faith and obedience, is essential to salvation, is, in fact, the one baptism; and that fire and water are emblematical or figurative of the True. "For which FIGURE whereunto baptism doth also now save us." Buried thus, with the Spirit of Christ by baptism, we may rise into the Spirit in newness of life. "Baptism" in this way, "doth now SAVE us," being baptised into one Spirit."*

*Supposing this difference of view on baptism were surmounted, you would probably be at one with the Christadelphians? Yes.*

*And join them? I don't know that I could.*

*Then what other difficulty arises? One of practice—that I think anti-scriptural.*

*What is that? A passage through a probationary state; a virtual order of Catechumens, for which I can find no warrant in the scriptures.*

*But is it not "necessary to ascertain whether candidates believe the truth of the gospel?" Yes; necessary on the part of the candidate himself, but not necessary or proper on the part of others.*

*But "must we not find out the truth of a man's profession, when he claims fellowship with us, and the genuineness of his faith? I think that is what no man or body of men have any scripture justification for doing; and is one of the numerous unscriptural practices that all the "sects" have from time immemorial practised.*

*Then you object to examinations in the faith? Most certainly, in the way you submit it.*

*But not entirely then? The examination I contend for, as the only one justifiable, needful and proper, is the apostolic one: "Examine your own selves, whether ye be in the faith."*

*Yes, but you then admit hypocrites and wolves in sheep's clothing? We are not responsible for consequences. Follow the Bible directions. Depend upon it the evils you fear are only imaginary.*

*But in opening the doors of admission thus widely, you would necessarily admit unqualified individuals, "and practice upon ourselves and others a complete deception." You have no right to sit in judgment. The deceiver and hypocrite are not amenable to your bar.*

*But we are to "try the spirits." Yes the spirits of the prophets—the teachers, pastors, expounders, and so forth; "for many false prophets and teachers are gone forth into the world." But no countenance is given to the idea that the "spirits" of "candidates" are to be tried.*

But suppose "disorder" or "confusion" did arise on the principle of admission you name, what remedy do you suggest? The one prescribed by the apostle, "Withdraw" from every brother that walketh disorderly.

Then you make objection to ALL "INQUISITION" for membership? I do most strongly. To my mind it savours very little of the Bible, and very strongly of the "sects."

Do you make any point of the great publicity the Christadelphians give to their particular creed? I am glad you mention this; it had escaped my remark—That every candidate for admission to the "fold" of Christ has an ample opportunity of knowing all the tenets of belief, through the prominence given them by the adherents of "the faith;" and the rash adventurer entering communion must be aware of the interdict suspended.—"He that eateth and drinketh UNWORTHILY, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself." Cannot you see the impotence of human barriers after this?

Well, I think you have a fair show of scripture and reason on your side. Yes; it is a matter of great surprise to me that Christadelphians have not kept closer to the word in this matter.

The "Friend" of the foregoing dialogue seems in a curious dilemma. He finds fault with the Christadelphians because they uphold the obligation of water baptism, and yet he admits it was "practised" by the Christians of the first century. He suggests that though practised, it was not enjoined. This is far-fetched and inconceivable. If not enjoined, how did they come to "practise" it? Does their "practice" not afford a fair presumption of injunction having given rise to it, considering they lived in the very presence of the authority on which gospel dispensation was founded? Would they have practised a thing not enjoined? Our "friend" may suggest that some of John's disciples may have practised it, without authority, but he surely would not suggest such a thing in the case of Peter, who said, in the house of Cornelius, "Can any man forbid WATER that these should not be BAPTISED as well as we?"

But our friend wavers before the fact that he reads of "baptism with fire, baptism of suffering, and baptism of spirit." Why should this trouble him? "Baptism," as a naked word, means immersion, without reference to the element to which it may be related. A person can be immersed in fire, in suffering, and in the Holy Spirit, and all these immersions were among the ex-

periences of the apostolic age; but does this exclude immersion in water, as the action by which men assume the name of Christ? There is a baptism connected with the terms of salvation. Our friend cannot shut his eyes to this: "He that believeth, and is baptised, shall be saved." The question is, which of all the baptisms "he reads of" is this? The "practice" of the apostles, is the answer. If there is ONE CASE, it settles the point; but instead of one, there are several. In addition to those acknowledged by the "Friend" of the foregoing dialogue, there is the case of the Samaritans: "They were baptized, both men and women," (Acts viii, 12), for some time before they received the Holy Spirit.—(verse 16.) It could not be baptism of the spirit; it was not baptism of suffering. Was it baptism of fire? Why doubt it was water, when Peter commanded WATER on a similar occasion. Why suppose Peter followed one practice and Philip another? Our "Friend" suggests that the baptism in this case, was "a baptism into the teachings and spirit of Christ by faith and obedience." How would this suit the record: "And he (Paul) arose, and was baptized." This was in answer to the appeal, "Why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptised, and wash away thy sins." To suppose that Ananias meant "Arise, and have thy mind immersed in the teachings of Christ," is inadmissible on every principle. In fact, it is impossible to imagine a rational mind would seriously put forward such a view. "Water" is incontestably associated with the initiatory rite of baptism, in the words of Paul "that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the WASHING OF WATER by the word," (Eph. v, 26), and again in Heb. x, 22, "Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with PURE WATER." Then there are Christ's words, "Except a man be born OF WATER and of the spirit, he cannot see the kingdom of God," which agree with those of John, (1 John v, 7), "There are three that bear record, (omitting the spurious part of the passage) . . . the Spirit and the WATER, and the blood." The proof that the apostolic baptism was water baptism is, therefore, beyond all question; and the conclusion that it is essential follows as a matter of course; for what God appoints is essential. His appointments are

not yea and nay; his laws never bend to suit the likings of the creature.

It was appointed as a means of induction into Christ, and apart from it in our day, there is no other means of induction. This follows from Paul's statement: "As many of you as have been baptised into Christ, have put on Christ."—(Gal. iii, 27.) The "Friend" thinks this proves it is *optional*! He deduces this from the phrase "*as many of you.*" What a slim foundation for such a surmise, going as it does, directly in the teeth of the unimpeachable cases, and making the commandments and the instructions of Christ, things with which we could play fast and loose, according to inclination! "As many of you" may in any case mean all, and in this case, without doubt it means all, if it referred to the ecclesia alone; for he connects their standing in Christ with their submission to baptism. Those who were not baptised among them (and it is possible there might have been hangers-on—insubmissive believers, who had not been baptised, and who were not in the ecclesia), had not put on Christ. This follows if his statement has any meaning. If there was no connection between baptism and the putting-on of Christ, Paul's words were both misleading and meaningless.

But supposing this point settled to the "Friend's" satisfaction, he still objects to the practice of the Christadelphians, in another branch of the matter. He objects to their examination of candidates for immersion. He says it is unscriptural. He looks at the matter from a wrong point of view, in pronouncing this judgment. If the position taken up by the examining party were this: "Now, Mr. Candidate, you cannot be saved unless we baptise you: your baptism will not be of any value to you unless administered by us: we must therefore see whether you are fit"—Friend's objection would hold good; but this is not the attitude of the "inquisitors," (as Friend seems to regard them) at all. They say "we are under the law of Christ: that law requires a man seeking baptism to be a believer of the gospel; and it requires of us not to receive into our fellowship those who do not believe the truth, on pain of being held responsible for their guilt. You

ask us to baptize you. As a matter of allegiance to Christ and defence of our own position, we must ascertain whether you believe the truth. We cannot be parties to your baptism, if you do not receive the truth. We should be misleading you and implicating ourselves." "Friend" admits the application of this rule after baptism, but denies it before. He would recognize the right to examine a man whom he should be bound to recognize as a brother in Christ, but he denies the right towards those who are not in Christ! He would be inquisitorial towards a brother, but not towards a man asking to be a brother! If a man stopped him in the street and said "Baptize me," he would not ask a question (for if he be asked *one*, he would concede the whole principle) but would go "straightway" and baptize him, and then perhaps find out someone had practised a joke. Would this be bringing the most ordinary sense to bear in the matter? We cannot impart validity to immersion by compliance, nor can we vitiate it by withholding countenance, but, as a matter of the commonest order and self-protection, we are bound to ascertain, (and in these days, to apply the test rigidly) whether a man believe the truth of the gospel.

The principle is scriptural. First, Jesus associates baptism with belief; and it is our duty to him to see that that association exists so far as we are called upon to sanction a profession of his name. Second, Philip is recorded to have observed this precaution in the case of the eunuch. Third, Paul at Ephesus, re-immersed twelve men, *on putting their faith on a right footing*. Fourth, in all recorded cases of baptism, belief preceded it, and it is an outrage on common sense to suppose that the parties immersing took no steps to ascertain the existence of that belief. Fifth, the dictates of common sense coincide with apostolic example and scriptural induction. For these reasons we press "Friend" to reconsider his scruples, throw them to the wind, and give effect to his growing convictions by joining the Christadelphians in their profession of the name of Christ, their obedience of his commandments, their service of his suffering cause, and their testimony for his rejected truth.—EDITOR



## INTELLIGENCE.

**ABERDEEN.**—We must decline to publish intelligence from this place, so long as those in it professing the truth, identify themselves with the Dowieites by fellowship. When they have taken up a faithful position, news of their movements will be interesting and useful. Till then, we must forbear to compromise ourselves by co-operation with those who hold the enemy by one hand, while stretching out the other in friendship.

**BERWICK-ON-TWEED.**—Brother Hayes, on a visit to this place, writes, May 28: "Last Sunday, you will be pleased to learn we had an immersion in the Tweed, of one of brother Nesbit's labourers, ANDREW MCKELVY, formerly Baptist. Brethren Tait and Yule were present, and the latter administered the rite. I read and offered up prayer, and brother Tait made a few appropriate remarks to those assembled on the banks of the river to witness the ceremony. I like these open air baptisms in a running stream; one is reminded of the immersions in the Jordan, in apostolic days. After the ceremony was over, we returned to brother Nesbit's, and broke bread together with our new brother; and in the afternoon, I addressed between forty and fifty people on the subject of baptism, in apostolic days. After the ceremony was over, we returned to brother Nesbit's, and broke bread together with our new brother; and in the afternoon, I addressed between forty and fifty people on the subject of baptism, for about an hour, after reading Romans vi. On the previous Sunday afternoon I addressed about the same number, on mortality and immortality. On both occasions the audience was very attentive, and expressed themselves very much pleased, and desirous of hearing more. Brother Nesbit is an astonishingly active man for his years. He is in the habit of addressing the people every alternate Sunday, at his son Robert's farm, about three miles distant, where a goodly number generally assemble from the adjacent villages; and it is entirely through him that the brother immersed on Sunday last came to a knowledge of the truth."

**BIRMINGHAM.**—The last month has witnessed seven immersions—the obedient believers being GEORGE HENRY CHESHIRE (25), puddler, formerly Primitive Methodist; EMMA HOLLAND (36), formerly "church," JOHN SHEMMANS (25), tailor, formerly Church of England; SARAH SHEMMANS (26), wife of the last-named; SAMUEL SKINNER (22), clicker, formerly neutral; THOMAS WATTON (35), boat builder, formerly Primitive Methodist; JANE WATTON, wife of the last-named. The first and the last two belong to Oldbury, and constitute the nucleus of a new ecclesia in that place. On Monday, June 1, an open tea meeting for converse with enquiring strangers, was held. There was a goodly gathering, and a profitable meeting. Numbers of earnest-minded people continue to give heed to the truth.—Sickness and poverty are prevalent in the ecclesia, and

indeed throughout the whole district, consequent upon the long and continued depression in trade, which in a community like Birmingham, means no work for hundreds, and a scant supply for the rest.

**EDINBURGH.**—Brother Hayes, visiting at Edinburgh, writes June 13, as follows:—"A week since, I had an opportunity, for the first time, of hearing a debate between the two parties in Edinburgh (Christadelphians and Dowieites—ED.) The subject was "resurrection and judgment." Cameron and Laing were the principal speakers on their (the Dowieite) side of the house. I was most unfavourably impressed with what I heard. What you have said of that party is quite confirmed. Being asked my opinion, I have expressed it strongly, in very plain terms. . . . Cameron particularly seemed to labour under a painful impression that he might commit himself. His hesitation and careful selection of words in framing a proposition brought this fact strongly out. Another of the party refused to answer at all. I do not think such people are worth arguing with. I quitted the meeting with disgust. I think the best name for such a set would be that of Jesuits. I am certain you have not handled them one morsel too severely. They deserve all you have said of them and more."

**LONDON.**—The brethren have rented Crowndale Hall, and have commenced meetings there under the following announcement:—

"Search the Scriptures. CROWDALE HALL, Crowndale Road, St. Pancras Road, Oakley Square. Meetings will be held in the above hall, every Sunday evening, for the Exposition of the Scriptures. To commence each evening at 7 o'clock. Subjects for June as follows: June 14—'The Second Advent of Jesus, its Certainty and its Objects.' 21st—'The Crucifixion and Resurrection of Jesus Christ: why were they necessary, and what are their consequences?' 28th,—'The Soul; is it immortal?' Admission free, and no collection. Bring your Bibles."

**NEWCASTLE.**—See paragraph headed "Aberdeen."

**NOTTINGHAM.**—Brother Phelps reports five additions to the ecclesia by immersion during the month: JOSEPH HODGKINSON, (Nottingham gas works), formerly Adventist; PHARAOH KEELING, clothier, formerly Campbellite; ISRAEL LOVETT, clothier, formerly Wesleyan; ELLEN KERRY, wife of brother Kerry, formerly Baptist; LUCY BRYAN, domestic servant, of no previous religious profession.—On the 1st of June, taking occasion of a general holiday, the brethren held a tea meeting for converse in the truth. About fifty were present. Some

visitors put important questions, which were answered. Brother Phelps says much was done on the occasion for the advancement of the truth.

OLDBURY, (near Birmingham).—See Birmingham intelligence. An ecclesia has been established here. The first meeting took place on Sunday, June 28th, when a number of Birmingham brethren and sisters bore them company and countenance, in the breaking of bread. The meeting place is the old Methodist preaching room, (Talbot Street,) which has been forsaken of the Methodist element, on the truth making an entrance.

SWANSEA. — Brother Randles, writing May 27th, says "On Tuesday, May 5th, the brethren were rejoiced by the obedience of ALFRED ROWLAND (50), merchant tailor and outfitter, formerly neutral, who was immersed into the One Name, on making a profession of the one faith. Our brother arrived at a knowledge of the truth through reading the *Twelve Lectures*, lent him by the writer, and has expressed himself exceedingly thankful at having seen them, being the means of bringing him out of darkness into the glorious light. May he endure unto the end, and be a recipient of the glory which is to be revealed." Writing June 22nd, brother Randles announces another addition in the person of MARY ANN BATER, (22), formerly neutral, who, after attending the meetings for some time, made an intelligent confession of her faith, and was immersed on Friday, May 22nd.

TURRIFF.—"On the 17th of May, HELEN ANDREW, on making the good confession, was baptized into the saving name of the Lord Jesus. She was formerly among the Campbellites, but was never very well pleased with her baptism among them. She received some teaching from Dr. Hayes that never left her, and what he commenced has been finished in her obedience."—JAMES ROBERTSON.

WHITBY.—There has been one addition to the ecclesia during the month, by the immersion of Mrs. ARGUMENT, who confessed her faith in the glad tidings concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ.

WISNAW.—Brother Hodgson writes, June 23rd: "We have had a visit from Dr. Hayes, who delivered two lectures in this place, on the following subjects, viz., first, 'Immortality a Conditional Gift,' and 2nd, 'What think ye of Christ?' Both lectures were full of instruction, and our only regret is, that the audience on both occasions was small."

#### CANADA.

GUELPH.—Brother H. L. Drake, writing June 8, says "When the *Twelve Lectures* arrived, I mailed a copy to a man living six

or seven miles from here, at a place called Eden Mills. I drew my bow at a venture, the most I knew of him being that he was called 'an infidel' by the sectarians of his neighbourhood. Subsequently I sent him other tracts, *Devil and Hell*, &c. He read and circulated them, and they caused great agitation. The 'satans' were roused. They denounced the doctrines in private and at last in public discourses. A request was sent to me to come and defend them, with an intimation that neither 'one lecture, nor boys' play, nor soft speeches,' would do. I announced a lecture, to take place in a cabinet shop, supposing it to have been permanently secured; but Satanic influence over the 'Eves' of this 'Eden' closed the door. Our friend of the *Twelve Lectures*, however, placed his house, and if necessary, his entire premises at my disposal. We have delivered five lectures amongst us, one by brother Evans, on 'The Truth necessary to be believed, and the Fables necessary to be rejected, in order to salvation.' A week ago one of sin's 'reverends' delivered a discourse three-and-a-half hours long, endeavouring to prove that there was a supernatural devil, and a hell of eternal torments. The claims of the truth are receiving increasing attention from the people. Agitation and discussion are becoming the order of the day. Brother Evans' lecture yesterday provoked a sturdy layman to ask permission to defend Trinitarianism. We have placed the hall at his disposal on Sunday next, at 1.30, on the understanding that we shall have a right of reply. A gentleman wanted the 'layman' to reply to all that brother Evans had advanced; but the layman thought one day was short enough to defend Trinitarianism. However, he said if the use of the hall was granted, he should consider whether he would not on some future occasion, take up the other subjects. We assured them all that we wanted was a thorough canvass of the subject. On May 17th, we had two additions by immersion. MARY HANS (54), and her daughter JANE HANS (23); On May 25, we had two more additions, viz: ELIZABETH COULING (74), ELIZABETH COULING (38); and yesterday we had another addition, LEONARD COULING (64). Others are interested."

INNERKIP.—Brother F. Malcolm writes May 16th: "Our activity in spreading the truth these last twelve months, has set the whole community in a blaze of excitement. The clergy have been preaching against the doctrines we teach, and the laity are circulating all sorts of scandal and lies; but I see by the *Ambassador* that it is the same in the old country, so we are encouraged. There is no one who has dared to meet us fair, in open fight, but all are ready to bite in the heel."

F.M.

## CHINA.

HONG KONG.—Brother E. Lilley, writing April 24th, says—"I have now plenty of books, but I do not see many in love with the truth in this place. At present there are only two of us that have been immersed into the great saving name. We break bread together every first day of the week, and are very happy."

## NEW SOUTH WALES.

BURRAWANG.—Mr. John M. Hawkins, of this place, having received from his brother in Britain a copy of *Twelve Lectures*, writes his brother, under date March 2, as follows: "The book has much interested myself and family. I have read it twice over, and am going over it a third time. I am at present inclined to believe it to be right, so far as regards the mortality of mankind, and future reward and punishment. I have long been satisfied that the Bible is true, but did not dream of being led astray as to its meaning by Protestant teachers, whose cry is, 'The Bible and the Bible alone, the religion of Protestants.' I have made up my mind that the Bible shall be the foundation of my faith, and that the teachings of men for the future shall be brought to the standard of truth, before I will believe them. But is it not strange that mankind should have been led so long astray? The wisest and best of men in all ages, almost from the time of the apostles, many of whom died for the truth—Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, Knox, Wickliffe, and in later times, Wesley and Whitfield, with many others; and even the Waldensian Church, which I have seen described as the purest and most ancient church on earth—these all I believe have held the doctrines of the immortality of the soul, of endless rewards and punishments, the Trinity, &c. Is it possible that all these should have been in the dark to these latest times? to the eleventh hour of the world? It seems strange to me that it should be so. Have all these died without saving faith? Will not some of these at least, when Christ comes, be received as 'good and faithful servants,' and be admitted to the joy of their Lord? I should be glad to have further light on these all-important subjects. . . . Tell me if there are many who believe and think as you do, and whether you have been baptised by immersion. Have you been present at any ecclesia? And if you can, tell me whether the Christadelphians lead more exemplary lives than christians generally do. I want as much information as you can give me. I can assure you that I am thankful for the *Lectures*; but as yet no one but my own family have read them here. My former views of things have greatly altered; but I do not feel quite strong enough to enter the lists against orthodoxy."

[The writer of the foregoing writes, as almost everyone writes who is brought in contact with the truth for the first time. A feeling of incredulity is the first impulse of a mind that has run for years in the established channel, when invited to believe that the men and systems revered for generations are in the wrong. It is not difficult to account for this feeling. When the mind has taken a set, it cannot be turned all at once. The impressions, views, convictions and affections of a lifetime, acquire the strong force of mental habit, and cannot readily be bent to a new current of ideas. This is especially true in religious questions, for the simple reason that religious bias is the deepest and strongest of all the mental forces. In a question, however, like the one introduced to Mr. Hawkins' notice, the matter stands in a simple and practicable form. Is the word of God to be the standard of faith? To this question, there can only be one answer on the part of minds of a religious order. Religious professors will with one consent, endorse the Protestant cry, "The Bible and the Bible alone is our religion!" The difficulty, however, is in reducing this rule to practice. The writer of the foregoing letter seems to have bravely addressed himself to this difficulty, with the object of surmounting it. He is determined to let the Bible rule his religious convictions. Still, he looks around, and suffers his purpose to waver in the presence of a crowd who with every good intention, are in the bonds of the apostacy, and arrayed against the teaching of the Bible, though revering the Bible itself. He says, Can all those be wrong? Even if they were in the land of the living, this would not be the question; but much less is it so when the persons in question are in the land of the dead, beyond reach of being brought to the test of the word. The question is, What does the Bible teach? and if the answer to this question should put us in opposition to every living soul, we can only accept our position with submission, if with sorrow, and say with David, "Let God be true and every man a liar." Neither is it the question to ask how the Christadelphians behave themselves; because if they were all thieves and murderers, it would not invalidate a single

item of God's promises which they believe. These stand or fall on their own merits, and not with reference to the character of those who hold them. There are those who "hold the truth in unrighteousness." There were such in Paul's day; but this, though it brought reproach on the truth, did not overthrow it. Nevertheless, it may be comforting to the writer of the foregoing to know that he will not be correctly informed if anyone tell him that Christadelphians are behind "christians generally," in the lives they lead.—EDITOR.]

### THE TRUTH'S PROGRESS.

Our statistical correspondent sends us the following summary of progress, for the last twelve months, as recorded in the *Ambassador*, from month to month. It has to be remarked that the figures applying to the United States and Canada do not represent the real progress in these parts of the world. Only an occasional item of intelligence comes from them. It is to be presumed that the great number of cases are never heard of; progress is not so systematically recorded as in Britain. Our correspondent has placed on record such cases as have appeared during the year:—

"June 30th, 1867, to June 30th, 1868.

(One year.)

Immersion—(Great Britain)	. 103
Re-immersions ditto	. 9
Secessions from nondescript Meetings	5
Canada (Immersion)	. 6
United States (ditto)	. 6
Australia ditto	. 4
Hong Kong ditto	. 2

New Zealand	. . . . . 4
Total	. . . . . 139
Defections, Great Britain	. . . . . 2
Deaths ditto	. . . . . 6

"The 'Intelligence' has also recorded the following facts, viz., there are, at two places in Canada, 15 brethren; in the United States, two meetings were recently formed, numbering together 44 individuals; there are 20 brethren at Philadelphia, Pa., and a few at Halifax; at Hong Kong, 4 brethren—(there are only two brethren, the others being friends—Ed.) In different localities in New Zealand there are two meetings comprising 31 believers.

"Three towns in England are also mentioned where there are a few or several brethren, but the numbers are not given.

"It would be esteemed a favour if a statement were furnished, giving the numbers in each ecclesia or locality at the end of June last."

We supplement the foregoing statement by the republication of last year's return, which will exhibit, by comparison, an increase of speed in the rate of progress as time advances:—

Immersion, Great Britain	. . . . . 79
Re-immersion (several, say)	. . . . . 20
Secessions from nondescript meetings	6
Canada (immersion)	. . . . . 3
United States, none recorded	. . . . .
Australia	. . . . . 2
India	. . . . . 3
New Zealand	. . . . . 10
Total	. . . . . 123
Defections, Great Britain	. . . . . 3
Deaths ditto	{ . . . . . 6

### REVILINGS OF THE ENEMY.

The *Voice upon the Mountains* continues its active hostility to the truth. The article on the pre-existence of Christ, which is answered this month by brother Butler, was followed in the June number by an article on the Devil, and this month by one on the soul.

There also appear several letters congratulating the editor on the successful exposure of "this abominable sect, the Christadelphians." We subjoin a few extracts, that our readers may perceive the growing influence of the truth in the embittered attacks that are made.

upon it. Time and space permitting, we may have something to say on the subject by-and-bye.

The first ("H. Goodwyn," writing from 60, Pembroke Villas, Bayswater,) says:—

"The 'Christadelphians' have afforded another proof that these are not only 'perilous times,' but 'the latter days.' This new sect is one of the 'wiles of the devil,' in malice endeavouring to draw souls away from steadfastness in Christ. And he will succeed to a great extent. I believe that it will assume the features of an act of *judicial blindness* on the part of God against those 'who receive not the love of the truth, that they may be saved.'—(2 Thess. ii, 10, 11.) It has been so from the days of Pharaoh; 'but they shall proceed no farther' than the assigned limit. I am not surprised at their appearance and doctrine.—(See 2 Tim. iii, 13; iv, 3, 4.) They will 'wax worse and worse.' Christians can do nothing but pray, and hold up the light of truth against this darkness that is 'loved rather than light.'"

"I should rather doubt their having very much truth about the coming of the Lord. The deep things of God and His mysteries are for the *children, disciples, and faithful servants*.—(1 Cor. ii, 9, 12; Mark ix, 2; vii, 33; Gen. xviii, 17; xv, 13, 14.) The mere fact of the knowledge of that truth which is written, without the power of its application to the hearts, lives, and consciences of men, is shadowy enough."

"I am meditating a three months' tour, if the Lord permit, through Yorkshire and Lancashire. . . . In doing this I take the opportunity of delivering addresses on The Kingdom and its glorious majesty.—(Ps. cxlv, 10-12.) I shall endeavour to counteract these antichristian deceivers, and may perhaps meet with some, for I hope to be able honestly to follow the example of Paul.—(Acts xxviii, 30.)"

The second (George Lloyd, writing from Darlington,) says:—

"I thank *The Voice upon the Mountains* very much for calling the attention of the christians of England to this last dangerous phase of heresy, called by the grandiloquent title, 'The Christadelphian Ecclesia.' Mr. Govett has ably combated its errors (or rather *their* errors) in the May number, and purposes to continue to do so. It remains, therefore, only for me to say—and I do so unhesitatingly—that the heresy is a masterpiece of Satan. He knows that his time is short, and that the most successful way of injuring truthful doctrine is to corrupt it; and this he does by his emissaries, such as those we have now to deplore. Religious

freedom! is the cry of the age, but it often means license to blaspheme. This has come from the fountain-head; and what next?"

"It is, however, dear brother, but another proof of the truthfulness of our exposition of the word of God. It is one of the signs of the times which we have frequently urged; namely, that in 'the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron.'—(1 Tim. iv, 1, 2.)"

W. Maude, writing April 28th, from 6, Prince's Terrace, Birkenhead, says:—

"As regards the strange new heresy, the 'Christadelphian ecclesia,' I am sorry to be unable to give you any additional information. I have heard very little of these strange people, and have read none of their publications, with the exception of Dr. Thomas's '*How to Search the Scriptures*,' which seemed to me, for the most part, utter nonsense. As regards Liverpool, I have never heard of them there—that they have made much progress there I can hardly believe. I believe Birmingham and the midland districts to be their head quarters.

"I shall read the articles in '*The Voice*' with much interest, and am glad to see the subject is in such good hands as Mr. Govett's. It seems to me, however, that a few clear, strong, and pointed tracts would be particularly useful. Were I furnished with fuller information, and some of the most important of their publications, I should not be unwilling to do something in this way myself. I think the matter demands attention."

Another writes as follows:—

"I am very thankful to the Lord for the clear and strong statements you and your correspondents are making as to the prevalent signs of these evil days. The new sect, whose errors Mr. Govett is exposing, is rather to be viewed as the coming to the surface of the hidden lawlessness which is deeply working in the midst of us. . . . It is like a fresh symptom in the poor man whose constitution is broken, and who is suffering daily through a complication of internal disorders."

Another says:

"I rejoice to see Mr. Govett's contributions to *The Voice*. His papers are very valuable. Surely we ought to be very thankful that this new and most abominable sect is being thus exposed. How fast predicted events seem to be coming on. The prophetic scriptures seem to be condensing. How peculiar the whole state of things, social, political and ecclesiastical.

# THE AMBASSADOR

## Of the Coming Age.

---

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

---

No. 50.

AUGUST, 1868.

Vol. V.

---

### STRONG DELUSION ;

#### OR, MODERN SPIRITUALISM IN THE LIGHT OF SCIENCE AND SCRIPTURE.

---

*ODOLOGY, continued from page 194.*

GENERAL facts are the laws by and through which God sustains all things and operates upon them. By these laws a relationship is established between Him and man, who is subjected to their operation in common with minerals and vegetables. Thus, electricity acts uniformly, whatever the nature of the thing acted upon; the products of that action vary according to the medium through which it acts. Like electricities repel, and unlike ones attract, whether minerals, vegetables, clouds, or animal substances, be the subject of their power.

When God speaks to man, He speaks electrically, that is, by *His Spirit*; for electricity is the term *science* has bestowed upon what the Bible styles *Spirit*. All physical phenomena are produced by the Spirit acting according to laws peculiar to it, a very few of which are found scattered about in works of science. When the Creator wills to speak, He does it by the same Spirit that shivers the sturdy oak, or rends the rocks asunder. Sometimes He communicates His mind by making direct spectral impressions on the magnetic mirror of the brain. In this case, a man in his sleep *sees* objects and *hears* sounds that have no real existence; but are representative of realities past, present, or future. These are the dreams and visions of the prophets. Sometimes He speaks mediately, but still electrically, as through Jesus Christ and his apostles, whose method we will look into briefly in connection with the principles brought out in M. Karsten and Dr. Draper's experiments.

Things, ideas, or images may exist upon the brain's tablet, or sensorium, and yet be invisible; that is, not be recollected by the individual who received them; and consequently invisible to all other persons from his inability to utter them. Though thus invisible, the ideas are nevertheless existent, and actually present within. They exist, however, in the state of *latent spectral impressions*, and in order to be evoked, or made visible, they need to *be breathed upon* by the same principle that impressed them upon the sensorium. Now the sensoria, or magnetic mirrors, or minds, of the apostles had been prepared,\* or highly polished (to speak artistically) by the process they had undergone by the ministry of John the Baptizer. They were in that state which is represented by the polished metal, or glass, in Dr. Draper's experiment, ready for the coin to be impressed upon it. Jesus came, *the medium* through which the Father operated in word and deed.† He spoke the words, laying them, so to speak, like coins upon the polished tables of their hearts; while the Father, who performed the miracles, passed by their effect, the electricity of His Spirit, as it were, through the words and their sensoria, stamping impressions there after the illustration of M. Karsten's experiment with the electrifying machine. "I can of mine own self do nothing," said the Lord Jesus; "but the Father is in me. The words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself: but the Father that dwelleth in me, He doeth the works." This proves what we have said; that Jesus was the Father's medium through whom, by His Spirit, He operated on men's minds by words confirmed by miracles, in strict accordance with the laws illustrated by the experiments before us.

The apostles saw and heard many things during their attendance on the instructions of the Great Teacher, which continued to *the end of months*, as hidden spectral impressions upon their sensoria, but which were afterwards evoked in lines of living light. They saw Jesus ride into Jerusalem on an ass's colt as predicted by Zechariah. But one of them referring to it says, "These things understood not his disciples at the first, *but when Jesus was glorified*, then *remembered* they that these things were written of him, and that they had done these things unto him."‡ They knew what was written in the prophet, and they saw what the people did on the occasion referred to, but their knowledge was a latent spectre until made manifest, some time after, at the glorification of Jesus. But what happened then by which these latent spectral impressions were evoked? *The Spirit was breathed upon them* after the illustration contained in Dr. Draper's experiment. But why were they not evoked before Jesus was glorified? For the reason assigned by John, in speaking of the gift of the Spirit—"The Holy Spirit," says he, "was not yet given: because that Jesus was not yet glorified."§ Speaking of his teachings, Jesus said to them, "These things have I told you, *that when the time shall come, ye may remember that I told you of them.* When the Spirit of the truth is come, it will guide you into all truth; It shall glorify me."|| The glorification in this sense was the receiving

\* Luke i, 17. † Jno. v, 30. ‡ Jno. xii, 16. § Jno. vii, 39. ¶ Jno. xvi, 4, 18, 14.

things concerning Jesus, and showing them to the apostles—evoking the impressions already existing, and communicating new ones, as evinced in their writings. In this way they were glorified as well as Jesus; for receiving the Spirit of the truth, it became in them as a fountain of living streams; thus, “whom he justified, them he also glorified.”\* The Lord Jesus was glorified in a certain sense, after his resurrection, before he was received up into glory; and therefore before he ascended, he gave a measure of the Spirit to his apostles—not a full charge as on Pentecost, but a sufficient charge, so to speak, to evoke the hidden spectral impressions, the effect of which electrification is seen in their words and actions, between the ascension and Pentecost, compared with those before the crucifixion. In bringing out these impressions, he proceeded as in Karsten and Draper’s experiments with the coins; for the apostle says, “*He breathed upon them* and said, *Labete pneuma hagion*, Receive ye Holy Spirit;” and from that, they had authority to remit sin.

Man was made in the image and likeness of God. Or, as David saith, *matkhasseraihu meat marelohim*, thou hast made him to fall short a little of the Elohim,† or angels. He is, therefore, like to them in form, and capable of similar manifestations; but he falls short of their perfection of beauty, strength, and electrical or spiritual exaltation. The Elohim, gods, or angels, are not spectral impressions, any more than men and women are, though they can make such impressions. They are ponderables, occupying space that cannot be occupied by another body at the same time. They are not ghosts, or disembodied winged phantoms, through which you may sweep your arm as through a shadow, and leave them undivided. They are bodies of a nature capable of corporealizing a thunderbolt without deterioration or hazard of destruction. Hence they can walk in the glowing furnace unaffected, as can they also whom they choose to mantle in a halo of their spirit.‡ They can eat and drink material substances;§ and have feet that can be handled and washed as the feet of men. “Let a little water, I pray you,” said Abraham to three of them, “be fetched, and wash your feet, and rest yourselves under the tree. And they said, “*So do*, as thou hast said.” The popular notions about angels are mere superstition. Disembodied spirits with wings are spectral impressions made by *odic emanations* from innate human folly on the unpolished sensoria of the ignorant. Winged heads of chubby babies, peeping out of clouds on the margin of inner glory, are spectres of minds bewitched, or crazed, by the “philosophy and vain deceit” of theosophical magicians and prophets of “the Spirit-World”—a world of electro-magnetic spectralia. Such angels as the people’s heads are filled with, flourish there, and only there; and the darker the intellect, the more vividly are they seen in all *their* glory. Hence fanatics, worshippers of dead men’s ghosts (called by them “saints”) and angels, see more phantoms of the kind than the less intensely foolish; others on their deathbeds, when sometimes their sensoria are more than ordinarily excited, and their latent spectral

\* Rom. viii, 30. † Ps. viii, 5. ‡ Dan. iii, 25; Is. xxxiii, 14, 15. § Gen. xviii, 8.



impressions become vivid, have visions of such angels and even hear, as men hear in dreams, celestial music, and invitations to depart and come to Jesus!! Hence error stamps the sensorium as indelibly as truth can do; and confirms itself with falsehood in the article of death.

The angels of Jehovah do His commandments, hearkening to the voice of His word.\* By His Spirit, through them, He shapes the course of human affairs that they may arrive at an appointed end, when Jesus and the resurrected saints—*isangeloi*—"equal to the angels," no longer falling a little short of them, will assume the government of the world. These noble and glorified men, real, not phantom, spirits, cannot be evoked at the will and pleasure of railway travellers, and circles of backwoods sectarians, and consulters of the dead! How prostrate must be the human mind in this truly heathen land to succumb to such a conceit! Honest they may be as honesty goes; but O, the inexpressible ignorance of the Divine Testimony such pagan practices display! "Should not a people seek unto God? Should they seek to the dead in behalf of the living? To the Law and to the Testimony if they speak not according to the word, it is because there is no light in them." This is the unerring rule. The consulters of the dead do not obtain answers according to this word; though they do according to the latent spectral impressions on the minds of their "*mediums*," and those who consult or seek to know through them. There is therefore no divine truth to be extracted from their answers; the truth they have is only an evocation of what exists in the mind of man. The things I advocate are matters of divine testimony and reason. They need not demand confirmation from the spectral impressions, visible or invisible, of "*mediums*," ignorant of the first principles of the oracles of God. Granting that all they say they see and hear, in *their* "Spirit World," is really seen and heard, it militates not one iota against any thing *proved* by the testimony of God. They see and hear nothing but what begins and ends in the carnal mind. Every thing they reproduce is the mere magnetic reflection of human action, or human thought, from the sensorium of the medium: or the magnetic mirror, lake, sea, or reservoir, in which we exist like fish in the teeming waters.

A prophet, one of the apostle John's brethren, (perhaps Enoch or Elijah) was sent as an angel to him in Patmos. He was sent to show him future things,† which then had no existence, and many of them at present also have none, *except in the mind of God*. There the underived archetypes of them exist, and no one could see them there, unless he was placed *en rapport* with the Divine mind. When this should be effected, he could behold them there in all their wonderful symbolization glowing on the Divine sensorium. No one, however, was allowed to gaze upon this manifestation proximately, but Jesus. Hence the Apocalypse is styled "the revelation which God gave to Jesus Christ," that He might communicate it to His servants on earth. In doing this, he sent an angel, called "His angel," who was qualified to *signify it to*

\* Ps. ciii, 20.

† Rev. xxii, 8, 9; i, 19.

John, that he might write a description of it to Christ's servants. Now, in signifying it to John, the angel had to present visible spectral impressions before the apostle—to daguerreotype his sensorium in the camera obscura of his brain, with the objects transferred from the mind of the Father to the Lord Jesus, and then to the angel. This was effected by the Spirit shining upon the divine scenery, and being thence reflected upon John's sensorium, "shining into his heart to give him light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ:" and all the angel had to do to accomplish this, was to place John *en rapport* with himself; so that the Spirit passing from him to John would transfer the spectral impressions to him, and make him clairvoyant. The circle being complete, the spectral current circulated through the group; and John records the fact, saying, "I was in the Spirit, and heard behind me a great trumpet voice"—"he that hath ears to understand, let him hear what *the Spirit* saith."

Now man being made in the likeness of the angels, can imitate them, without knowing it, in many things, only in an imperfect manner. The Quaker "light within" can be made to shine with latent or *odid light* upon the sensorium of a prepared "medium." "If the *light within* you be darkness, how great is that darkness!" This is the character of the Quaker "light," which that sect teaches every man brings with him into the world! It is the electro-magnetic halo of the sensorium, stamped in after life with all sorts of spectral impressions, according to the teaching the pupil may happen to receive. Now take two such persons, and make one a "medium," called formerly a wizard or a witch, and the other a consulter of the dead through him, or her. In preparing the medium, you have preternaturally exalted, or rendered unusually sensitive, the sensorium—you have so highly polished the plate as to prepare it to receive impressions—its electro-magnetic halo is susceptible of the most delicate touches. Now place the seeker to the dead *en rapport* with the medium, and cause to pass from his sensorium a current of whatever you choose to call it—electricity, magnetism, od, or what not. This done, there is a connection established between them which unites the halos of the two; so that even the hidden spectral impressions of the seeker are daguerreotyped on the sensorium of the medium, and the witch sees and hears in dream-sight and dream-sound, things which the seeker may have himself forgotten. But the relationship established is not limited to the seeker and the witch; through her, it extends to all she knows, and through them, to others, and reacting upon herself; and so through the seeker, to all the ramifications of his acquaintanceship, both living and dead. He says, "Bring me up Samuel!" And Samuel vividly depicted on the sensorium of the seeker, appears also evoked as a spectral impression before the magnetic sight and hearing of the witch or medium. Saul saw nothing and heard nothing of himself; but perceived by the woman's description that it was Samuel. "What sawest *thou*?" said he to the woman. She told him; and "he perceived that it was Samuel," and made obeisance. The conversation between the spectral impression and Saul was carried on through the witch as

through a medium at this day. She heard as we hear in dreams, and what she heard, she reported; and Saul's spectral forebodings became prophetic in the witch's mouth.

Spectral impressions may be made in divers ways upon the sensorium. Irritation of the stomach will do it. A gentleman in Edinburgh told me that for six weeks, he had the appearance of a pig's head sitting upon his left shoulder, so that whenever he looked to that side, he saw it staring him in his face. He was suffering from dyspepsia. It was as much the disembodied spirit of a pig, as the spectres seen by mediums are the disembodied spirits of dead men and women, boys and girls, infants and sucklings. When his stomach was restored to healthy action, the pig's ghost vanished from the sensorium, and was consequently dethroned from my friend's shoulder; so when the excitation of the medium's sensory from another cause ceases, the disembodied spirits, and all the angels, vanish in a trice!

Reasoning from the facts presented in the experiments of the coin, we might argue that the actions of men cause hidden spectral impressions to be made on the external magnetic halo of the earth, which remain after they are dead and long forgotten; so that were the Almighty to breathe upon it with His Spirit, a man's history would be evoked like the handwriting on Belshazzar's palace-wall. Even these exterior spectral impressions may be discerned by mediums of peculiar sensibility; so that they may perceive scenes after the actors have become quiet. Clairvoyants have seen many things upon this principle. Elisha's is a case in point here. The king of Syria warred against Israel, and devised ambuscades for his enemy; but Elisha, who was in Dothan afar off, warned the king of Israel and saved him, not once nor twice. The king of Syria suspected treason in his own camp; but he was told by one of his followers, that Elisha, the prophet in Israel, told the king of Israel the words that were spoken in his own bed-chamber.\* Here the spectral impressions made upon the universal magnetic mirror by the Syrian's words, were breathed, or shined, upon by God, and evoked upon the sensorium of the prophet by the daguerreotypism of His Spirit, which gave wings to the matter. This is the "*bird of the air*" that reveals even the inmost thoughts of men. Therefore, "curse not the king; no, not in thy thought; and curse not the rich in thy bed-chamber: for a bird of the air shall carry the voice, and that which hath wings, shall tell the matter." † Let no man commit crime, and say, "No eye sees me, therefore the offence shall be hid." Sooner or later, his sin may find him out. The impressions of his deeds upon the earth's magnetic halo may happen to be reproduced upon the sensorium of some sleeping or waking medium; or stare him in his own face when he shall rise from the dead, and behold his actions written, like Belshazzar's doom on the magnetic page, in words of living light—thus verifying the proverb, trite yet true, that "*murder will out.*"

Unless God think fit to infatuate a people by their own folly and presumption, and so create spectral impressions of things upon the

\* 2 Kings vi, 8.

† Eccl. x, 20.

sensoria of their wizards beyond the range of their own sphere, the second-sight of mediums never contemplates ideas, or images, or shadowy forms, which are not purely of human origin. All the things they have seen are but the spectral impressions of human thoughts, words, or actions. *The doctrine they utter is always traceable to some sectarian theosophism*—some double-distilled theological foolery, always at variance with “the law and the testimony,” If they stumble upon a truth, it is just that proportion of truth that happens to be blended with human foolishness; and being truth, serves as a decoy to lead them into the mazes of a labyrinth, from which there is no possibility of extrication. From what I have read of “*Spirit Worldism*,” I have no hesitation in saying that it is mere “lying divination.” I have a volume at my side, Cahagnet’s “*Celestial Telegraph, or Secrets of the Life to Come revealed through Magnetism*,” a book of 240 large 12mo. pages, which is full of this sort of thing. It is a French work, and on p. 220 the author inquires, “On earth, is there aught that we can hide from the perception of a clairvoyant? It is not, therefore, ridiculous to admit that in the world of spirits, none is any longer able to conceal aught; it is the Book of Life which will be open to all.” Hence, a relationship being established between a clairvoyant and “spirits” in the invisible world, messages may pass between living bodies on earth and dead men’s ghosts in heaven or hell as by telegraph, and clairvoyants become the *see-ers* and *prophets* of their familiar spirits or gods! In this way are laid broad and deep again the foundations of a *new system of idolatry*, of which the magnetizing circle-men who entrance the clairvoyants, are the *priests*. Already, in the hands of these ignorant people, the Bible is what the clergy have made it by their preaching, a “dead letter.” They misapply it—and they can do nothing else—at pleasure, and cull from it texts, without regard to contexts, to suit their purpose—to sanctify their nonsense in the esteem of those in whom some veneration for “the Law and the Testimony of Jehovah,” is supposed to be still unextinct. Now the issue is between the *Magnetic Book of Life*—the Book of Magnetic Spectral Impressions—and the *Book of the Covenant*, usually styled THE BIBLE. Both volumes cannot be divine revelation of the future, or exponents of the same truth; for they foretell opposite events, and teach doctrines subversive of each other. The *Magnetic Book of Life* is nothing more than the magneto-etherial spectral impressions pertaining to the living generation, whose mind or sensorial halo, is the mirror from which is darkly reflected its own thoughts; while the Bible is a revelation from Jehovah of the fate of all existing governments, of His purpose to establish a theocracy on their ruins; of the destiny of nations for the coming thousand years; of the eternal constitution of the globe from the end of that period; of the condition of the human race when all things terrestrial become new; and of how *we of this*, and others of past generations, since the world began, may constitute a part of His theocracy, and become dwellers on the earth for ever. These are the great destinies, upon which the priests and prophetesses of “the Spirit World” can throw out no

light. Their divinations upon these topics, where not borrowed from the Bible, are only lying rhapsodies—the dark and malarious thinkings of nervous flesh, rioting in the spectralia of musty theosophisms, talked into by the gospel-nullifiers and pulpit mar-texts of the “chairs” and “sacred desks” of “christendom.” Like the old Athenian spirit-worldists who withstood Paul, they reject the resurrection of the mortal body, in resolving death into the introduction of the spirit of man into the spiritual world on the total cessation of the heart’s action! The Bible says “Many who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake.”\* And again, “the earth shall cast out the dead;” “and no more cover her slain;”† and that we may know by what power the dead shall rise, and who shall participate in the resurrection of the just, it is written, “If the Spirit of God that raised up Jesus from among the dead (*ek nekron*) dwell in you, He that raised up the Christ from among the dead, shall also make alive your *mortal bodies* through His indwelling Spirit in you.”‡ This is teaching the resurrection of dead bodies from earth’s dust, in which they are mingled—a resurrection effected by Jehovah’s Spirit through Jesus § at the reorganization of the righteous dead, and not at the dissolution of their existence here. But compare with this, and spurn with contempt, the following drivelling foolery of spirit-worldism, taken from Cahagnet. It is the clairvoyant Swede who vapors.—“The spirit of man,” says he, “after the separation, remains a short time in the body, but only until the total cessation of the heart; this happens differently; according to the nature of the disease of which the man dies; for the movement of the heart in some lasts a certain time, and in others ceases at once; no sooner does this movement cease than *man is resuscitated*, but this is brought about by the Lord alone. By *resurrection*, we mean the spirit of man leaving the body, and introduced into the spiritual world; correctly speaking, this resurrection should be termed *the awakening!*” The awakening believed in by spiritists is very different from the awakening taught in the Bible, as must be obvious to the weakest intellect. The clairvoyant awakening differs in the time and subject of it: it is the awakening of a dead man’s ghost at the last pulsation of his heart, while his body is still untouched by decomposition; while the Bible awakening is the awakening of a dead man himself, at some time, it may be five thousand years, after he has actually mouldered into dust. Now which are we to believe? Baal’s prophets, or Jehovah? The spectral illusions of the flesh or the testimony of the living God? The crazy old mesmerist of Sweden, or the apostles of Jesus Christ?

(To be concluded next month.)

## PARAPHRASE OF THE APOCALYPSE,

ON THE BASIS OF EUREKA II.—CHAPTER VIII, VERSES 1 to 5.

1.—AND when the lamb opened the seventh seal, silence ensued in the heaven about half-an-hour; a period of tranquillity in the political serial

\* Dan. xii, 2.

† Isai. xxxvi, 19, 21.

‡ Rom. viii, 11.

§ 2 Cor. iv, 14.

of the Roman Empire, and implying that previously there was an absence of silence, or, in other words, that there existed a tumultuous storm. This silence succeeded the conflict described under the sixth seal, in which the Pagan dragon power was expelled from the heaven of Daniel's fourth beast, thus leaving the Michael power the sole occupant of the throne.

The half-hour began A.D. 324, in which year, Constantine united the Roman world under the authority of one Emperor, and it lasted until A.D. 337, the year of Constantine's death. This period comprised nearly fourteen years, during which, says Gibbon, Constantine maintained a general peace, though it was marked by a condition of apparent splendour rather than of real prosperity. A prophetic half-hour comprises fifteen years, but as this period of silence falls short of that length of time, it is described as being "about half-an-hour."

During this half-hour of silence, there existed two temples in the Roman Empire, the one being composed of the aggregate body of true believers, and the other consisting of the members of the apostate church. The latter was the temple under which appeared the man of sin predicted by Paul, as personified by Constantine, the man-child of the Catholic woman, who, sitting in the temple of power, exalted himself above every other power, and it was during this period that the worst part of his character was manifested. From being a hero respected and loved by his subjects he degenerated, into a cruel and dissolute monarch, sacrificing, says Gibbon, the requirements of justice to his own passions and interests. In the temple of which he was the head, the truth of God was so perverted by traditions and fables that it became completely hidden. But in the opposition temple, the temple of the Deity, the reverse of this was the case. This latter temple was composed of believers, who were built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner stone, and hence this temple was the habitation of the spirit or truth of God. It was formed by the truth being believed and obeyed, and was therefore not of human construction; for the Deity dwelleth not in temples made with hands. Each believer was a lively precious stone, bought with the price of Jesus' blood for the purpose of being used in the erection of a spiritual house, in which was placed the light of God's truth.

2. And I saw the seven angels, who stood in the sight of the Deity, and seven trumpets had been given to them, and they thus stood in a state of inactivity, until the consummation of the sealing of the 144,000 at the termination of the symbolic half-hour.

3. And there came another angel—the symbol of the saints in their capacity as priests—and he stood by the altar, which, as already seen in the fifth seal, is composed of all who are in Christ. He had in his hand a golden censer or frankincense bowl—another symbol of the brethren of Jesus—and it contained the incense of their prayers and praises. And there was given to this symbolic angel many odours, that he might cast the prayers of all the saints upon the golden altar

which is in sight of the throne; a representation of the saints themselves offering up their petitions and thanksgivings, which are kindled into odours of acceptable perfume by the fire taken from the altar of the court.

4. And as they themselves constitute the golden altar of the Holy Place, the smoke of the perfumes of their prayers ascend in the presence of the Deity, as it were, from the hand of the angel. These petitions consisted of the prayers of the thousands, who were being sealed during the half-hour of silence, and were directed against Constantine and his clergy, the leaders of the apostacy.

5. That they were answered is denoted by the symbolic angel at the close of the half-hour taking the censer, filling it with fire from the altar, and casting it into the earth. This action produced voices, and thunders, and lightnings, and an earthquake: the symbols of the judgment inflicted upon the apostacy. Fire is a symbol of judgment against those on whom it falls; and as the fire of the sacrificial altar was cast out in answer to the prayers of the saints, it is evident not only that they had been praying for retribution upon their enemies, but that these punishments on the apostacy were inflicted in the interest of the saints. When the latter walk in the truth, they have fellowship with the Father and the Son, and are then a holy, heavenly community, and are said to "sit together in the heavenlies," or in Apocalyptic phraseology, to "dwell in the heaven." But the outside Gentiles, not being a part of this community, are denominated "the earth," or "inhabiters of the earth;" and hence the fact of the fire being cast into the earth is evidence that the judgments which it symbolizes were poured out upon the apostacy.

As soon as the half-hour silence was at an end, these judgments began to manifest themselves. The first results were the *voices*, which excluded silence from the political heaven, great misfortune upon the members of Constantine's family. It was in May, A.D. 337, the last year of the silent period, that Constantine the Great died, and immediately afterwards, a loud and unanimous *voice* came forth from the soldiers, instigated by the ministers and generals, declaring that none should reign over the Roman Empire but the sons of Constantine, namely, Constantius, Constantine and Constans. But this was not the purpose of Deity, for His name had been blasphemed, and His truth perverted, and, therefore, vengeance must be executed upon the guilty. This vengeance was first visited upon the Constantine family, a number of whom—brothers and nephews of the deceased Emperor—were massacred. The empire was then divided between the three sons; the eldest, Constantine, taking Gaul, Spain, and Britain; Constantius obtaining Thrace, and the countries east; while Constans secured Italy, France, and the Western Illyricum. But scarcely three years had elapsed before the *voice* of discontent began to manifest itself against this arrangement. Constantine complained of not having an equitable portion; and to redress his grievance, he demanded the cession of some territory from the dominion of Constans. But Constans did not readily accede to this demand, and

---

so Constantine endeavoured to effect his object by the *voice* of an invasion into the territory of Constans, which, instead of producing the desired end, resulted in Constantine being slain. Ten years afterwards Constans suffered a similar fate. In consequence of his vices, his subjects lost their affection for him and became discontented. This encouraged a rival and ambitious soldier, Magnentius, to endeavour to supplant Constans. He was so far successful that he got the soldiers to salute him as Emperor, instead of Constans, and in the year 350 became master of the troops, and treasurer of the city and palace of Autun. This *voice* of the desertion of his soldiers and subjects necessitated flight on the part of Constans, but, being overtaken, he was put to death. Another *voice* that disturbed the tranquillity of the Roman heaven, was the ferocious administration and tragical death in A.D. 374 of Gallus, a nephew of Constantine the Great. Through the jealousy of Constantius, he, with his half-brother Julian, was consigned to a strong castle for a period of six years. When released from this state of servitude, he was invested with the title and authority of Cæsar, and Constantine gave him Constantina, the cruel daughter of Constantine for his wife. His residence was fixed at Antioch, and he was delegated to rule the eastern prefecture. But his incapacity for reigning soon manifested itself, and, in consequence, he lost first the affection of the people, and then the support of the Emperor, who sent for him to come to the imperial court where he had him put to death like the vilest malefactor. Such were the *voices* which excluded silence from the Roman heaven and exterminated the members of the Constantine family, none of whom died a natural death excepting Constantius. The reason for this was, that Constantine was the Anti-Christ of his day, the newly-born man-child of sin and son of perdition, and hence the bloody fate that befel his family is significant of the vengeance to be inflicted on the family of Anti-Christ at the approaching apocalypse of the true Christ.

---

SUNDAY MORNING AT THE CHRISTADELPHIAN SYNAGOGUE,  
BIRMINGHAM.—No. 8.

---

*From Shorthand Notes by brother JOHN BUTLER.*

---

In accordance with the words we have been singing, we have just now to behold our High Priest by faith. It would be a very great stimulus to our profession, if we could for one moment enjoy the privilege which many of the disciples in the first century enjoyed; if we could but for a moment *see* our High Priest. This privilege we are denied, and so far, we are at a disadvantage; but our very disadvantage may work glorious things for us in the

future. We draw consolation from the words of Jesus to Thomas, "blessed are those who have not seen me, and yet have believed."—(John xx, 29). We look forward with consolation to the prospect of seeing him, after believing. We shall see him, then, as the disciples saw him not. They saw him in his humiliation; they accompanied with him in the flesh for 3½ years; and there is no doubt he was great company even then: for the testimony of



his enemies was that he spake as never man spake. We can quite understand the strong feelings of affection that would be developed in the breasts of the disciples, by keeping the company of such a man for such a period. But they did not understand him as we understand him, and as we shall understand him when we see him; for they did not comprehend the full bearing of his mission, nor the full richness of his nature. They did not understand fully who he was; they believed that he was the Son of God, and they believed that he was the Lamb of God, appointed to take away the sin of the world; but as to the way in which that was to be done, they evidently had no conception; for we find that when Jesus apprised them of the then imminent event by which the work was to be accomplished, they remonstrated against it. They did not understand him when he said he was to be taken away from them, and when he spoke about being delivered into the hands of the Scribes, Pharisees and Gentiles; and being mocked and spat upon, and despitefully entreated, and put to death, and that he would rise again the third day. It is said that they understood none of these things. Their attitude on several occasions would shew that they had not risen to the full appreciation of the master whom they loved and served; nor the position which they themselves occupied in relation to him. You will remember that on one occasion when Jesus sent two of his disciples to a certain village, to prepare the way for his advance journey, the people in the village would not allow him to pass through; and the disciples, James and John, whom Jesus surnamed Boanerges, or Sons of Thunder—which suggests that they were fiery men, of zealous mind and prompt action—asked him if he would allow them to do as Elijah once did, call fire down from heaven to destroy the rebellious. Jesus said "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of:" that is, the spirit to which they were related—the calling to which they had been called. They knew what their individual spirits were; but Jesus meant to say that they did not comprehend the spirit of their calling; for he said, the Son of Man had not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them. The disciples, however, were right to a certain extent. The destruction of the rebellious is a divine purpose. Christ came to save men's lives, but it is also true that he is coming to destroy them. The disciples were wrong in the sense of being premature, and, perhaps, wrong in the

particular motive that actuated them. Christ did not come to destroy men then, but he is coming to destroy them; for it is one of the most emphatic testimonies concerning him, and one that occurs very often, in a variety of forms, that he is the instrument by which God's vengeance is to be inflicted on the world. He is to tread the winepress of God's anger, to plead with all flesh, and give them that are wicked to the sword. He is coming to destroy men's lives, and there will be such a time of destruction, both of life and property, as the world has never known. When God enters upon the scene, to work upon the area of the whole world, as he will, you may depend upon it that something, of which we have no conception, will mark such a great interposition. We have only to look for confirmation of this to what he did on a small scale, whilst bringing his people from Egypt. This will give us some notion of what he will do when he takes them out of every nation under heaven. The Egyptians were subjected to continual and all manner of suffering. At one time, swarms of flies afflicted them; at another, loathsome frogs corrupted the land by their abundance; at another, the forces of heaven would contend visibly against the people, killing their cattle in the field, destroying their crops and killing all those persons who did not, on the intimation of Moses, withdraw to the protection of their houses; and, to wind up the dreadful tragedy, we find that a whole army was buried in the Red Sea. That is a small illustration of what God does when He interferes. It was not a matter of favouritism towards the children of Israel, and partiality against the Egyptians, for we find that the Israelites themselves, whilst wandering in the wilderness, were the objects of repeated acts of divine anger. The Israelites were, of course, a mere rabble of slaves when they came out of Egypt, untutored idolaters. We learn from subsequent prophets that in Egypt they worshipped idols, and that they brought the institutions of Egypt into the wilderness, and for forty years carried their idolatrous gods with them. Well, we find that a whole generation of them perished in the wilderness; but before that generation died out, what repeated manifestations of God's displeasure took place. The people were incessant in their rebellion against Moses, and had not Moses been kept up by divine power, it would have been impossible for him to have maintained

the leadership of so untractable a people, or to have consummated the object of the exodus. The people would have destroyed Moses and Aaron, and all connected with them, and would have straggled back to the land of the flesh-pots; but God repeatedly interfered just at the critical moment, and destroyed great numbers of them; and on one occasion a great company was swallowed up by the earth, with their wives and children and all that they had. So that we can form some conception from what God has done, of what He will do in the greater time to come, when a greater work is to be done; for it is a far greater work to break the power of all nations than to break the power of one; to teach all the world than to teach one people. God's object, in the Egyptian tragedy, was to teach Israel and all nations that there was a God; and that work was achieved, and effectually achieved. The Jews at the present day are standing witnesses of the effectiveness of what God did, for it is simply a moral impossibility to eradicate from the Jewish mind the belief in their God. Three thousand years have passed away, and still we find this faith in full and tenacious possession of every Jewish mind. The work was done most effectively, and the work in the age to come will also be done most effectively; but it is a more important work, and will involve more potent machinery; for God is to coerce the power of all men, and He has to write for Himself a name in the minds of untutored millions, and not the least difficult to manage of those untutored millions will be the civilized millions. These have in them a sort of intellectual insubordination that will constitute a greater obstacle than the ignorance of barbaric races, who will readily give way before what will irresistibly be done. So the disciples were quite right in thinking that it was part and parcel of God's dispensation in Christ, that his power should be made manifest; only, they were before the time. Everything is right in its place; out of its place, everything is wrong, and it was wrong that they should attempt any acts of judgment at that stage of affairs; and it is quite wrong for us to perform acts of judgment in our state of affairs. It is part of our calling at the present time that we are not to resent, that we are to suffer, that we are to be passive like Christ. We are not to vindicate ourselves, but to suffer wrong, take it patiently, put our trust in God. Some people think it strange that

God's will should be that we should suffer wrong. If they would think a little, the difficulty would disappear. It is God's will that we should suffer wrong, not because it is right that wrong should be inflicted, but because it is good for us to endure. God is very angry at wrong being done, but for our sakes, He permits it at present. It is part of the trial by which He is preparing a people who shall be capable of wielding power judiciously when the time comes for Him to transfer the power of the whole world to the hands of Christ's people. We know that nobody is fit to rule except those who have suffered. Put authority into the hands of a novice, or one who has not learnt wisdom and mercy by suffering; and the result is, caprice and tyranny. Those who have been at the bottom, as it were—those who have learnt by adversity the varied needs, the varied rights, and let us add, the varied wrongs connected with existence; those who have been disciplined to endurance, and patience, and self-denial, by suffering—those only are fitted to rule; not those who impatiently pull the shoulder from the burden, who impatiently speak fiery words and do fiery deeds. We can have this principle exemplified on a small scale as well as upon a large one. It has effect upon our little affairs now. God will judge us in reference to the things belonging to us, and within our power, whether large or small. If we are, in a small scale and in trifling matters, short-tempered, and speak impatiently, and do obstinate things, we are not fit to be entrusted with the rule of others. So that the object of the discipline to which we are subjected at present, is in great part, that we may be tried, prepared and educated to patience and submission, by the evils of the present, in order that we may be fit to undertake the merciful and judicious work of ruling men for their own benefit, when the time comes. Jesus had not come to destroy men's lives at that time, but to save them. That exactly expresses our present relation to mankind. Our position at present is altogether one of benefaction to others; we are not at liberty to do any harm to anyone, even in self-defence; we are prohibited from doing harm. We must be like Christ: he was not only holy, but harmless. Now this means much that is above the ordinary practices of men. There are many ways of doing harm, of letting out your pique, of venting your spleen upon the object of your dislike. You leave him in the lurch in some matter, and

rejoice secretly at his misfortune. This must not be. You must help your enemy when he needs it. We must do good: it is not sufficient that we refrain from doing harm. It is good to refrain from doing harm, and it is incumbent that we should. If we do not, we shall not be children of the Highest. How could we be children of the Highest, who only doeth good, and who when He performs acts of severity, does them for good—if we say and do malicious things, which, if ever so small in their way, are spiteful and hurtful? We must not only refrain from doing harm: we must do good; and this is a very different thing from the negative sort of virtue that is applauded in the world. There is a far greater number of persons who refrain from doing harm, than those who do good. That is only saying that there is a far greater number who will not be saved, than there is of those who will be saved; for you may take it as a rule to which there will be no exception, that everyone who will be saved, will be one who does good. You may see many persons that don't do any harm: they do not steal, they do not tell lies, they do not do anything very much out of the way; but no one ever heard of them doing good. No one ever knew of their doing a noble deed, or planning a disinterested enterprise. They are all the time taken up with themselves. They think only of themselves, and serve only themselves. It never occurs to them to think about other people, or do a thing that is only intended to promote the benefit of other people. If they do anything that has the semblance of a good deed about it, it is that they may receive a benefit in return. They are like the Pharisees, ancient and modern, who ape the forms of goodness, but take care to practise them under circumstances where they are profitable. They do good to those who do good unto them. Their very acts of charity are besmeared with selfishness. Such people are not the children of the Highest: they are not fit to enter into the kingdom of God, for the kingdom of God is an institution, the very object of which is to do good in the highest form, and the administration of which is to be entrusted to the hands of those who learn to do good, under circumstances of trial and evil, and who will, therefore, be qualified to do good, and to do it effectively when circumstances are prosperous. Jesus gives us the principle in the words: "He that is faithful in little will be faithful also in much." On the

other hand, he says "If ye are unfaithful in that which is least, who will trust you with greater things; if ye are unfaithful in unrighteous mammon, who will put you in trust with the true riches?" The true riches are a life never-ending, a body that will never decay, riches that will never take flight, joy unspeakable and full of glory. The management of our own little affairs is, by Jesus, made the rule by which our position in relation to the kingdom of God will be determined. It is most important that we should remember this, instead of deceiving ourselves amidst present faithlessness, with a sort of blind confidence that all will be right when Christ comes. All will not be right when Christ comes, unless all is right before he comes. Those who are wrong now will be wrong then. Those that are selfish now will be selfish then. Those who are unfaithful now will be unfaithful still; those who are unjust will be unjust still; and he who is holy will be holy still. Everything depends upon the present; our own little circle is the sphere in which we make or mar our future destiny; and, therefore, let every man and every woman, to the extent of their means, however little, and their opportunities, however few, see to it, that they do good, that they be faithful stewards, so that at the return of the master, to whom they hold a stewardship, they may be able to render a satisfactory account.

Let us hope that the time is not far distant when we shall cease to have to call our "humble faith" into exercise, in order to "behold our great High Priest above." May the time soon come when we shall see him *as he is*. The arrival of that time will, doubtless, produce different effects upon different persons. There are some whom it will throw into a shrieking fit, who will simply become frantic, because utterly unprepared for such an event. They have deceived themselves with the idea that they are Christ's, because they have professed the truth, and passed current amongst its friends, although in quiet moments, they do not feel so. They have been hoping in a dim and fatuitous way that when Christ comes, it will be all right with them. They have not allowed themselves to realise the coming of Christ. They do not reserve a sufficient surplus of the strength God has given them to realise what Christ is. Their little strength is eaten up in purely "temporal" matters. All their energy is expended upon the flesh, so that the mind never has any chance of

getting into the spiritual channel. They do find time for the imperative things of the flesh, but none for the imperative things of the spirit. Indeed, the things of the spirit are not imperative with them. Being after the flesh, they mind the things of the flesh, leaving the things of the spirit to be attended to by other people, in the delusive hope that some day, things will alter. When they hear that Christ has arrived, it will go through them like a cannon ball. It will take away all presence of mind. They will be petrified with affright, because they have not the answer of a good conscience; but of a very bad one. Shame and confusion will be their portion. There are others who will feel differently. While struck with awe, their fear will be mixed with an inconceivable sense of relief and joy. The knowledge that Christ has come at last, will bring consolation unspeakable. To think that the right hands have now taken hold of the work—that Christ himself is now at the helm, will be a joy the world knows not of. There are others, and perhaps these will be the largest class, who will not know how to be affected, in whose breasts hope and fear will struggle with uncertain conflict. They are conscious of having done something, and they fear not having done enough. They feel that to some extent, the flesh does not rule them; yet they are afraid that the spirit has not been powerful enough with them; and so, in a state of agonising uncertainty, they await THE MEETING that will decide their fate. That meeting will no doubt be a much more straightforward transaction than some of us are in the habit of thinking. Orthodoxy has given us the idea, (and we have a difficulty in throwing it off) that it will be a sort of flash-of-lightning affair, in which miracle will blaze about in all directions, working instantaneous transformation on no intelligible principle whatever. Now this fallacy arises from the predominant sentiment of orthodoxy, under which we have all, more or less, been in bondage, that the established rules are not God's rules, but the devil's—that all God's rules are up in heaven, and apply only to immortal souls; and that with regard to earth and material life, the Prince of the power of the air has it all his own way. But casting such Pagan trash to the moles and to the bats, and recognizing the fact

that all established rules are God's, we see things in a different light. We shall simply hear that Jesus has come, and shall be invited and compelled to go to him. To those who have at all realized the great calling to which they are called, it will be a relief and a joy to go. When a friend whom we love arrives from a distance, what a thrill of delight we feel when we are informed of his arrival, and if that friend—besides the pleasure of friendship, brings—good news of substantial advantage—say that you have become heir to a fortune; how greatly would the pleasure of his arrival be enhanced. In the case of Christ, it is precisely so. He is the best friend we can have. He is interested, and deeply so in those who are his true friends. He is jealous, just as a man betrothed to a woman is jealous; he is exacting just as friends are exacting, and will view with displeasure any inordinate love of other objects than himself, and visit treachery and coldness with severity. But if as wayfarers and as pilgrims, we engage in this world's business merely as a matter of necessity, and with reference to the higher objects presented in the gospel, then Christ is the best friend we can possibly have. Christ's kindness passes knowledge. It is something beyond all the love that can ever flow in the bosom of the dearest mortal friend. It is something infinitely above our sin-smitten minds. It is something that will dissolve us in tears of everlasting joy. If we have our heart right towards him, what a joyful intimation it will be that he has come. But to be right then, we must be wrong now, in one respect, that is, to be rich then, we must be poor now; to be honoured then, we must be despised now; to be mirthful then, we must, to some extent, be sorrowful now. Jesus has said "Woe unto you that are full now and laugh now; but blessed are ye that hunger now and weep now; blessed are ye when men shall persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake; for so persecuted they the prophets who were before you. Blessed are ye that hunger and thirst after righteousness, for ye shall be filled; blessed are ye poor in spirit, for yours is the kingdom of God." If we suffer with him, we shall reign with him, but if we deny him, he also will deny us.—EDITOR.

## SAYING AND DOING.

THE world had, perhaps, never more to say on religious matters than it has now. It is full of the loudest professions of piety and ardent love to God. In view of all this devout parade, one might suppose the world was very good. But a glance at its practices, immediately dispels such a pleasing idea. We may very properly speak of it as "this present evil world." It is full of contradictions, and totally ignorant of those things about which it has the most to say. We speak now of what is styled "the religious world."

If you ask a denizen of this world whether he loves God, he is aghast at your rudeness of speech. Of course he loves God, with all his heart, mind, soul and strength, as he thinks; and from his talk you might infer that he loved Jesus Christ much more than he does the Father. Jesus to him is *most* dear, *very* precious—in short, everything that the warmest language can express. True it is, that words are but wind; and nothing can exceed the windiness of the majority of religious utterances.

Were it not for something in the Old Testament concerning "gross darkness," and something in the New about "*strong delusion*," we should certainly marvel, and be at a loss to understand these sincere, but ignorant and empty professions. But there we are led to explain, that is, if we will be led by the truth, a state of intense piety in *form*, with an absolute lack of *power*. Gross, and humanly speaking, impenetrable, or at any rate, irremovable darkness should at some time cover the people. And for their willing blindness, God would send them "*strong delusion*, that they should believe a *lie*." If ever these remarkable words were true, they are now. And those who have the truth, can only proceed upon the same principle as did Ezekiel towards rebellious Israel of old. It is their duty to set the truth forth to the utmost of their power, quite regardless of the attention likely to be paid to what they advance.

The world is drunk with religion. Not altogether drunk with crime of the grosser sorts; but dead drunk with religion. And nationally considered, none have escaped—no, none of the so-called civilised nations of the earth. They have all long ago been made drunk with the wine of fornication. They have prostituted the word of the most high God. They reel to and fro; they are heavy with sleep; they can only

hear enough of the voice of truth to madden them against the speaker. But whether they will hear or whether they will forbear, "he that hath the truth must speak, and must not keep silent." He must "lift up his voice like a trumpet, and shew the people their transgressions."

Now, in view of the ardent and enthusiastic profession of love to God and the Lord Jesus Christ, ought there not to be found a desire to obey his commandments? Every sober person will answer in the affirmative, and many who are not sober would do likewise. But how is love to be shown towards God, and how are we to convince our fellow-men that we really love the Lord Jesus Christ? Let the following passages be read with attention.

If ye love me, *keep my commandments*. He that hath my commandments, and *keepe h them, he it is that loveth me*. Jesus answered and said unto him "If any man love me, *he will keep my words*."—(John xiv, 15, 21, 23, 24.) Ye are my friends, *if ye do whatsoever I command you*.—(John xv, 14.) For this is the love of God *that we keep His commandments*.—(1 John, v, 3.) And why call ye me Lord, Lord, and *do not the things which I say*? Whosoever cometh to me, and heareth my sayings, and *doeth them*, I will shew you to whom he is like: He is like a man who built a house, and *digged deep*, and laid the foundation on a rock; and when the flood arose, the stream beat vehemently upon that house, and could not shake it; for it was founded upon a rock. But he that heareth, and *doeth not*, is like a man which built a house upon the (surface of) the earth, against which the stream did beat vehemently, and immediately it fell; and the ruin of that house was great.—(Luke vi, 46, 49.) But, be ye *doers of the word*, not hearers only, *deceiving your own selves*. For, if any man be a hearer of the word, and *not a doer*, he is like a man beholding his natural face in a glass. For he beholdeth himself and goeth his way and straightway *forgetteth* what manner of man he was.—(James i, 21, 24.) *Not every one that saith* unto me, Lord Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but *he that doeth* the will of my Father which is in heaven.—(Matt. vii, 21.) Many will say unto me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied (preached, &c.) in thy

name? and in thy name have cast out devils? (this has been largely professed both in ancient and modern times) and in thy name done many wonderful works?—sent out missionaries, carried on revivals, sprinkled babies, sent souls to hell-fire for evermore, killed bodies by the thousand in “holy wars,” burnt heretics, told the people they had better not study the scriptures, appointed bishops and pastors who could not read their mother tongue, administered the consolations of religion to murderers, sent kings direct to heaven from the guillotine, blessed the army and navy, extolled national robbers, consecrated ground for the interment of rogues and vagabonds, styled every scamp “this our dear brother,” in putting him out of sight, and written themselves down “*miserable sinners*,” all this, and much more than we can now call to mind, or care to try. These “works” are truly “wonderful.” They are unmistakably the works of the flesh, and of the devil, “Lying wonders” of the pious sort.

In the political world, success justifies everything. In the religious world, sincerity is sufficient to sanctify any form of worship, at least among civilized peoples. No mistake could well be greater than this. God is a spirit, and must be worshipped in spirit and in *truth*. He has not, at any time, left the manner in which he desires to be worshipped, a secret to those whom He has commanded to worship Him; but has always been very precise in His directions concerning acceptable worship. So that nothing in this matter has been by Him left to the fancies of men. They can find no justification in the scriptures, old or new, for the great idea of the day, viz., that it is enough for every man to serve God according to the dictates of his own conscience. No man, by nature, is qualified to serve God. God cannot be served by those who are ignorant of His will. Knowledge, therefore, or an *enlightened* conscience, is indispensable to the proper worship of the Deity. Sincerity is often stone blind. It cannot, therefore, be trusted as a guide. There must be something else—truth. Now, therefore, fear the Lord, and serve Him in sincerity *and in truth*.—(Joshua xxiv, 14.) For our rejoicing is this, the testimony of our conscience, that in simplicity and *godly* sincerity, *not with fleshly wisdom*, but by the grace of God, we have had our conversation in the world, and more abundantly to you-ward.—(2 Cor. i, 12.) To make

sincerity pleasant in the eyes of God, it must be sanctified. No un sanctified person or thing is fit for His service or for His use. The truth cleanses all; and that truth is the word. Sanctify them through Thy truth: Thy word is truth.—(John xvii 17.) Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you.—(xv, 3.) In the face of these things, let no more be said of the sufficiency of sincerity. Ignorance may sometimes be excused, but never justified.

The Acts of the Apostles contain several remarkable instances of pious ignorance, and from the treatment of the persons, no doubt can remain upon the mind of any sensible man as to the value which heaven puts upon mere sincerity. There is Cornelius, “a devout man, and one that feared God, gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God alway.”—(Acts x, 2.) Were Cornelius now alive, he would no doubt be esteemed as a real christian. No clergyman would require more of any man than is said of Cornelius; and be it observed, said of him *in the days of his ignorance*. For notwithstanding these good qualities, the centurion was not a Christian. He had not heard *the word of the truth*. He had not therefore been made clean, or sanctified, by it; he was not holy, and consequently, could not “see the Lord.” However, he was teachable, which cannot be said of many who claim sincerity. By divine command, he sent for Peter, “*to hear words of*” him. The words Peter uttered pertained to the kingdom: they concerned the Lord Jesus: they made known the remission of past sins, and union with his name, and hope of eternal life when he should sit on the throne of his father David. Cornelius heard and obeyed. Peter told him what he “*ought to do*,” and he complied. Only thus can a man be saved.

Look at “the religious experience” of Lydia, whom Paul met at Philippi, the chief city of Macedonia. This woman was doubtless a model of piety. Like Cornelius, she was devout, prayerful. Paul found her in a place “where prayer was wont to be made.” “She worshipped God.” But how? According to the dictates of her own conscience, and in all sincerity, doubtless. Well, was that enough? No, it was not. Her heart was fast closed. She had not “*obeyed from the heart THAT FORM OF DOCTRINE*” which Paul preached for salvation. She was not, however, obstinate, but attentive; and by Paul’s preaching, the Lord “opened her heart.” He enlightened her understanding, and she believed

the things concerning the kingdom of God, preached everywhere by Paul, and was immersed upon the name of the Lord Jesus into remission of sins. And "how shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation;

which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto the apostles by them that heard him?"—(Heb. ii, 3.)

Z.

## "WHAT THINK YE OF CHRIST?"

### REPLY TO AN ORTHODOX ATTACK UPON THE TRUTH CONCERNING THE NATURE OF CHRIST.

(Continued from page 202.)

WE have quoted John's warning against the class who taught in his day that Jesus had not come in the flesh, but in some other form. It is rather strange that believers in the popular doctrine, which is essentially the same, should rely on the writings of this very apostle, more than any other part of scriptures, to prove their case. It is evident that John's object in giving such prominence to Christ's statements respecting his connection with the Deity, was intended, not to give countenance to the very heresy he condemns in his epistles, but to illustrate the truth of Christ's declaration, that he was the Son of God. The sense in which this was true, must be the subject of enquiry. Mr. Govett does not think the Christadelphians have got hold of the truth of the matter. "This system of false doctrine," as he styles it, denies the pre-existence and godhead of Jesus before he appeared on the earth. This denial fills him with horror, and makes him incapable of seeing how the Christadelphians can believe the scriptures on the subject. "Whether," says he, "they believe that Jesus has been made a god since his resurrection, I cannot say,"—but he supposes so; and says the Christadelphians actually believe that the risen will be gods too. This he seems to regard, in conjunction with the other, a special enormity. He takes no notice of the testimony which declares that it was after his resurrection that God highly exalted Jesus.—(Acts ii, 33; iii, 13; Heb. i, 8, 9; Phil. ii, 9, 10); and that the saints will be raised to the same nature that Jesus now possesses; for when he (their life) appears (Col. iii, 4), they will be made like him (Phil. iii, 21; 1 John iii, 2), and will live and reign with him a thousand years.—(Rev. xx, 4). Mr. Govett attempts to break down these Christadelphian "falsehoods," by confronting them with texts of scripture, "taken principally from the gospel of John," as we have already stated. The first passage adduced, is that which states that "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God." On

this he remarks, very truthfully, that here the Word is proved to have existed co-eternally with the Father; but he evidently fails to perceive—like the rest of those holding his faith—that "the Word" is not equivalent to "Jesus Christ"; and that the eternity of "the Word" does not prove the eternity of Jesus. John distinctly says also, "the word was God." We can only understand this, by ascertaining the meaning of "word." A word is a sound by which the mind or will is expressed, and in the case of command, the expression of the mind, *by word*, leads to action. The action is the result of the word; and the word may be spoken of as the direct cause. Now as regards God, it is said, "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made." "He said, and it was done; He commanded and it stood fast."—(Ps. xxxiii, 6, 9). Hence "the Word" created all things, "in the beginning," and was "with God," and "was God." God's *will* is the antecedent; it is part of Himself, as it were—it is God. The enunciation or giving forth of this word or command, presents the phase expressed by the words "with God." The spirit was the vehicle, instrument, or channel. The "Word," originating with God, was the first cause. Hence we read "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them *by the breath of His mouth*." "He spake and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast."—(Ps. xxxiii, 6, 9.) "The worlds were framed by the word of God."—(Heb. xi, 3.) "By the *word of God*, the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water."—(2 Pet. iii, 5.) "God said Let there be light, and there was light;" the light shining as the result of the word spoken. But are we to say the "Word" in these passages signifies a personal agent distinct from the personality of the Father who commanded? By no means. It is merely a personification of the will of the Almighty. After the style of language that personifies wisdom in Prov. viii. "The Word" existed from eternity; Jesus, who was its living expression, did not;

yet, whilst going about his holy mission, he was not less the Word of God than if he had pre-existed. He was the Word made flesh. The spirit rested upon him, without measure, which gave him wisdom and power above mortals, and enabled him to speak with the authority of God. He was the Word, in living revelation. God manifested himself and spoke through him. This is Paul's declaration in Heb. i, 2, "God, who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath, in these last days, *spoken unto us by his Son.*" It might be argued from this passage, that the prophets, equally with Christ, were constituted the Word, by God's use of them to declare his mind. To a certain extent, this was the case; but God only spoke through them in a partial manner, and by means of visions and messages. They were not the complete exemplification of the Word; neither did they, like Christ, owe their birth to the power of the Word which spake through them. They were the mere instruments of the specific divine impulses brought to bear on them; Jesus was the embodiment and living reflex, as it were, of the Word. He could reveal the whole will of the Father; and received the knowledge he possessed, directly from the Father, being as it were, *en rapport* with him, in the Spirit. "The Father loveth the Son, and *sheweth him all things that Himself doeth.*"—(Jno. v, 20.) "The Father who *sent me*, he gave me commandment what I should say and what I should speak."—(Jno. xii, 49; vii, 16; viii, 25-28.) Hence, he could say "I am come in my Father's name:" (v, 43.) If he had been the Deity himself, he surely would never have used such an expression as this. As we have said, he never once ascribes the works he did to his own power. Mr. Govett makes a great point of the statement that Christ was *sent* by God. He argues that Christ being *sent* shews he existed before he was sent. This is a short-sighted conclusion, and would prove the pre-existence of the prophets, of whom it says that God "sent" them. Of John the Baptist, particularly, it says "he was sent from God."—(John i, 6.)

Mr. Govett lays stress on the words of John the Baptist "He that cometh after me is preferred before me, *for he was before me.*" He also endeavours to strengthen his position by the words "No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him."—(John i, 18.) With reference to the latter text, Mr. Govett suggests that "the only-begotten Son" should be "the only-begotten God." This, in reality, would make no difference, for the term "begotten" shews that the being which begot must have preceded the being begotten. This consideration precludes the use of the amended reading, as well as the common one, in support

of the popular theory. The meaning of John the Baptist, one would think, scarcely needs pointing out. "Is preferred before me," means that Jesus was higher and greater than John. "For he was before me," points to the fact that this greater rank always pertained to Jesus. The two "befores" mean the same thing. No Trinitarian, therefore, can deny that the statement affirms the pre-eminence of Christ. Christ was fore-ordained from the foundation of the world—(1 Peter i, 20,) as the Christ, the anointed of God, and as such anointed one, he was always (even before his existence), in the mind or purpose of God, the highest of created beings. The statement that Christ was in the bosom of the Father, is no proof whatever of pre-existence of any sort. It is a metaphor taken from the custom current among the Jews, of favoured persons reclining whilst at meat, in the bosoms of their superiors; and is merely an intimation of the position of favour that the Saviour occupied, and now occupies, in relation to the Deity. So far from proving the godhead of Jesus, it proves the reverse; for it shews that Christ's nature and position were derived from and dependent upon the Father. It is one of the legion of texts which demonstrate the subordination of Jesus to the Father.

The next passage adduced in favour of the godhead of Jesus, is John iii, 13: "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven—even the Son of Man, who is in heaven. Giving orthodoxy the full benefit of this verse as the Trinity, it will not avail anything for the Trinity. It must be interpreted in harmony with "the mystery of Godliness," which is that "God was manifest in the flesh."—(1 Tim. iii, 16.) Jesus was the flesh in which God, by spirit, was manifested. The spirit, at the time of speaking, abode without measure on Jesus, and gave him that visual relation to the abode of the Eternal, that he might, without incongruity, use the words quoted. But according to Trinitarianism, Jesus was the incarnation of "the Son," separately from "the Father," and "the Holy Ghost," and could not therefore affirm that it was the Father that was in him, and that of himself he could do nothing.

The passage under consideration opens the question as to the way in which Christ could be said to have come down from heaven, a statement upon which Mr. Govett lays great stress, as proving his doctrine: "I came down from heaven."—(John vi, 38;) "What, and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before."—(vi, 62.) "Ye are from beneath, I am from above."—(viii, 23.) "Before Abraham was, I am."—(58, &c.) With reference to these passages, Mr. Govett exultingly exclaims "Let those who deny the pre-existence of Jesus, tell us how they explain away these testimonies concerning Jesus's descent out



of (!) heaven, and his superiority to all others in consequence." The answer is, there is no necessity to explain them AWAY, but simply to explain them. They must remain as they are; and need not, in the interests of the truth, be altered, but there is a great necessity for people to properly understand them; and this they can only do by employing the literal facts of the case, to unlock the metaphor by which they are expressed. "The Jews," Mr. Govett says, "could not reconcile such an assertion (as Christ coming down from heaven) with Jesus being a mere man; nor can the Christadelphians." Why could not the Jews make this reconciliation? Because they believed Jesus to be the son of Joseph.—(vi, 42.) This is the whole secret of their infidelity on this point. They did not know that Jesus was begotten of God, though born of a woman, nor did Jesus care to tell them plainly this fact, knowing that if they did not believe him for his works, they would not believe him for any of his words. He, on that account, nearly always spoke to them in figurative language.—(Mark iv, 11, 12.) This is a fact which must never be overlooked. In what sense, then, did Christ descend from heaven? Did he descend in the form in which he stood before the Jews, when addressing them? No! That form was the form in which he had been born and brought up *in their midst*, and which was as much a form of flesh and blood as any of them. That form of flesh and blood constituted him son of David and son of man. As son of David and son of man, he was as much son of Adam as any of themselves. Had he, *as Son of Man*, descended from heaven? No: in this we all agree, and yet he says "What, and if ye should see THE SON OF MAN ascend up *where he was before?*" Construing this as Mr. Govett construes the passages he quotes on the subject, it would prove *that the Son of Man was in heaven before the birth of the babe of Bethlehem!* Is Mr. Govett prepared for this? We never met a Trinitarian that was. Not only did Christ not descend from heaven as the Son of Man, but he did not descend from heaven as *the Son of God*. This must be admitted when the evidence is considered. Christ did not receive the title of "Son of God" till he was born. "Therefore, also, (because the Holy Spirit shall come upon thee) that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called THE SON OF GOD."—(Luke i, 35.) Trinitarians maintain that before he was born, Christ was Son of God and God himself.

In view of all the facts of the case, the candid mind is bound to admit, that in the statement quoted by Mr. Govett, Jesus could not be speaking in literal language. He came from heaven in a sense, but not in the Trinitarian sense. He says "I am from

above; ye (Jews) are from beneath." He came from above in the sense in which the Jews came from the dust. If Christ, as a person, came from above, then the Jews were persons in the ground before they were born, for they as really ascended from "beneath" as he descended from above. We are shut up to the explanation which is the only scriptural one, *viz.*, that Jesus had his origin from heaven by being born Son of God. His existence was due to the power that came from heaven. Before he was born he existed in heaven, in the sense that Levi existed in the loins of Abraham, when the latter paid tithes to Melchisedec.—(Heb. vii, 9, 10.) His *Christship* descended *directly* from heaven. The Spirit of God descended in visible form at his baptism, and anointed him. Without this anointing, he was not the Anointed. He was Jesus (Saviour), but not Christ (Anointed.) As Christ, therefore, he might be said, in an emphatic sense, to have descended from the Father; but this is not the sense in which the "orthodox" believe him to have descended.

"Before Abraham was, I am," is another declaration of the same order, perfectly harmonious with the truth revealed. When our first parents fell, Eve was told that her seed should bruise the head of the serpent. In this declaration, a promise of Christ lay hid, which shewed that Jesus then existed *in the mind of the Deity*, (who foreordained him from the foundation of the world.—1 Peter, i, 18.)—Jesus, consequently, ante-dated Abraham, who in fact was only raised up as the channel in which Jesus should be generated.

"I am the bread of life," &c.—(John vi, 35) is another passage relied upon by Mr. Govett, who declares "how awfully preposterous and blasphemous these words are, if supposed to be spoken by a man born with a sinful nature, and feeling then its motions within him," supplementing these remarks subsequently by the assertion that when we affirm that our Lord took an unclean nature, and felt the motions of sin within him, although it never broke out in action, we make the Holy One of God to be a sinner. In this Mr. Govett shows his ignorance of scripture truth. Sin is disobedience.—(1 John iii, 4; Rom. v, 12, 19.) Jesus was *obedient* unto death; therefore, though subject to temptation, in having the motions of sin in his members, he was without sin. Sin consists in yielding to wrong impulse. Jesus did not yield to these impulses; therefore he was not a sinner. According to Mr. Govett, he had not human nature; but was of a higher and sinless nature. In this also, he is against the scriptures, for they testify that "he took not on him the nature of angels," but took the same nature of flesh and blood that clothed the children of men.—(Heb. ii, 14, 16); that "he was tempted in *all points* LIKE AS WE ARE, yet without sin.—(Heb. ii, 17; iv, 15.)

We have already shown how Jesus was

the Bread of Life—the Resurrection and the Life—namely, that he was the man by whom we have life. He has been appointed by God the only name under heaven whereby we can be saved. Had he not had the sinful (or mortal, for the words in this case are synonymous) nature that we possess, he could not have been the Captain of our salvation. If Jesus were of the nature orthodoxy ascribes to him, and it were impossible for him to sin, what is the meaning of the passage quoted above, “He was in all points tempted like as we are?” And why did he go into the wilderness “to be tempted of the devil?” There would have been no liability to temptation.

In the garden of Gethsemane, Jesus had to resist, and did resist, a strong temptation. He knew it was the will of God that he should be offered up as a sacrifice, and yet he prayed to God that the cup might pass from him, if it were possible. He was prompted by his human nature to resist the condition imposed upon him, in view of the terrible suffering it would entail. Was this sin? Certainly not; though according to Mr. Govett’s definition—that the impulse of sin is sin—it must have been. He would have been guilty of sin had he yielded to the temptation or motion of sin; but he resisted this and all other temptations, *developing a perfect life, notwithstanding his sinful flesh*. In so doing, he became the antitypical Lamb, without spot, capable of taking away the sin of the world. He also “left us an example,”—(1 Peter, ii, 21.) which he could not have done had he possessed a nature unlike that of any other man.

Another passage cited in support of orthodoxy, is John ix, 35, 38, where Jesus reveals to the man whose sight he has restored, that he is the Son of God. The man on hearing this, said “Lord, I believe,” and *worshipped* him. Mr. Govett says that Jesus here claimed godhead, though how he extracts that conclusion from a simple statement of Jesus, that he was the *Son* of God, we fail to perceive. Jesus did not claim the worship due to God. On another occasion he *disclaims* any such homage—indeed, goes farther, disclaiming even the ascription of goodness; for when addressed as “Good Master, what must I do to inherit eternal life?” he instantly rejoins, “Why callest thou me good? there is none good save One, and that is God.”—(Matt. xix, 17.) If our Lord had been as ready to assert his equality with the Father, as Mr. Govett appears to think he was, this would have been the time. The worship paid to Jesus by the blind man, was doubtless the worship he refers to when he said, with reference to a modest promoted guest, “Thou shalt have *worship* of them that are bidden;” and such as David received from Mephiboseth, the son of Jonathan, when he had shown him signal proofs of his favour.—(See Josephus’ Ant., book vii, chap. 5, sec. v.) The Saviour is to be worshipped,

deferred to, venerated, adored, as the Son of God, just as we do honour to any great one; but he never puts himself forward as the Deity on any one occasion, but always as the one sent of God; as the Son who had come in his Father’s name; as the way of approach appointed by the Father. He is represented as *the way* to God, the door of approach, the high priest, the mediator between God and man.

When Jesus—says Mr. Govett—said to deceased Lazarus “Lazarus, come forth,” he said not “In the name of the Father, come forth;” No! the miracle was designed to glorify “the Son of God” (John xi, 4); to prove that he was sent of God; not to shew that he was himself the Deity. Immediately before the miracle, he thanked the Father for hearing him, thus, in effect, ascribing his power to the Father, and asking for a continuance of that power.

Nor is the next quotation of any greater weight. A reference is made to Isaiah vi, to prove the pre-existence of Jesus, and Mr. Govett exclaims, “Now, the Holy One of Israel whom Isaiah saw on that occasion, was Jesus Christ.” Anyone who carefully examines the chapter will see that the vision of Isaiah was a prophetic one—a vision of what is to be, but at the time made use of for a then present purpose. A similar case is found in Ezek. xliii, 10, 11, where the event seen in vision is future, but made the occasion of a message to the people contemporaneous with the prophet. The earth is not yet filled with the glory of God, but it is to be when Jesus re-occupies the temple.

Mr. Govett next quotes John xvii, 6: “And now, O Father! glorify me with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was.” This he quotes to prove the co-equality and co-eternity of Jesus with the Father. The answer is that in the first place, the very act of prayer on the part of Christ is proof of his non-equality with the Father. The lesser always prays to the greater. In the light of this fact, let us consider the subject of his appeal. What was the glory which Jesus had with the Father before the world was? It will, no doubt, be answered by Mr. Govett, the glory of the Deity Himself. If so, how had he become deprived of it? and for what reason? Glory is an inherent attribute of God: Without it, he must cease to be God. Christ must either have deprived himself of it, or been deprived by another power necessarily higher than himself. If deprived by another, the other is greater, and where is the co-equality of the Trinitarians? If deprived by himself, he had the power to re-assume it, and what need then to ask another for it? The question for the Trinitarian is beset with difficulty, whichever way it is considered. But, looked at from a scriptural point of view, the matter is

simple and clear. Jesus bases his appeal for glory on a certain fact, which he states, viz., that he had finished the work that the Father (a higher power necessarily) gave him to do. On this ground it is, that he asks for glory, thus shewing it was not a thing that he really possessed before. Nor did he possess it before, only in the sense in which he existed before, namely, in the purpose of God. This is the explanation of the whole matter, and his appeal is equivalent to saying "I have finished the work thou gavest me to do; give me the glory which I had in thy purpose before the world was." A Christadelphian could scarcely desire a better portion of scripture than the whole of the chapter in which this passage appears, for the purpose of demonstrating the truth of his view, concerning the position of Christ.

The next enquiry is, as to the meaning of the exclamation of the apostle Thomas, on being convinced that Jesus, who had been put to death, really stood alive before him—"My Lord and my God!" The view held by the apostles respecting Jesus could only have been one that was in accordance with the teaching of Jesus concerning himself. He asked the question of them, "But whom think ye that I am?" and Peter replied, "Thou art the Christ (anointed), the Son of the living God." Here was made a marked distinction between Christ and the Deity, which was evidently recognised by the apostles. If Peter had been an "orthodox" professor of the present day, his answer would have been quite different. He would have said, in addition to the answer he gave, "begotten of the Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made," and a lot more of such rubbish as is taught in the Church of England Prayer Book. But this is not the light in which the apostles regarded the Saviour, because it is not the light in which they were taught to regard him. He himself had disclaimed the ascription due to God alone. Jesus was not the Father; but though not the Increate himself (a fact which Jesus always takes pains to enforce), yet in a very well understood sense, he was God. In John x, 31, it states that the Jews took up stones to stone him: Jesus asked them why they did so; they replied, "Because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God." We find the answer in John v, 18—Because he called himself the Son of God; one member of a Royal house in general estimation to the present day, sharing the honour and glory of the whole of it in common with the Head of the family himself. How did Jesus defend himself from this charge? By declaring that he was really the Almighty? and vindicating his claim by some terrible act of vengeance upon his accusers? No; he clears himself by an argument which excludes the Trinitarian view of the

matter. He contends that he was as much entitled to the name of God as some of the Jewish fathers, who had received that name. "Is it not written in your law, 'I said ye are gods?'" (Psalms lxxxii, 6). If he called them gods unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken, say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified and sent unto the world, Thou blasphemest, because I said *I am the Son of God?* By this answer he shewed his right to the title "God;" and Thomas, who no doubt was present on this occasion, was only giving expression to the view inculcated by this argument, when he found by the resurrection of Jesus, that he was really the Son and the sent of God, at a time when the apostles had almost, if not quite, begun to doubt it, in consequence of his unexpected death. He gave fervent expression to his revived faith, in the exclamation to the Saviour, "My Lord and my God!"

Mr. Govett concludes his article, by saying that Christadelphians deny the sonship of Jesus in the sense in which it is testified by the Spirit, in the gospel of John. He says we believe not the testimony of God concerning His Son's *co-eternity and Deity*. In this paper we have shown the falsity of these charges. We have shown that we do fervently believe in the sonship of Jesus, and that it is Mr. Govett who does not. We have shown that there is no testimony to Christ's co-eternity and Deity in the Trinitarian sense. We can therefore denounce his charges as libels, for which he may have to answer.

He declares that the sacrifice of the Redeemer was the sacrifice of more than a mere man, because the blood offered was the blood of God.—(Acts xx, 28.) He does not exercise discernment in this any more than in the other matter. In what sense was the blood of Christ the blood of God? For an answer we have only to quote 1 Cor. iii, 23. "Ye are Christ's, and *Christ is God's*." In that sense alone was the blood of God shed.

There is one text almost invariably advanced by believers in the popular faith, when discussing the nature of Christ, which is not touched upon by Mr. Govett. Doubtless, he thinks he has quoted sufficient scripture to annihilate the Christadelphians without it. It is "I and my Father are one."—(John x, 30.) This is generally brought forward as an infallible proof of the Trinity, but, when examined, it is found to destroy the Trinity. With Trinitarians, the texts which throw light upon and explain it are, as usual, overlooked or ignored. That this oneness with the Father did not consist of personal identity, is evident from the fact that Jesus himself declares "My Father is greater than I."—(xiv, 28.) What the text really does mean is also shown by Jesus, when he prayed that his disciples might be *one in him* as he is one in the Father,—

(xvii, 20-3)—that is, one in mind, in purpose, in perfect righteousness.

We have now endeavoured to present the truth concerning the nature of our Saviour, in its proper scriptural light, in opposition to Mr. Govett's shallow misrepresentation of the subject. We trust that we have succeeded in proving that so far from being co-equal and co-eternal with the Father, (and, in fact, the Father himself), he was as our Saviour was required to be, a man like ourselves, but a man who, working out his own salvation, at the time when it was not in the power of any mere Son of Adam to do so, became the first-born from the dead, and the medium of approach to God, for all who wish to have a share in that salvation. We trust that we have successfully vindicated the truth in this particular from the attack of those who understand it not; who have rendered the word of God of non-effect by their traditions—who believe that in order to appease His own wrath, God sent Himself into the world, and saddled Himself with a

number of trials and persecutions; that He, the Almighty, Ever-living, and, therefore, *Deathless* One, caused Himself to be *slain*; that He then took Himself back to heaven, and constituted himself the mediator between man and Himself, that no one should approach Him but through Himself; that Christ is at the same time God and the Son of God; Son of the Father, and less than the Father, yet co-eternal and co-equal with Him; not "born" till the time of the Virgin Mary, yet "begotten" before all worlds; with a mass of other contradictions, whose name is legion.

That we have converted Mr. Govett or any of his co-religionists, we dare not believe; for reply has been excluded from the pages of the magazine where they would have been likely to get the benefit; but we may hope to have strengthened the faith of those who have accepted the mystery of godliness, in the intelligible form in which it is presented in the scriptures. If we have, we are recompensed.\*

*Birmingham.*

J. BUTLER.

## PRE-IMMERSIONAL EXAMINATION.

"FRIEND" writes as follows, in reference to our reply to his dialogular objections last month, to water baptism and pre-immersional examination.

"Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christadelphian.' One by one have the old ideas of things gone, and my peculiar views of baptism must follow the rest, for they with the others have not a sufficiently firm basis. Your proofs of water baptism are more than I can attempt to controvert, based entirely on scripture; but with the other 'lion' in the way the case is different—this matter of practice, or discipline: 'Examination' commends itself, no doubt, to the feelings of prudence and propriety as a matter of the 'commonest order and self-protection,' and as a 'dictate of common sense,' to 'gauge the actual relation of things; but when you add 'the principle is *scriptural*,' my obtuseness immediately replies, I cannot see it. Take the apostolic cases of baptism seriatim. 1st, that at 'Pentecost.' The examination contended for is there entirely out of the question. In the minute account of '*Philip and the eunuch*,' we read of nothing of the sort.

Nothing is recorded of it with '*Cornelius and his kinsmen*.' If it occurred with 'Simon' it certainly did not answer the purpose. Nothing of it with the '*Philippian Jailer*;' nor with '*Crispus and the many Corinthians*,' who believed and were baptised; nor of '*Paul*,' himself. Respecting the re-baptism of the '*twelve Ephesians*,' it must be remembered that though called 'disciples,' and had experienced John's baptism, they could not be said to have had 'faith in Christ' at all, nor even have had the truth presented to them, for they 'had not so much as heard that there was a Holy Ghost.' Apostolic precedent is therefore against Christadelphian practice (in this one respect.) This you tacitly acknowledge, saying, 'it is a mistake to draw a parallel between the apostolic era and our own time as to this particular practice,' and 'the circumstances preclude comparison.' But if so, then the argument of orthodoxy on baptism standing on the same ground, holds good. Baptism, by immersion in water, some of them say was appropriate to the apostolic age, and to our own, so far as regards *proselytes* from Jewishdom. or

\* NOTE.—In last month's article, page 200, line 31, for "merely," read "thereby,"

heathendom, but not applicable to us. Wherein are 'the circumstances so totally different?' When was the doctrine concerning Christ uncontested (by those believing it!)? Paul wrote to the Thessalonians, that the mystery of iniquity doth *already* work. The man of sin (germ of Romanism) was even then in embryo existence. John said the spirit of Anti-christ was *already in the world*, and that even *now* were there many Anti-christs.—(1 John i, 18.) Did not this constitute "middle ground" in the great controversy? So far as middle ground can be said to exist, between truth and error, and had to be guarded against. False friends and brethren unawares brought in.—(Gal. ii, 4.) And 'certain men crept in, denying the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ.'—(Jude, verse 4.) All this demonstrates that though a man is in reality either a friend or an enemy of the truth, that even in the apostolic age there was a 'middle ground' of those who *claimed* friendship with the truth, but claimed it *erroneously*, having no doubt entered the fold without the ordeal of a rigid examination. On the *improved* method of the present day, they might not have gained admittance perhaps. The parallel of the two eras has also another resemblance in the similarity of the relative positions of the truth at that time, with Jewishdom and its corrupt Mosaic traditions, and at the present with christendom and its corruptions and mimicry of the truth. Every aspect of the matter confirms me that the simple statement of faith (sincerity alone being ascertained) is equally as applicable and appropriate to the one age as the other. Two misapprehensions occur in the 'few comments' in July *Ambassador*. 'Friend' did not, I think, admit the application of the rule (of examination) 'after baptism,' to other brethren. The examination in the faith, even then, should scripturally be confined to the individual. 'Examine your *own-selves*,' not each other. What applies before baptism, applies equally after. Again, 'Friend' does not object to questioning, but to questions as to the *character and degree* of faith. Questions as to *earnestness and sincerity* are fit and proper. 'If thou believest *with all thine heart*.' This apostolic mode of question will preclude the 'practising of jokes' and be sufficient to protect the baptiser, and I think the individual; and he alone and not the 'church' are responsible for the rest. Who would be likely to seek baptism at

your hands, if not persuaded of the truth of Christadelphianism and the errors of orthodoxy? Your five reasons are good, and I accept them, but don't consider they exactly touch the point. My scriptural induction' leads me to think still that you have in this wandered away from apostolic precept and practice, in substituting the 'crucial test,' and 'rigid examination,' which the law and testimony do not justify.'

\* \* \* \*

#### REPLY TO THE FOREGOING.

It is gratifying to perceive from the foregoing that "Friend," though tenacious, is not immovable. He is not a fixture—say, a wharf or a jetty in a harbour, but a ship with water under the keel, which can be moved when the requisite propulsion is applied. True, he is at present in the dock, and a little slow to move, but being afloat, there is hope he will be got out to sea by the necessary appliances, and his slowness to move may indicate the size of the ship, and a future value proportionate to the present difficulty of utilization.

He concedes baptism; but there is still a "lion" in the street, which compels him to keep indoors; at least he thinks there is a "lion" in the street. There is no "lion" except what exists in his imagination. It is one of the hallucinations engendered by too long a confinement within the walls of "Doubting Castle." A few more gasps of the fresh air of truth will clear the brain and correct the vision, and enable the liberated captive to sally forth without fear into the king's highway, and proceed at once, and with alacrity, on the journey to the king's city.

He objects to the proposition that pre-immersional examination is scriptural. He instances Pentecost, when three thousand were baptized. He says that the pre-immersional examination contended for was, in that case, out of the question. True, but it was not necessary. Examination is contended for as a necessity, not as a ceremony. Where special circumstances render it superfluous, it would not be enforced. The special circumstances in the case of Pentecost were of this character. In the first place, the three thousand were composed of "Jews, devout men" out of every nation

under heaven," who had come to Jerusalem to worship. They were men grounded in the elements of the law and the prophets, in a state of reverent appreciation to the extent of their understanding. They were, therefore, prepared men—"good-soil men"—in whom constitution and culture conspired to make them the ready and fruitful recipients of the good seed. Secondly, the only question on which their minds had to be changed, was the identity of the Messiah. They looked for the Messiah, and in great part believed the truth concerning the Messiah, but they did not know the Messiah had come. They did not believe that the Nazarene, publicly executed as a criminal some weeks before their arrival in Jerusalem, was he. Hence, the point aimed at was to convince them that Jesus was the Christ. This was successfully accomplished by the visible outpouring of the Holy Spirit, combined with the testimony of the apostles; and their confession of faith was limited by the circumstances of the moment, to the admission that the man whom the nation had "crucified and slain" was "Lord and Christ." A third circumstance was that Peter, with "many words" taught and exhorted them. His words were words of authority, and, therefore, the implicit reception of what he declared stood in the room of the examination, which, in the absence of authority, is forced upon us in our deserted times.

These were so many circumstances, which excluded the examination "contended for," under present circumstances. They made such examination unnecessary, and indeed, highly out of place; but what was unnecessary then may be necessary now. None of the circumstances of the Pentecostal triumph attend the proclamation of the truth in Britain; and "the case being altered, alters the case." If our case had been the apostolic case, the apostolic practice would not have been the Pentecostal method. They would have advertised and lectured, and examined. The apostles always showed a sensible regard to exigencies. Good sense consists in the adaptation of means to ends. In the hands of good sense, methods are flexible. Pedantry adheres to forms and abstractions to the sacrifice of the practical object involved. We cannot, in matters of pure expediency, imitate the apostles without the circumstances and gifts of the apostles. What was the necessity then may be impracticable now, and *vice versa*.

"All things common," for instance, was a necessity, among a multitude of disciples, in one city, at a time of persecution; and it was practicable with inspired men at the head; but now it is neither necessary nor practicable. On the other hand, critical examination was not necessary in the days when the issues of truth were simple, and when the voice of authority was present to decide them; but now, with a change on both points, there is, of necessity, a change of attitude on the part of those contending for the faith.

Here "Friend" interposes that the same argument would exclude water baptism. His words are: "Apostolic precedent is, therefore, against Christadelphian practice on the one point. This you tacitly acknowledge, saying, 'it is a mistake to draw a parallel between the apostolic era and our own time, as to the particular practice,' and 'the circumstances preclude comparison.' If so, then the argument of orthodoxy on baptism, standing on the same ground, holds good. Baptism by immersion in water, some of them say, was appropriate to the apostolic age, and to our own, so far as regards proselytes from Jewishdom or heathendom, but not applicable to us." Now, this is a fallacy which will be seen at once, when the argument is stated in a naked form. The "acknowledgment" of the Christadelphian is that there is no parallel between the apostolic and the present age, as to particular methods necessary to arrive at the *same results*, because there is no parallel to the circumstances existing. To this Mr. Orthodoxy responds. "You admit there is no parallel as to *methods*: therefore, I contend there is no parallel as to *results*!" He is like the man who, hearing that there is no resemblance between the English way of getting a livelihood in the nineteenth century, and the Oriental way, eighteen hundred years ago, therefore the *Oriental* did not eat bread!—who, because it is admitted that the ancient way of fabricating cloth was as unlike the modern as possible, therefore, *the ancients made no cloth at all!*

The want of parallel is as to *expediencies*—the practical way of doing the things commanded—the common sense arrangements necessary to achieve the objects common to all centuries. These are always flexible, and yield to circumstances, but the objects themselves are unalterable. People *must* have bread, however they procure it; people *must* drink, whether they draw from the brook

the sunken well, or the leaden pipes of modern water supply. So people *must* believe the gospel, whether they hear it from an apostle or private disciple, or read it in the Bible, or in books fabricated from the Bible. People *must* be baptized, whether in the sea, in a river, or in the domestic bath. People *must* give evidence of their belief before baptism, whether that be in a pregnant and significant monosyllable, or in the more diffuse profession contained in necessary conversation. We *must* try the spirits whether they be of God, whether the trial be on Christ coming in the flesh 1,800 years ago, or Christ coming in the spirit, at his appearing and kingdom; and whether the trial be effected by one question or 172 questions. If pretended *apostles, pastors, &c.* were to be tried, surely not less the lesser personage of a pretended disciple. If one "spirit" is to be tried, surely all spirits must be. There is no distinction of persons in such a matter. It is *results* that are the subject of concern, and the object of effort: *methods* are flexible and subordinate. Children are gladdened with the *ways of doing things*; men are taken up with the things to be done, and adopt whatever arrangement is necessary to the effectual doing of them. Discretion applies only to expediences, about which no directions have been given, or can be given, or need be given: *it does not apply to divine principles or institutions.* Baptism appointed as the means of induction into Christ, is a divine institution, and woe be to the man who degrades it to an "appropriate" but dispensable thing. God's commandments and God's principles are not to be squeezed and bent, or destroyed according to human conceptions of appropriateness. They are imperative: but the way of getting at or communicating the principles, and the way of performing the commandments are matters of circumstance, left to the good sense, and loving and liberal ingenuity of those who fear God and tremble at His word.

The answer given to the case of the Pentecostal believers applies to the others cited by our correspondent. Philip taught the eunuch minutely (Acts viii, 35), and all that the eunuch had to do was to believe what was taught him, and signify his belief in an intelligible, however short a fashion. "Examination" would have been a farce; but there is no Philip now to teach, with divine dogmatism, so we have to "examine." The same with Cornelius: Peter was aware that he and

his friends *knew the truth.*—(Acts x, 37), and all he had to do was to direct them how to do under an arrangement which, for the first time, admitted the Gentiles to a covenant relation with God; and all that Cornelius and his friends had to do was to obey the directions given. Examination would have been absurd. But there is no Peter now whose word will be taken with unquestioning faith; and so we have to examine to see if people comprehend the written truth. So with Simon, the Philippian jailor, "Crispus and the many Corinthians," and every case cited. There was divine authority present in every case to direct, and perfect submission to authority on the part of those who were obedient. This constitutes the great difference between that time and our time; and with a difference of circumstance, there is, of necessity, a difference of method of procedure necessitated, *but the result aimed at and secured is THE SAME, viz., the induction of men and women into Christ by the belief and obedience of the truth.*

Our correspondent stumbles at the proposition that there was no middle ground in the controversy between the apostles and outer darkness, at the time they came on the scene with their doctrine of Christ's resurrection. He cites Paul and John to prove there was "middle ground" in the controversy, inasmuch as there was the "already-working" mystery of iniquity, and the "many Anti-Christ's" that had made their appearance. He forgets that these manifestations were *late in the apostolic day*, and were not occurrent at the time to which our remarks last month applied, viz., the time of the immersions recorded in the Acts of the Apostles; and he further overlooks the fact that both Paul and John counselled increased strictness on account of these manifestations.—(See 2 John, 9, 10; 1 Tim. vi, 3-5; Gal. vi, 9-12.) These facts answer his argument. In the first instance, there was no middle ground. It was a plain issue—Yes or No; did Jesus rise from the dead? and is he the Messiah, Saviour of the world, and judge of quick and dead? And as in every other fresh and prosperous movement, there would not be acute discrimination as to those brought in; but as time rolled on, the inferior elements drawn into the church began to work like leaven. False doctrine began to be ventilated, and (through familiarity) the authority of the apostles grew weak, while the influence of the brawling dogs

(Phil. iii, 2) increased among the mediocritic majority. But this did not prove omission in the first instance, to exact from these a clear profession of their faith before immersion. It only proves that they came in "unawares," as a man may do under the strictest examination. An examination only ascertains his conformity for the time being to the truth recognized. It does not detect the shallow or the fleshly-minded man, who afterwards proves weak, and easy to be an instrument of evil in the ecclesia.

"Friend" corrects what he thinks "a misapprehension;" but his correction shews he has misapprehended himself. He denies having admitted the applicability of examination to a brother. True, he did not admit it in that form, but in substance it was admitted in the following words: "Q.—But suppose disorder or confusion did arise on the principle of admission you name. what remedy do you suggest?" A.—THE ONE PRESCRIBED BY THE APOSTLE: WITHDRAW FROM EVERY BROTHER THAT WALKETH DISORDERLY. Now, does "Friend" mean to say he would apply this remedy without taking the trouble of ascertaining if a brother did walk disorderly? Would he act on mere report? Hearing certain damaging statements, would he not "examine" or apply some process (it does not matter what name we give it), to ascertain the accused brother's acts and sentiments on the matter? His letters shew good sense enough to justify us in saying "Of course, he would," and, therefore, he would examine a brother in certain circumstances, but would not examine a man claiming to be a brother.

Oh yes, he would: beg his pardon. He

would examine as to *his sincerity*. He would allow "questions as to earnestness and sincerity!" He would say "Are you in earnest?" he would shrink with horror at the question, "Do you believe in the kingdom of God?" He would approve of saying to a candidate, "Are you sincere?" but he would protest against his being asked *what about!!!* Will this be for a moment gravely defended? How can you ascertain a man's sincerity better than by frankly questioning him about the whole matter? Will a true man take harm by it? Would a true man not prefer it? What harm is done? Any? None to the right sort; and if it detects a hypocrite, or keeps out a disturber, or rebuffs a man who stands on a pedestal of fleshly dignity, too high to come down in the presence of the truth, no matter. Much good is done, and no harm: yet "Friend" objects. He says we have "no right." Granted; as regards the applicant, we concede everything "Friend" may urge against sacerdotal authority toward the individual desiring to be immersed, but are there no rights in relation to *our own position*? Are there not two sides to the question? If a man asks my fellowship, have I no right to say upon what conditions it can be had? Surely "Friend" will not deny this. If he admits it, his case is gone; for the whole of the "examination" objected to by him proceeds entirely upon the principle that as a matter of personal duty, the parties applied to have a right to ascertain the existence of the conditions, under which alone they feel at liberty to unite in religious fellowship.

EDITOR.

## INTELLIGENCE.

BIRMINGHAM.—The past month has witnessed seven more immersions, viz., WILLIAM LISTER HIPWELL (31), leather dealer, formerly Church of England; MARY ANN STEPHENS (34), housekeeper, formerly among the Plymouth Brethren; ELIZABETH SHELTON (44), wife of brother Shelton, formerly Church of England; SAMUEL HARVEY (26), miner, formerly Methodist; WILLIAM JOHN BUCKLER (27), railway guard, passenger train, Midland Co., formerly Church of England; WILLIAM BLOUNT (24), grocer, formerly Baptist; ELLEN BLOUNT (22), wife of William Blount, formerly Independent. *Notes with reference to the*

*foregoing*.—Mary Ann Stephens resides at Warwick, where she keeps house for brother W. Hearne. A breaking of bread was held in that town on Sunday, July 26th, on the occasion of a visit from Brother Alldridge, of Birmingham.—William Harvey resides at Oldbury, where he unites with the ecclesia recently formed there.—William John Buckler resides at Leicester, (his address being 85, Northampton Street, London Road), but his avocation brings him to Birmingham daily.—Mr. and Mrs. Blount, who have been enquiring after the truth for more than two years, are only visitors in Birmingham at present, where it is hoped they may



ultimately settle.—The quarterly meeting was held on Monday, July 6th, when, after tea, brother Turner presided. The secretary presented the usual report, from which the following facts appeared:—total amount of weekly collections for the quarter, £22 4s. 10½d; highest weekly collection, £1 18s. 10d.; lowest ditto, £1 10s.; disbursements for the quarter, £20 15s. 9d.; largest attendance at the table, 72; smallest ditto 53; average 61. visitors 2.

Brother Bailey, in consequence of failing health, resigned his office of treasurer. The resignation was not accepted by the ecclesia, in the hope that returning health will admit of the retention of his appreciated services, but he was relieved from the trouble and anxiety incident to the office, by the appointment of Brother Dean as his associate, to do the work for six months, on the understanding, that should brother Bailey be ultimately unable to resume duty, brother Dean will retain office as his successor. The sympathy and gratitude of the ecclesia were expressed on the occasion by resolution towards Brother Bailey.—The sum collected during the quarter towards the expenses of Dr. Thomas's anticipated visit was £11 4s. It was resolved to continue the collection. On Monday, July 27th, the Sunday School children, to the number of 56, were entertained at tea. A considerable number of the brethren and sisters were present. After tea, the children were questioned on the truth, and book prizes were distributed according to the attendance and relative degrees of merit appearing by the books for the previous six months. The children sang several anthems during the evening. The number of scholars on the books is 60, and the average attendance 48. The teachers are 8 in number, and attend every Sunday, as the rotatory system works badly for the children.

GLASGOW.—Brother W. Clark announces the immersion of JOHN O'NEIL, middle aged, by trade a miller, (formerly connected with the established Church, who came to a knowledge of the truth through Dr. Ramsay, of Galston, and brother Graham, of Beith; also, the immersion of an elderly man named Campbell, who heard Dr. Thomas lecture in Glasgow in 1848, and subscribed for *Elpis Israel*, but was not aware of the existence of any believers in the truth till the placards, announcing the lectures by the Editor, appeared last year.

OLDBURY.—(See Birmingham Intelligence.) On Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, July 22nd, 23rd, and 24th, the Editor lectured in the People's Hall to large audiences, which increased each night. The Lectures were at the suggestion, and by the request of the Oldbury ecclesia, but the cost was borne by the Birmingham ecclesia, as the brethren at Oldbury are too poor to do what they desire in the way of proclaiming the truth. The last meeting was crowded, and there was much excitement. On the following Sunday, a local town missionary endeavoured to counteract the supposed mischief by delivering an (advertised) out-of-door discourse to 1,000 people. Several brethren attended, but were not suffered to reply. Reply was afterwards made to large meetings, at another place, afternoon and evening.

TURKIFF.—Brother Robertson, writing July 21st, announces the immersion of MRS. ANN SIMPSON, which took place on the 12th ult., after an intelligent confession of the faith.

WHITBY.—Intelligence "crowded out" till next month.

#### UNITED STATES.

HARVARD, (Illinois).—Writing June 30th, Brother Soothill reports "with feelings of deep sorrow," the death of Brother A. D. Barnes, of Caledonia, Boone Co., after an illness of eighteen months. He describes brother Barnes as "truly beloved" for his intelligence and zeal in the truth, and says the brethren in that part greatly mourn his loss. The blow has fallen heavily on sister Barnes. We are called to sorrow often now; but it is not the sorrow of the world "who have no hope" but a sorrow, that confers benefit by raising the mind to the hope laid up in heaven, ready to be revealed in the last time.

WORCESTER, (Mass.)—Brother Henry Lovell, writing from this place June 20th, announces three immersions:—Mr. (now brother) WHITING and his wife, and CHARLES MANN: the two former were Baptists. He adds that there is an ecclesia in Worcester of thirty brethren and sisters; also a small ecclesia in Portland, M., another in Chelsea, Mass., consisting of one family, enlightened by the brethren in Worcester, and others in various parts of the country, west and south.

NEW HYMN BOOK.—Copies of *The Hymn Book* are no longer to be had, and a new one is in course of preparation. The new one will be an improvement, in every respect, upon the old. Selected contributions will be acceptable. Original compositions of excellence will also find place.

# THE AMBASSADOR

## Of the Coming Age.

---

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

---

---

No. 51.

SEPTEMBER, 1868.

Vol. V.

---

---

### STRONG DELUSION ;

OR, MODERN SPIRITUALISM IN THE LIGHT OF SCIENCE AND  
SCRIPTURE.

---

*ODOLOGY, continued from page 218.*

So much for the strongest argument for the existence of spirits separate from material bodies—an argument which, with all its strength, is but general debility in the presence of God's testimony, and Messrs. Karsten and Draper's experiments of the coins. Separate spirits!—mere spectral impressions on magnetic haloes!—hidden, indeed, from light-stimulated optics; but disclosed to electro-magnetically excited brains! How are the "wise?" with the ignorant entrapped in their own foolishness! And the "pious" too—the "great and good divines," with their adorers—how are they taken in the craftiness of their own pietism! O, the worth of the immortal soul, who can calculate it!—of that soul evoked from the magnetic halo of a clairvoyant's sensorium! Such is the phantom-soul, for whose salvation, from Pluto's realm of fire and brimstone, the whole machinery of clerical superstition has been erected in ages past; and is now maintained at the expense of the liberty, intelligence, and wealth of the nations; and is sought to be imposed upon all semi-barbarians and savages as a means of introducing the long-looked for millennium upon earth! A mighty superstition—a great mountain filling the globe—a stupendous fabric of moonshine—a pious cheat for the salvation of a magnetic spectre! Still out of evil God educes good; for if he did not,

where on earth would the good come from? Even this vast imposition on human credulity, He turns to a good account. The generations of mankind having yielded themselves to their propensities; or, as the scripture expresses it, "instruments of unrighteousness to serve sin"—their intellectual and moral sense has become so darkened and unfeeling, that they cannot comprehend or appreciate the goodness of God, so that order in the absence of the divine majesty might be maintained among them by its influence over them. There is, therefore, but one of two things remaining—either the earth must be left a prey to anarchy, which would be "hell;" or order must be established by acting upon the fears of the multitude. The existence of "hell" here would defeat the divine plans destined to eventuate in blessedness upon all nations. The world became hell before the flood. It was, therefore, destroyed to become heaven: therefore, order was elaborated; and "the powers that be," as they appeared from time to time, from amid the storm of human passion, were controlled and ordered of God. Without approving their words, He permits them to exist as a terror to evil doers until the appointed time arrives to punish them for their wickedness, and to set up his own kingdom in the earth, which shall rule over all, administering His will in truth and righteousness over all nations. At present the popular superstitions are an important element in "the terror" by which evil-doers are restrained. The clerico-priestly dogma of immortal disembodied ghosts; heaven in a spirit-world; hell somewhere; and the necessity of faith in these wares as administered by an ordained ministry, or "sacred order," on pain of the soul's exclusion from the joys of the one, and eternal fiery torment in the other—are the staff of the spiritual police, which co-operating with the imperial sword, keeps the world in awe, and maintains order until the Lord comes. It is the fear of punishment, not the love of truth and hope of reward, that makes men behave with social decency and order. This is the general rule, to which, doubtless there are exceptions; but they are such as to establish the rule.

Our worthy correspondent thinks that the answers obtained by the dead-seekers from the spectres before the medium's sensorium, are "the strongest arguments of the existence of spirits separate from matter." I grant it. It is doubtless the strongest, and but weak at that. It is the argument of a dream to prove a fact. But the argument cannot be received as valid; for the dream-answers are *not always right*, as he testifies in the case of the second gentleman. Answers from God are infallible. His spirit never makes mistakes; nor is it presumable that any intelligencies of a true spiritual nature, in harmony with His spirit, are ever guilty of false utterances. The "spirits," whatever they be, are neither of God, nor of "the just made perfect." But, may they not be the spirits of the wicked or unjust; if they be, then, the disembodied existence of spirits is as much proved as though they were the spirits of the just? Granted. If by a *spirit* is to be understood no more than a *spectral impression on a medium's sensorium, mesmerically evoked by the thinking of the dead-seeker*, I grant that such spirits do exist

separately from the person they represent, as the spectral impression of the coin exists on the halo of the mirror separately from the coin itself. All the phenomena observed belong to spirits of this class, and prove only their existence under mesmeric excitation. Before their evocation before the medium's sensorium, they exist only as images before the seeker's mind when he thinks of them. I can now see before my recollecting faculty a child of three years old, standing with a ruler in his hand, with which he has just struck me over the head. This child, a little brother, has been dead over thirty years. I see his image, and if I were placed *en rapport* with a medium, I could make him see the child's appearance; but would it be logical to conclude that he saw the child himself, or the real individual, which a spirit is supposed to be? If the spectral impressions, or spirits, seen, were real persons, and had cognizance of human affairs, they would make no mistakes in their responses; they would speak truth only, unless they were wicked persons. It is admitted that they err, and on theological subjects it is notorious that the mediums utter the most stupid nonsense; hence, I conclude, that they are not of God, nor of his saints, whatever they be.

Now, it is not my business to prove that these *lying spectres* are not real persons. I do not undertake to prove negatives. I have shown that they may be philosophically accounted for. It is for the spirit-mongers to prove that the *forms* observed by their clairvoyants are realities, and, therefore, not appearances only; and that they were formerly embodied in human clay, and lived in the world as men, women, and children, now exist therein. The kind of proof must be different to anything they have produced yet, however. The declaration of the spectres through the clairvoyants cannot be received; because in a multitude of instances they have proved themselves to be liars, and, therefore, unworthy of credit; besides that, unsupported self-testimony is incredible. It may be true, and it may not. If, then, the spectres say they lived in human clay as its animating, thinking principle, let them give us proof from God that their assertion is true. Jesus Christ, the sinless man, did not require his unsupported testimony to be received; shall we then admit the self-testimony of the lying spectres of the wicked dead? Perish the thought! "If," saith the Lord, "I testify concerning myself, my testimony is not credible."\* We demand, therefore, confirmation of spectral assertions, strong as Holy Writ, because assertion is no proof. They tell us, or rather mediums do, that they are the ghosts, or spirits, of dead men, and that they know a great many things, and much more than the living. But upon this point the Word of God gives them the lie direct. It testifies, that "the dead know not anything; †" and that "there is neither knowledge nor wisdom in Sheol," ‡ whither we go. Now "divines" make this word *Sheol* equivalent to *Hades*, which they say is "the place of departed spirits." Well, let us accept their definition for the present; how then reads the latter text? Even

\* John v, 31.

† Eccle. ix, 5.

‡ Eccle. ix, 10.

thus: "There is neither knowledge nor wisdom in the place of departed spirits," which theological mesmerists term "the spirit-world! This is, with me, authority outweighing the testimony of all the spectres in creation, with all the opinions to boot of the 30,000 simpletons in the east: judges, lawyers, doctors and parsons, and less distinguished dupes, who vainly imagine they converse with living spirits from the vasty deep.

Our correspondent thinks, that "the whole system promulgated in our writings goes down, if the claims put forth by these spirit-mongers be established." By *established* he means *proved to be God's truth*; or else, established as true in the estimation of all men. If the latter be his meaning, the system we advocate only goes down in regard to mere human opinion. Its truth is not at all affected by mankind's opinion of it; because men who are ignorant of the true Bible-doctrine, judge according to the thinking of the flesh, which knows not the things of the spirit, because they are spiritually discerned; \* that is, they are discerned by the light shed upon them by the spirit, in the prophetic and apostolic testimony, or writings. We advocate the system exhibited in this testimony, which went down in the estimation of their contemporaries, in whose judgment the spirit-mongers of the apostles' day established the notion, that the spectres seen by the clairvoyants in the idol temples, were the disembodied immortal souls of the dead. As this notion went up, the apostolic doctrine of the immortality of the body at the resurrection, went down, as at this day. It ate out the truth of immortality at resurrection only, as a gangrene, † and left in its place nothing but a fetid, ill-conditioned ulcer, which has reduced the patient to a gasping state. The gangrene is everything; the apostolic doctrine scarcely to be found beyond the lids of the Bible. On the other hypothesis it is doubtless true, that if the spirit-mongers' claims be proved to be God's truth, the system we advocate will be exploded. No doubt of it. It ought to be; for if their claims be true, the system we exhibit must be false—utterly and entirely false. There is no agreement between spirit-worldism and the Bible; so that if mesmerized theology be God's truth, God is not the author of the Bible; and, as we advocate the things taught in this book, which are altogether at variance with the spectre-revelations of clairvoyants, we must go down with the Bible, and share with it the misfortune that peradventure might befall it. But such an hypothesis is monstrous. God can be the author of no doctrine at variance with bible teaching. This He has plainly declared in the text below.‡ The Bible is not to be tested by the peepings and mutterings of familiar-spirit mediums, and the table-tappings of mesmeric circles; but their utterances on the contrary, by its word, which is the truth. We stand or fall by this; and feel no apprehension of the result, though a thousand millions of spirits, a thousand times told, pronounce the reveries of the possessed, the infallible and eternal truth of God.

\* 1 Cor. ii, 9-15.

† 2 Tim. ii, 15-18.

‡ Isai. viii, 19-20.

---

## THE QUESTIONS ANSWERED.

In conclusion, I present the following replies in brief to the questions propounded through our correspondent :

1. To question No. 1, I respond, that I have nothing to do but to believe Matthew's testimony in regard to the Transfiguration and its attendant circumstances. I have nothing to do with the claims of spirit-mongers in the case. Matthew says nothing about "forms," or "souls," or "spiritual bodies," being seen there. He says, "there appeared unto Peter, James, and John, Moses and Elijah talking with Jesus." Luke testifies substantially the same thing, saying, "There talked with him *two men*, who were Moses and Elijah, *who appeared in glory*, and spake of his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem. But Peter and they that were with him were heavy with sleep : and *when they were awake*, they saw his glory, and *the two men that stood with him.*" † Now I ask any man, not crazed by spirit-worldism or "theology," when he is awake in the midst of a crowd on court days, what does he take those living things to be which he sees around him? Would he not reply, "men to be sure?" Suppose, I were to say to him, "No ; they are spirit-forms, or souls, that once inhabited human bodies ; they are not men, but the ghosts of men, which became "spiritual bodies" when the hearts of their old bodies ceased to beat"—would he not say I was either a madman or a fool? Or, if neither, that, on the supposition of his being a dupe, I was amusing myself at his expense? If rational, would he not argue that they must be men, because they presented to the eye all the marks by which men are ordinarily known? The apostles were matter-of-fact men, and reasonable withal. They judged of Moses and Elijah as they did of other men, and therefore called them by the right words, styling them "two men." Whatever quibble might be raised about Moses, because he died, cannot at all affect Elijah, who never died ; and therefore never experienced a resolution into two parts. But we need add no more. Moses died, and must have been raised from the dead, or he could not have appeared as a man before three witnesses, wide awake, who called him such. There is no difficulty or mystery in the case, except with those whose minds are spoiled by "philosophy and vain deceit."

2. The sudden appearance and disappearance of the Lord's body, or the Lord rather, for the Lord and his body are one and the same, was the result, not of any change *upon him*, but of an effect produced by him *upon the eyes of his disciples*. "Their eyes were holden that they should not know him," until he thought proper to release their sight from the restraint. Mary saw Jesus but did not know him for the same reason. † The eyes of the disciples going to Emmaus were holden. The meaning of this is given in the words, "And their eyes were opened, and they knew him." Hence to hold the eyes is to shut the sight, so that though the lids be unclosed, certain objects shall be invisible. I have performed an experiment similar to this upon the eyes of a person now in this city in the presence of many witnesses. I

---

\* Matt. xvii, 3 ; Luke ix, 30-32.

† Luke xxiv, 16 ; Jno. xx, 14 ; xxi, 4.

first mesmerized him by looking at him steadily in the eye. By this process the lids were closed so that he could not open them. I allowed him to remain in this state for some time, and then brought him out of it by a wave of the hand upwards and backwards. He could now see, and converse with any one. I told him to look at my finger which I held before him, and about six inches above the level of his eyes. While he was doing this I carried it obliquely upwards and forwards as far as I could conveniently reach, and then suddenly withdrew it from the line of vision. This left him staring with the eyes wide open upon vacancy, with a countenance as blank and inexpressive as a corpse. He was now in *the state of extasy*. His eyes "were holden" completely; for he could see nothing. In proof of this a lighted candle was passed almost near enough to singe the lashes, but without causing a wink. Every thing in the room vanished from his view with the jerk of my finger from the line of vision; and appeared again as suddenly as I waved my hand upwards before his eyes, which "opened them" to the objects by which he was surrounded. The Lord Jesus, who understood man's physique better than all the living, operated upon the disciples more skilfully. He could close their sight upon some objects at once, while he left them capable of discerning others. In this way he made himself invisible to them, and entered with them unseen into their room, where he continued to hold their eyes until they shut the doors for fear of the Jews, when he opened them, and was discovered standing in their midst, to their no little amazement, as may be supposed. When he parted with the disciples at Emmaus, he did not vanish as a figure from a magic lantern; but as the margin of the text reads, "he ceased to be seen of them;" that is, he took his departure. Just men, made perfect at the resurrection, will, doubtless, have the same power over mortals to make themselves visible or invisible as they please, by holding or opening their eyes; for of them it is testified "they shall be like him." He was never seen so as to be recognized by others than his disciples, because it was contrary to God's plan that he should be seen by any others. He was only to be seen by witnesses, that his resurrection might be a matter of testimony and faith, that believers might walk by faith and not by sight; therefore, the eyes of all men were holden, except "the witnesses chosen of God,"\* and the Roman guard.

3. Elisha's servant saw on the mountain near Dothan "horses and chariots of fire," such as Elijah ascended to heaven in. They descended to Elisha, and, at his instance, in obedience to Jehovah's command, their riders smote the Syrian host with blindness. The servants' eyes were made more open, and the Syrians' were closed by the same spirit. The patriarchs and prophets saw angels as they saw men, by their natural sight. When men do not see them, it is either because there are no angels present to be seen; or because their natural sight is holden that they may not see.

4. Paul was not removed from earth when he saw Paradise. When

\* Acts x, 10, 11.

he is writing about the Third Heaven and Paradise, he tells us he is treating of "*Visions and Revelations of the Lord*;" that is, of things represented and communicated to him by the Lord, as they were of old time to the prophets, and afterwards to John in Patmos. He was so absorbed in the contemplation of what he saw and heard, that he was altogether unconscious of his present existence. He had a vision of Paradise, or a Vision of the Third Heaven, in which he heard things not communicated for utterance. He did not see Paradise or the Third Heaven, but a representation of them as they will be, when the Kingdom is established by the God of heaven, in the land promised to Abraham, and shall be in continuance after the thousand years shall have passed away. The "heaven of angels" is their abode, in some of the stars. Hence they are styled "the Morning Stars;" but which of the heavenly bodies is not testified; therefore, I cannot tell. Paul's body could have been taken anywhere God pleased; but, as I have said, it, that is, he, never left the earth. He was wrapt in vision, unconscious of where he was.

5. In his argument with the Sadducees, Jesus meant to prove the resurrection of the dead from Moses' writings; and he did prove it triumphantly. He does not even hint, much less affirm, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob "are already risen." He said, "that the dead are raised even Moses has shewn at the bush, *when he called the Lord the God of Abraham, &c.*;" that is to say, "that there is to be a resurrection of the dead, Moses teaches in calling Jehovah Abraham's God." How so? Because Jehovah is not a God of dead men. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are dead men; therefore, for Jehovah to become their God they must become living men; for Jehovah is a God of the living, not of the dead. Hence their resurrection is necessitated, as that is the only way in which the dead can become living. This being so, he is called the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, while they are actually dead, "because they all live to him" in the sense of *rising from the dead to live*; for "God who makes alive the dead, calls *ta me onta* things not existing *as though they were*."\* The Lord of glory dealt not in "catches" nor "dishonesty;" these are the weapons of spirit mongers, and of those who have more respect for the foolishness of men, than the words of the living God.

EDITOR.

---

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.—1 (general), the divided state of the Roman Habitable, answering to the clay-weakened feet of Nebuchadnezzar's image, and the ten-horned phase of Daniel's fourth beast; 2, the tottering condition of the Papacy, or eleventh horn of said fourth beast, indicating the close of "time, times, and dividing of time;" 3, the political ascendancy of French diplomacy, or the frog-spirit; 4, the rapid decadence of Turkey, or the drying up of the political Euphrates; 5, the steady encroachments and territorial expansion of Russia, or "Gog," and "the King of the North;" 6, the revived interest in the Holy Land, and returning prosperity of the Jews. "BEHOLD THE BRIDEGROOM COMETH, WATCH! AND BE READY!"—EDITOR.

---

\* Rom. iv, 17.



---



---

## SUNDAY MORNING AT THE CHRISTADELPHIAN SYNAGOGUE, BIRMINGHAM.—No. 9.

---



---

*From Shorthand Notes by brother JOHN BUTLER.*

---



---

1 Cor. ii chap.—We should make a great mistake were we to do what some do with regard to this chapter, and that is, to read it as applicable to the state of things existing at the present time in the world. By making that mistake, individuals both acquire a false idea of the relationship of God to us, and fail to perceive what Paul actually means in this part of his writing. To avoid that mistake, we must take several things into account. Paul is here writing to the Corinthians, the inhabitants of a city of Greece, among whom he had planted the gospel, by going to them and preaching it; and showing wonderful works by the power of the Holy Spirit (Rom. xv, 19), in attestation of what he taught. Before he went to them, they were under the guidance of mere philosophy. Greece was the great country of philosophers. It produced a class of men—vigorous-minded in their way—who elaborated out of their own brain a system of wisdom. These men were in no way divinely guided. They simply looked up into the heavens—abroad upon the earth—observed human action turned in upon the operations of their own minds, and putting all things together, they came to certain conclusions. These conclusions they argued, and founded schools to propagate them; and by and by they came to constitute the wisdom of the day—the wisdom of the world: a thing to be spoken of in beautiful words; for the writings of these men to this day, are books of reference in all our great scholastic institutions—models of oratory—standards of writing and storehouses of wisdom. Keeping this in view, that the Corinthians, before Paul came to them, had been familiar with a system of wisdom of human devising, and that he came to them with a system of truth of divine communication—we shall be able to understand what is here written. Another thing we must remember in order properly to understand it, is that Grecian philosophy taught, like the philosophy of men in every age, that if men were only virtuous, they would be saved—that all men, good and evil, would be disembodied, and sent to a state, good or bad, with reference purely and entirely to their

individual peculiarities. Paul's teaching was the opposite of this. Paul taught that all men were under sentence of death, and that there was only one name given under heaven whereby they could be saved, and that that name had been developed by the death of Jesus Christ, who was crucified by the Romans, and rose again. Keeping in mind these antagonistic views and the difference between them, we shall be able to understand this chapter; but keeping out of view these circumstances which were before Paul's mind, we shall fail to understand what he means, and construct out of what he says, a false theory, an impracticable system, and one that we shall find to mislead us. The conclusions generally brought out of this chapter are, that it is of no use trying to understand the scriptures; that we cannot penetrate their meaning unless we are the subjects of divine illumination, by the spirit; that the Bible is valueless as a teacher, unless we have a light within superadded to our natural faculties. How utterly unjustified these conclusions are by the chapter, and how utterly mischievous they are in their effect, will be apparent. "And I, brethren, when I came to you—came, not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God; for I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and him crucified." It was the custom for teachers among the Grecians to come with excellency of speech and wisdom; that is with polished oratory, and high philosophical orthodoxy, according to the standard recognised among the wise of that time. Paul says in effect, "I didn't come with the excellency of speech to which you are accustomed. I did not come with the moral philosophy which teaches that men will be saved by good works—I came to you in a blunt, earnest way, preaching the death of Christ as the means of the world's salvation." Some people think that because the gospel of the kingdom is not mentioned here, it was therefore excluded from Paul's preaching; but if they will but keep in view what Paul had in view, they will perceive that it would have been entirely out of place to have been

brought in here; yet, though not mentioned by name, it is set forth in substance. You cannot believe in "Jesus Christ and him crucified," without first believing in Jesus Christ; and you cannot believe in Jesus Christ without believing in the kingdom; because the fact concerning Jesus Christ is that he is the son of David, appointed to restore again the kingdom to Israel; to establish the dominion of God throughout the whole earth. It is further to be observed that it is impossible to believe in "Jesus Christ and him crucified," otherwise than by comprehending the doctrines signified by that phrase. The name of Jesus is a doctrinal name. It is not like our names, bestowed merely for the sake of distinction. It means "I shall save by an anointed one;" and unless we understand who is to save, and who is to be saved, and from what, and by what instrumentality, we cannot believe in the name of Jesus Christ; and therefore we cannot scripturally believe in his crucifixion. We may believe in the crucifixion of a person called Jesus Christ; but without understanding, we shall fail to believe in what Paul says he set forth among the Corinthians. We shall fail to understand salvation by the death of Jesus Christ, as opposed to the doctrine of Grecian philosophy—that virtue would bring deification to every man when he died. Paul "determined not to know anything" of the Grecian nonsense which he elsewhere styles "foolishness," and guards us against it in these words: "beware, lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit." He would only know or recognise and proclaim, the fact that all men are mortal, and that Jesus Christ and him crucified, are the only foundations of hope. He would only maintain that "since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead;" and that "this Jesus Christ whom I preach unto you, is the man by whom has come the resurrection of the dead." He says "I was with you in weakness, and fear and much trembling;" because this preaching of his brought down upon him the hostility of all classes, and exposed him to many privations. Both the parties of which society was then composed, were his enemies—the philosophical party and the Jewish party; both of whom he equally offended by his teaching. The Grecians sought salvation by wisdom, the Jews by the law. Hence, Jesus, as preached by Paul, was foolishness to the one, and to the other a stumbling block. A crucified Christ was a stumbling block to the Jews,

who looked only for a glorified Christ; and to the Greeks it was mere foolishness to say that our salvation depended upon what another man had done. We have both these parties in our own days; but the Grecian party is by far the more numerous, which is no great wonder, considering that the Grecian works are the standard works in all places of learning. Against both we have to place the doctrine of Jesus Christ and him crucified; and the doing of this leads to precisely the same antagonism that manifested itself in the days of Paul; though it cannot take the same shape. Strength is on the side of the enemy—fashion, money, wealth, and numbers: it always has been so. Truth has always been in the corner. Jesus himself, who was the truth, is a good illustration. He lacked the commonest sustenance; he was in poverty and unpopularity. Faithful women ministered to him of their substance; of himself he had not where to lay his head. This is the fate of truth to-day, "with weakness and fear and much trembling," accompanying its operations. It is not so to the same extent now; because the antagonism of the enemy is no longer, in the providence of God, backed up by the military power of the state—legal authority. In Paul's day, the enemy could beat, imprison and kill. Paul himself was almost killed more than once. We must be thankful to God that things are a little changed in this respect. The fact that there is a change marks the expiry of the Little Horn period of Daniel, during which the saints were to be given into the hands of the persecuting power, and trodden under foot. We have reached the time when, in the providence of God, we can serve the truth under the protection of the law, and no man can dare to lift a finger against our person or property. We must be thankful that we are not living under circumstances when the authorities might burst in upon us at any moment, and hurry us off to prison.

"And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom; but in demonstration of the spirit and power." Paul did not come as the Grecian philosophers did, with flowery speech and philosophical argumentation; he came with divine dogmatism to tell them what was right and true, and to demonstrate by and "through mighty signs and wonders by the power of the spirit of God"—(Rom. xv. 19); that what he told them was of God; "from his body were brought unto the sick handkerchiefs and aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits

went out of them."—(Acts xix, 12.) Not only did he himself exhibit this power of the spirit of God, but those who believed also received the spirit, and there and then spoke with tongues they had never known before. The spirit thus demonstrated the truth of what Paul said, and enabled those who heard him to lay hold of it with confidence. However finely spun an argument may be, listeners may be misled; but here was a "demonstration of the spirit and of power, that their faith should stand not in the wisdom of man, but in the power of God." Now we in this age do not stand on an equal footing of advantage with the Corinthian believers; there is no demonstration of the spirit and of power now. Still we can imitate them in this result, that our faith shall not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the wisdom of God. That is the only extent to which we can imitate them. Our faith cannot stand in the power of God, because it has not been induced in us by ocular demonstration as theirs was; but it can stand in the word of God. We can take the word as our guide; and the word being the mind of the spirit, we may lay hold of the spirit in this sense, that we may become spiritually-minded by the study of it. We hear a great deal about the pouring out of the spirit in religious assemblies, which is but an exciting development of the spirit that is in us; and that is the spirit of the flesh. There is a spirit in the flesh that can be evoked by excitation; and that is the spirit which becomes excited by modern preachers—a spirit that simply amounts to, and is most active where there is most ignorance, but which in all cases subsides and evaporates in quiet life. The "outpouring" at a revival meeting is but an outpouring of the flesh-spirit from the preacher; and only those who reciprocate the sentiments of the preacher, are stirred by the spirit. It was not so in ancient days; the spirit was visibly manifested; nobody could mistake it. It evinced itself with irresistible power in gifts of tongues, and impelled the apostles to speak in agreement with those things that God had already spoken by holy men of old. Both characteristics are entirely wanting in the so-called outpourings of the spirit in our day. There are no gifts; no miracles; no demonstrations; and the men who boast most of possessing the spirit, and who make the most display of invoking the spirit of God, are the men most guilty of giving the lie direct to what God has already spoken by His spirit, in prophets and apostles. So, trying the spirits, whether they be of God

or whether they be of men, we can see that they preach not the gospel of God, nor the truth concerning Jesus Christ and him crucified. All their revival excitements, demonstrations, prayer meetings, worshipings, crowded conferences, &c., are nothing more than the spirit of the flesh in superstitious manifestation, in the action of all our religious faculties, without the enlightenment of what God has revealed to us by His spirit. We must be thankful to God, that though the spirit is not in manifestation, we have an opportunity of standing as we do stand, not in the wisdom of man, but in the wisdom of God. The word of God might have been lost in the revolutions of time, in the agitations that have convulsed all nations since it was written; but God's providence has guarded it, and we hold it in our hands complete and intact. Therefore, we must take care, as our only security in these days of darkness, to stick fast and close by the word, and to reject everything opposed thereto: thereby our faith may be the same faith that the Corinthians had, though implanted by a different process and standing in us by a different evidence.

"Howbeit, we speak wisdom among them that are perfect, yet not the wisdom of this world." He means to say "Although my words do not stand in the wisdom of men, what I say is not nonsense: I am only using the word 'wisdom' ironically; I accommodate myself to the ways of talking that are fashionable. When I speak of wisdom I speak of wisdom as currently reputed, and foolishness as currently reputed. It was the doctrines of the world that were reputed as wisdom, and the doctrines of Paul were reputed as foolishness. Therefore, he said, I came not with that which the world considers wisdom, but with what it considers foolishness; nevertheless, that which I speak is the real wisdom." "Howbeit we speak wisdom among them that are perfect, yet not the wisdom of this world, nor of the princes of this world, that come to naught." When men are dead, their self-named wisdom will be all forgotten like a nightmare; the truth of God alone will shine out in the glory of accomplished facts. "We speak the wisdom of God in a mystery; even the hidden mystery which God ordained before the world unto our glory, which none of the princes of this world knew; for had they known it, they would not

have crucified the Lord of glory. But, as it is written, "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God has prepared for them that love him." But, according to the Grecian philosophers, it had entered into the heart of man; for they had conceived it out of their own heads. It was their notion that the immortal soul went to the Elysian fields; therefore, that theory, which is the popular theory in our day, had entered into the heart of man. But, Paul says "No. The wisdom of the truth is opposed to the wisdom of the Grecian. It has not entered into the hearts of man to conceive what God's purpose is, but God hath revealed it unto us by His Spirit." Now, keep that in mind, and you have a key to the succeeding verse. Paul acknowledges that apart from the descent of the Spirit of God—the means by which God chose to reveal himself to his prophets and to him—he was himself in the same position as the Grecian. Of his own natural self, he did not know the truth. Like Daniel, he doubtless would have been willing to say, "this secret is not revealed unto me for any wisdom that I have more than any living."—(Dan. ii, 30.) Indeed, he says something very like this: "I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing." Paul of himself was as much a natural man as any of ourselves. He had shewn himself the natural man, the ignorant man, but withal the conscientious man, the zealous man, in putting to death the christians. He thought he was doing God's service. He was quite as conscientious before he became a christian as afterwards; he did not become changed in that respect. He was brought up under the law; trained to fear God and do His commandments, and he thought he was doing His commandments in putting to death the christians. When Jesus appeared to him by the way, he told him he was kicking against the pricks; and Paul said, "Lord, who art thou?" "I am Jesus of Nazareth whom thou persecutest" The question was "what wilt thou have me to do?" He told him what to do, and Paul went and did it. And after that, Paul shewed the same enterprise, the same conscientiousness, the same energy, the same self-sacrificing devotion to what he considered right as before, only he had got the ideas of the spirit introduced into his mind, and the spirit itself came upon him. So he could say "God hath revealed them unto

us by His spirit." Not unto us, in the present day, has the spirit come; for then we should be like Paul and the other apostles; we should be able to speak with tongues, to shew the gifts of the spirit; we should be inspired. But men pretend to have the spirit, and yet not to be inspired. Great anomaly! If they had the spirit, they would be inspired. No devout man would speak lightly on the subject if there was the smallest element of reality in the loud professions of the present day. As the prophet of old said, so would every devout man say, "would God, that all the Lord's people were prophets," but what is the use of professing to have the spirit when we have it not? Why play at it like children? Yet though we are not permitted to have the spirit, we may have the benefit of what the spirit did when given; what God revealed to men of old by His spirit, they wrote, and they are thus the instruments through which the spirit can shine into our minds. Mentally, we get into the same position as they did; only we differ as to the mode in which we arrive at it. They got their ideas direct by the spirit of divine enlightenment, which they could not resist or oppose. But in our case, it comes by the slow process of reading and believing. Yet by this process we may become enlightened and saved; for salvation comes by believing the truth. "He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved." "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." There could not have been a hearing of the gospel in the first instance, if the spirit had not come. The Jews would have been no more than the Grecians. But the word of God coming, they spoke, and that has given us an opportunity of hearing. Although they are not alive to speak; the giving attention to what is written is equivalent to listening to what the writers might have spoken. By this hearing, faith is formed in the heart, and faith purifies. "For the spirit searcheth all things; yea, the deep things of God." The meaning of this is illustrated thus: "For what man knoweth the things of man, save the spirit of man, which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the spirit of God." To see the point of this, we must take the illustration in the connection in which Paul gives it, instead of applying it to the totally different circumstances of our day. He says the natural man, without the inspiration of the spirit of God, knows nothing of the things of God. We could have known nothing of eternal truth, if God had not revealed it,

The contrast is—as applicable to our day—between the natural man without the Bible *versus* the natural man with the Bible; whereas the teachers of the present day construe Paul's words into a comparison between the natural man with the Bible in his hands, and the *spiritual* man with the Bible in his hands. This is not Paul's comparison at all. His point is that man, by his own knowledge, cannot know the things of God; he can only know his own things. Nations, without revelation, are everywhere the proof of this. The Spirit of God alone knows the things that are of God, and only by that spirit can we be made acquainted with them. That spirit came upon men in ancient times and revealed these things. Through them we can get to know them; but, as natural men, we never could have known them, had we not read them in the holy oracles. We see what a perverse and mischievous use

is made of this part of God's word. That use is a use of destruction. Under the idea that it is no use to seek to understand God's word, they put it under the table. Instead of looking into the Bible, they look into their own empty hearts. They look to the spirit of the flesh which dwells within them, instead of coming reverentially into the presence of the spirit of God, as embodied in the scriptures. We must be on our guard. The devil as an angel of light, makes assault against this beacon of life, and we must resist him. The whole chapter is very intelligible from Paul's point of view, but bring into it orthodox thoughts, and use it with regard to orthodox circumstances, and it becomes utterly unintelligible and pernicious. May we be wise enough to know the precious treasure we have in God's word, and to use it bountifully in the enlightenment of ourselves and others.—EDITOR.

## THE DOWIEITES.

THESE *quasi* friends of the truth have had a meeting in Edinburgh, at which representatives from several parts of Scotland were present. The proceedings at the meeting have been reported and published in the magazine of the body, *The Messenger of the Churches*, and copies of the number containing the report have been gratuitously circulated in parts where the magazine is not taken, with the object, in plain words, of re-establishing the influence of Dowieism. This movement on their part is our reason for taking notice of their meeting, which otherwise would be of no consequence.

The speeches at the meeting, and the tone of the report, are very plausible, and highly calculated to deceive the unwary. They ignore the facts which cause Christadelphians to stand apart from Dowieite fellowship; and indulge in honeyed generalities which have a heavenly lustre about their exterior, but which (wittingly or not,) are the mere covers of Dowieite faithlessness and ignorance. They would heal slightly the hurt of the daughter of the people, saying peace, peace, when there is no peace. They would build, like their ancient counterparts, the false prophets of Israel, the wall with untempered mortar; but their refuge of lies will not stand. Their smooth things will turn to

gall before the testimony of truth; their sleek maxims and dreamy generalities, which consistently carried out, would land them in the bosom of the Old Mother at Rome, will disappear before the simple application of principles which they themselves profess.

Fellowship has its basis in the truth. Morality makes man an agreeable neighbour; but it does not make him a Christadelphian. He becomes a Christadelphian, or brother of Christ, when he believes the gospel and is baptised. In this position, his righteousness must truly exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, for "the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God;" and we are not to fellowship a man who walks disorderly, even if he believe the truth. But his Christadelphian position arises not from his righteousness, but from his connection with Christ, through the truth believed and obeyed, and his position only continues so long as he "holds fast the beginning of his confidence." If he let the truth go, his position perishes, even if he continue amiable, correct in behaviour, and religious in sentiment. On the other hand, it is also true that even if he continue in the truth, and walk after the flesh, he will die.

Now if the foundation is wrong, of what advantage will perfection of superstructure

be? If a man is not in the truth, what will it profit him that he is benevolent, honest and devout? The question between the Christadelphians and the Dowieites is as to the foundation, and what answer do they make? They point to the beauty of their own superstructure and condemn the superstructure of the Christadelphians. This is shirking the question. It is no answer at all. If the Christadelphians were as bad as they declare them, it would not disprove that they stand in the truth; and if the Dowieites were as saintly as they make out, it would not make their position in the truth a good one, if it is a bad one. If they mean discussion, let them buckle honestly to the work, instead of raising a false cry about arrogance, love, &c., and diverting attention from the real question at issue. Let them grapple with the question whether the principles of truth contended for by the Christadelphian, are to be upheld in the profession of our faith or not; and then there may be some chance of coming to a basis of agreement. Is it to be a question of indifference, whether Jesus was "a man anointed of God with the Holy Spirit and with power," or the incarnation of a previously existing invisible son of God? Is it to be a question of indifference whether the devil-power that Jesus came to destroy is a supernatural being, or the sin of the world? Is it to be a question of indifference whether Christ will judge his people at his appearing or not? Is it to be a question of indifference whether the immortality of the soul is or is not incompatible with a belief of the truth? These are some of the questions at issue, and time bestowed upon their discussion might be of some use; but to preach up unity and love under existing circumstances, is a waste of time. It is talking away from the point, and throwing dust in the eyes. It is covering up the real sore, and trying to make the impression that the cause of division is that the Christadelphians are very sour, harsh and cruel, and the Dowieites sweet, heavenly, and truly Christian—that all have one faith, but not one spirit; that all believe the truth, but that the Christadelphians are self-willed, arrogant, and carnally-minded; while the Dowieites are full of all grace and virtue. This is proclaiming a large falsehood in every particular. It is the truth that is at issue; and as to character, there is such a thing as a sleek and white exterior for a foul inside; a sheep's coat on a wolf's back; pious volubility with a mean and can-

tankeous nature. There are opposite combinations, of which Jesus and the prophets are examples—men of bitter speech, but true benevolence; of disagreeable out-spoken hatred of evil; with large souls, full of true love to God and man. Dowieism does not understand this, but glorifies the insipid sweets of mere sentimentality, to the hoodwinking and destruction of the great principles upon which existence is founded and regulated. The "enjoyable festival" of Dowieism, by which it seeks yearly to palm itself off as Christ's true witness, is, therefore, a mockery; a seduction of the serpent; a delusion, at which "good words and fair speeches" are largely ventilated to the deception of the hearts of the simple. There is much fair show of piety, and much protestation of brotherly love, and other excellencies which people most loudly talk of as a rule, when they are least possessed of them; but there is an absence of that clear and robust apprehension of divine truth, which alone can constitute, in these days of Old Mother ascendancy and spiritual stupefaction, a safe basis of fraternal communion and divine service.

The speeches on the occasion were great fallacies. W. Gill argued back to the Church of Rome without knowing it. He maintained that vitality depended upon connection with "the church," and that if a man separated from "the church," whether by intention or accident, he necessarily became spiritually defunct. If this is the case, in what an awful predicament are the Dowieites, for they have cut themselves off from the universal church, and lie on the ecclesiastical highways, a dry bit of old tegument, rapidly turning to dust. To this the Dowieites might say, the Catholics and Protestants are not the church; and if the question be asked, Why? the answer would be, because they have not the truth: which would be all very good, but very destructive to the pretensions of Dowieism, for it reduces the question to one of the truth, and not of organization. A number of men uniting together in religious exercises may call themselves the church, but they are not the church unless they have the truth: and that, not a bit of it, but the whole truth—the one faith delivered to the saints—and held by them without parley with the fables of the apostacy. And even suppose they are in this wholesome position, they will never hold themselves up as the means of salvation. They are only themselves poor men and

women, hoping to be saved through Christ. They will never be guilty of the arrogance of saying "We are the true church to give you life; join yourself to us, and you will get our sap; sever yourself from us, and no matter what you believe, you must die a dead branch." The arrogance of which they will be guilty is this: "You cannot be saved without Christ; you cannot get Christ without the gospel; you cannot get the gospel without the truth, of which the gospel consists; and the things we declare unto you from the prophets and apostles, are the truth. If you wish to be saved, accept them, obey them, and assemble with those of a like precious faith. We have no bishops or elders, no authority among us; no one to rule; the spirit has withdrawn itself; and until it returns with the Lord Jesus, we wait, a nondescript crowd of spiritual units, hoping by faith, patience, and obedience, to share in the glory that shall be revealed." But Dowieism, speaking through W. Gill, is obliged to go beyond this, and to say "We are the church; you cannot be saved without joining us; separate yourselves from us, even if you believe the truth, you cannot be saved." They are obliged to put the matter in this shape, for they have no other way of putting it, that will have an atom of plausibility. They have no other challenge for those who have separated from them, and will remain separated from them, and fight against them, until they drive out the lingering bat-winged fables of the apostasy and turn into the uncompromising witnesses of the truth.

W. Gill truly says "that none of the separatists ever thought that the matter had such a serious aspect." Such an aspect of the matter could never occur to any man of sense and discernment.

W. Gill was followed by W. Laing, who dilated in clerical fashion and style, on a "text," which he split and manipulated, and elaborated in the cheap style of a "sermon." It was always known that he "aped the clergy;" but this time he came out in his true colours, with dreary subdivisions of wishy-washy commonplace. That the preaching of a "sermon" is a possibility among the Dowieites, shows where they are.

J. Cameron, following in the wake of W. Gill, laboured to uphold the Romish dogma that "the church" is a thing of

visible organisation: to separate from which is to become a heretic; that heresy in thus leaving the church, is a deadly sin; that doctrine—that is the truth—is a thing of forbearance, that is, a matter of no consequence; that unity of the organization is the great essential; that when a man takes it into his head that an organization, styling itself the church, is destroying the faith, and refuses to be compromised in the crime, and therefore leaves the organization to itself, it is a case of "human self-will, refusing to conform to the will of God!" The Dowieites will make excellent Roman Catholics by and bye.

D. Lindsay, of Dundee, advocated "mutual service and fraternity," on the broad basis of tolerating error and fable of every shape and hue in the ecclesia. He says he does "not know of *any error of faith and knowledge*" that will justify non-fellowship. He would tolerate an "erring one denying the resurrection!" This is Dowieism declared—Dowieism with the mask off—Dowieism stated, without that studied indefiniteness and specious rotundity of expression, by which its leaders are wont to deceive the unwary. Let it be plainly seen by all who desire to be on the truth's side, that Dowieism means simply *having a meeting, no matter what may be believed*.

The speech by T. Wallis calls for no answer. As bearing upon the question before the meeting, it was mere froth, and not the froth that precedes the liquid flow, but the froth that comes from a sick man's empty stomach.

How absurd and almost sarcastic is the expression with which the reporter closes his report. In effect, he expresses the hope that the holding of the meeting, and the publication of the report, may tend to "*re-establish intelligent confidence among the brotherhood!*" that is, restore the influence of the Dowieites among the Christadelphians. We should imagine that the very opposite is the effect likely to be produced; and that this may be so, we have thought it worth while to set out of our way and take notice of proceedings, which, apart from their belligerent relation to the good work going on throughout the kingdom, we should have "let alone" as a case of the blind leading the blind.—  
Aug. 21st, 1868. EDITOR.

## THE VOICE UPON THE MOUNTAINS.

*"The voice of my beloved! Behold he cometh leaping upon the mountains, skipping upon the hills."—CANT. ii, 8.*

By W. D. JARDINE.

THE above is the title and superscription of a periodical recently commenced, which we have had forwarded to us for perusal, through the kindness of brother Andrew of London. We thank him, and like himself, feel no dismay. It reminds us of an attractive sign board. The device is artistically contrived; and as we are to some extent bound to believe a notice so professedly given for the public advantage, we cannot dispute its truth, until we try it. In this case we have done so, and find that like many things in the commercial world, with which the periodical in question exhibits everything in common, it presents a fine front with an enticing invitation, but unhappily, the articles sold within differ greatly from those advertised without. Ostensibly it assumes to combat error and set forth truth, but in reality it combats the truth and sets forth error. The intentions may be very good, and we have no doubt that they are so; but as there is nothing more mischievous than good intentions in combination with false knowledge and old wives' fables, the means used and the ends attained by the said periodical, are decidedly bad. We have perused in particular, the pages which bear directly on the cause we espouse, and find the title and superscription quite a deceit; and separated as they are from the book of truth they contribute to beautify, they look more like jewels in a swine's snout than as a fitting inscription on the publication they are made to designate. The "voice" so described betrays itself. It does not sound like the "voice" it assumes to be, and though it certainly does not sound like the braying of an ass, for it is more tolerable than that; neither, like the roar of a lion, for it is far from being so powerful as that; nor like the howl of a wolf, for it can scarce be compared to that; still its sound is as disturbing, because much more significant. Its sound is that of a hiss, repeating as from the seven hills of Rome, the sense, the serpent first uttered in the garden of Eden, "Ye shall not surely die." This is the voice, and these are the mountains. How significant the name! The mountains from which it hails, are not those referred to in the song of Solomon. The "voice"

is not that of the one referred to as "leaping upon the mountains" and as "skipping upon the hills." It is far from being so cheerful and joyful as this. It is not "the voice of our Beloved" we hear, but it is that of a "generation of vipers" as of a reptile after its prey. And having this before us, and the experience of our first parents besides, we hope to baffle the evil, which by the pen of Mr. Govett, it seeks to achieve.

The serpent we are told was very subtle. This appears in the large semblance of truth with which its falsehood was set out. We do not accuse Mr. Govett of possessing the same amount of subtlety, but the large amount of scripture with which he garnishes his silly and wicked remarks, is so exceedingly seductive to those, who though sincere and devout in their respect for "what saith the Lord," are not in the habit of thinking and searching out for themselves, what in reality it is the Lord saith. We rejoice, therefore, to perceive he has had already a clear and fitting reply on one part of his heresies from brother Butler, and encourage the hope he will be as well met on the other parts.

Referring to the doctrine of man's eternal existence, Mr. Govett asks, (see page 86, No. 21, of the *Voice upon the Mountains* dated, July 21st, 1868)—*"Is not he to be renounced as a guide, who tells us that sooner than receive a doctrine which stands clearly on the surface of Holy Writ, he would give up faith in the book and its God altogether?"* To this question, we emphatically reply,—yes, certainly, such a man ought to be renounced as a guide. But to whom does he refer in putting the question? To the author of the *"Twelve Lectures."* And what right has he to put it, in reference to him? Where does he find the said author telling us that *"sooner than receive a doctrine which stands clearly on the surface of holy writ, he would give up faith in the book and its God altogether?"* Certainly not from the following quotation he has given us, from page 68 of the *Twelve Lectures*. "Look at this passage," says Mr. Govett: "No amount of theorizing can persuade him (a good



man) that God is the merciful being of order and harmony brought before us in the Bible, if he is told, that with all His foreknowledge and omnipotence, He is to permit nine-tenths of the human race to be consigned to an eternal existence of blaspheming torture indescribable. Rather than believe it, he will reject the Bible altogether, and even dispense with God from his creed, and take refuge in the calm, if cheerless, doctrine of Rationalism." Well, reader, "look at this passage," and say if the author of it does reason as Mr. Govett would have his readers think. Certainly, from the way Mr. Govett puts his question, he makes the reasoning appear to the unthinking mind as he wants it to appear, but apart from this colouring which is no part of those passages, they utter no such sentiment as is implied in the question he puts. Another question, therefore, arises more appropriate than the one from Mr. Govett, which we invite our readers to consider. It is this:—"IS NOT HE TO BE RENOUNCED AS A GUIDE WHO WOULD DARE TO PUT INTO ANY MAN'S MOUTH THAT WHICH HE NEVER SAID, NOR WOULD SAY, OR WHO WOULD DARE IN THE BEGINNING OF HIS ARGUMENT TO INSINUATE INTO THE MINDS OF HIS READERS, A FALSE IMPRESSION CONCERNING THE CHARACTER OF THE MAN WHOSE LECTURES HE WRITES TO OPPOSE? Brother Roberts in the above quotation, and we have had no conversation with him regarding his meaning, as we take his meaning from what he says—brother Roberts in the above quotation, argues after the manner every right thinking man would argue; and if Mr. Govett does not perceive this, or does not wish to perceive it, he betrays himself, as employing tactics significant of his either not being endowed with sufficient ability to discuss this or any subject, or of his not being honorable and straightforward in his actions. Brother Roberts argues on the supposition that the Bible contradicts itself, if it teaches eternal punishments, while it reveals the character of God as altogether at variance with such a doctrine. And if the Bible does contradict itself, it is then no more the Word of God, and therefore unworthy of our belief. But, as we do not believe the Bible contradicts itself, and as we do not perceive the doctrine of eternal punishments "stands clearly" or stands at all "on the surface," or even lies beneath "the surface of Holy Writ," we put the question to every right thinking man: wherein lies the justice of Mr. Govett's assertion that

"sooner than receive a doctrine which stands clearly on the surface of Holy Writ" the author of the *Twelve Lectures* "would give up faith in the book and its God altogether." It is a wicked insinuation, a calumny, more damning however to the calumniator than to the calumniated. It recoils upon himself. Some, doubtless, of his readers, will be so far affected by it as to prefer to burn the *Twelve Lectures* rather than read them, and if this is a good act with which Mr. Govett will be pleased, the end accomplished may in his own eyes justify the means. But, if he is not of those who say "let us do evil that good may come—whose damnation is just," and if he has inadvertently fallen into what is foreign to all honorable men, he will retract his imputation, and we will forgive. We grant that he may think that the doctrine of eternal punishments lies "clearly on the surface of Holy Writ," or rather, *under* the surface we would suggest to him, where he would more likely find it were it in its pages at all; but *his* thinking so, is nothing to the question. He has no right to assume, because *he thinks so*, others should. He may think what he pleases, but while he cannot prove it does, nor say aught of any weight to establish his thinkings, *his* thoughts and assertions go for nothing. What is *he* more than any other man, though he may prefix "reverend" to his name?" "To the law and to the testimony, if he speaks not according to this, it is because there is no light in him." He muddles up scripture texts with silly remarks, but refrains from showing in what their aptness consists. For example in the same column, in the same article we have referred to, Mr. Govett remarks "we must admit the eternity of punishments as affecting the devil and his evil spirits, for Jesus says, "depart from me ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." Profound reasoning!!! Even though the doctrine he contends for, did "stand clearly on the surface of Holy Writ," this text of his from Jesus' own lips, in the manner Mr. Govett puts it, *does not* make it clear. For, as well may we admit that Roman Catholics are right in their doctrine of transubstantiation, because Jesus says, of the bread "This is my body," and of the wine "this is my blood." Here, the doctrine of transubstantiation "stands clearly on the surface of Holy Writ," but only on the surface, where all false science, on both nature and religion, is invariably

found, but we do not wish on this account, any Roman Catholic should impute to Mr. Govett the crime he has imputed to brother Roberts. Mr. Govett overreaches himself, animated by the spirit which induces one of his correspondents to call us "this most abominable sect," so like that which was said of the one that "was everywhere spoken against." He reasons against us, as if everything Jesus said was literal or exact truth. But though it suits his purpose to so reason as regards eternal punishments, and the mortality of the soul, does he so reason as regards the bread and wine? We decide, therefore, to deny the existence of Satan and of evil spirits, much upon the same principle as he denies that the bread is Jesus' body and the wine Jesus' blood.

"But," says he, "Jesus tells us of punishment already begun" upon the souls of the wicked as soon as they die. "In hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments."—Luke xvii, 23. "That" says he "is also a stumbling block in the way of the theory; so the existence of souls after death is to be denied." Yes, indeed, we decide to deny it, on the same principle we deny the other; we decide to deny it from the evidence of Holy Writ, and thereby find the story of Dives "lifting up his eyes in hell" as no stumbling block in the way of our believing in the non-existence of souls after death. So far from finding it a stumbling block, it is rather a help from the difficulty that ever such a thing did, or will occur. The great dead wall Mr. Govett runs his head against, and makes himself stupid, is his assuming that all Jesus spake and did, was as plain truth. We but smile at his quotation, therefore, "In hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments," as of no use to him. It is not details we have here so much to do with, as principles. Jesus' teaching was governed by peculiar motives. He did not for example "come to call the righteous but sinners to repentance." He therefore did not condescend to teach all men equally. As for the Pharisees to whom the parable was spoken, his practice was to teach them much less than others. And so in the carrying out of this principle, he in the story of Dives, could not have taken a better method than speak to them in their own belief in place of his own, considering that one part of the lesson he meant to convey to them, was not whether there was an existence of souls after death or not, but that on the supposition there was; and as they believed it, a soul from

hell was of no account compared with Moses and the prophets, towards the convincing them of the truth. This corresponds with the teaching of the prophets, and their denunciation of those "who seek unto them which have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep, and that mutter: should not a people seek unto their God, for the living to the dead?" So far, therefore, from believing the story of Dives was founded on fact, the evidence is clear it was but founded on the superstition of the Pharisees, that it was planned to blind their eyes, while it confounded their estimation of the rich, their contempt for the poor, and their superstition for the dead, and nothing we think could have been better chosen for the purpose. To understand the parable, we must examine it not as it appears by itself, but as it appears in relation to the principle and object of Jesus' teaching. Why spake Jesus to one this way, to another that way, and to a third another way? What was the principle which guided Jesus in the several ways he took to impart instruction and withhold it, according to the characters of the people he spoke to? Jesus was far from being a free and open instructor as Mr. Govett would lead us to believe. He was rather a very reserved one; as a public instructor he more often covered his instruction than otherwise, and it was his wisdom to do so. He was like a man living in an age long before his time. His enlightenment was far beyond the age in which he lived, and if he had chosen to speak *plainly* of all he knew, and lavish with unsparing hand the treasures he possessed on those who could not understand the value of them, he would have but cast his pearls before swine, who would have turned about and rent him. As it was, he was misunderstood and called a devil, and had he been plainer in his teaching, they would not have heard him at all. He therefore took a wiser course, and began his instruction with line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a little, sowing seeds in place of strewing flowers, that the seeds might take root, grow, and yield the flowers, which he might have strewed, but only to be destroyed. Need we wonder, therefore, he clothed his instruction in "dark sayings," and "spake many things to the people in parables?"—Luke xiii, 3, 24; Ps. lxxviii, 2.

(To be continued.)

## TOUR THROUGH ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND.

ON Monday, August 3rd, the Editor left Birmingham for a five weeks' tour in the truth's service, throughout England and Scotland. The first place of call was a farming village in the Midland counties, where reside a brother and sister. The inhabitants of the village number only about 140, and are exclusively employed in agricultural occupations. This was a most unlikely place for the truth to have penetrated, but so it has, through the power of a faithful word, spoken in conversation, followed by the potent, though quiet-working agency of book-lending. It has struck at the very head of the village, and made property of the principal lady in the place and her husband, who farms an immense acreage, which has been occupied by the same family for several generations. The lady in question was, for twenty-seven years, a member of the Church of England, but never felt quite at home in the system. She had brains enough to see for herself that there was a want of harmony in many points between the Bible and Episcopalianism. She even went so far as to express opinions in opposition to received notions on scriptural subjects. She could not, however, see through the mist and intense darkness that brood over christendom. To use her own words, the Bible was "a terrible puzzle" to her; and the enigma was in no way cleared up till the truth came, and then she experienced that intense satisfaction, which results from "seeing through" the overwhelming problems proposed to the understanding by orthodox religion. Her husband, in due time, followed, and joined her in the obedience of faith, in which they now both rejoice, though isolated from all society in the truth, and cast off from personal activity in its service. Their position is a little like that of Abraham and Sarah, waiting in pastoral solitudes for the time of the promise. Their lack of opportunity to press the truth upon the attention of men is, to some extent, a source of discontent; but they must ever remember that the shape and acceptability of faithfulness is determined by the circumstances we are in, and not by those out of our reach. "It is reckoned according to that a man hath, and not according to what he hath not;" as a man's faithfulness can only relate to the sphere in which he moves. Works commensurate with opportunities are the service required. These opportunities may be great or small; that is a question of circumstances over which we have no control. What is wanted is the proper use of our opportunities, whatever they may be. God may be served in every position in life. If we are faithful in

that which we have, God will be well pleased, even if our abilities and opportunities are very small. The brother and sister in question can scarcely hope that the truth will grow in an intensely priest-ridden and narrow-minded country parish; but if they may not have the society of an ecclesia to cheer and strengthen them in their profession of faith, they can, at all events, keep the company of the prophets and apostles in the holy oracles, and celebrate the memory of Christ in the breaking of bread, as acceptable by two as a hundred.

Next came Nottingham, a large and tolerably well-educated town, in the midland counties. Here the truth has had chequered fortunes. Years ago, there was a large meeting on a loose basis. Some actually doubted important parts of the truth, denying in some cases the restoration of Israel; and many who had believed the truth would not admit the necessity for re-immersion, contending that the baptism they had gone through in orthodox days, stood good for a connection with Christ, though they knew nothing of the truth about Christ at the time they went through it. In process of time, a growth of knowledge led to a division—the more healthy element, who may be described as the "baptised believers," seceding and leaving the nondescripts, who, after their leader, may be known as Tudorites. Since that time the Tudorites have dwindled away. Some of their number went back to orthodox bodies, and others became further enlightened and cast in their lot with the brethren; and no acquisitions being made from the ranks of ignorance, they are reduced to a state of great feebleness, and as a body, are on the point of giving up the ghost. The baptised believers, after leaving the Tudorites, held together in a prosperous way for several years, till harmony was broken, and another division resulted in the separation of the Dowieite and Christadelphian elements which had embryotically co-existed all the time. This happened about three years or more ago. The Dowieites met together for a time, but now they have no meeting place, and are scattered every man to his own home. They occasionally meet in each other's houses, but having no zeal in their composition or vitality in their system, they make no acquisitions, and are rapidly following the Tudorites in their progress towards nonentity. The Christadelphians, on the other hand, having successfully coped with sundry obstacles, are now more numerous than they ever were, and are rapidly increasing in number, and let us hope, in faith, devotion, and good works. They meet in the People's Hall, Beck Lane,

for worship and the breaking of bread in the morning; and in the evening, brother Edward Turney lectures to the public. On the occasion of the Editor's visit, four lectures were given in the brethren's meeting place, which is capable of holding about 250 people. The first three (week-day) were not largely attended, though there were audiences of tolerable dimensions; the last (Sunday Evening) was crowded—subject, "Judgment to come." After the lecture, there was a meeting of the brethren, at which the editor was presented with unexpected and liberal provision for the expenses of the journey. He rather begrudged the excess thereof over the actual outlay, but gave into the kindness of the brethren, in consideration of the fact that absence from Birmingham involves more financial drawbacks than travelling expenses, since the editor has to provide a deputy, who takes two-thirds of the grist coming to the mill during the time he may be away. It is not at all agreeable to receive, especially from those who are poor, but there are times when submission is a necessity and a duty; when, indeed, it is a graceful act of fellowship in the common work of upholding the testimony of God in a faithless generation. This was one of those occasions, and the editor could but bow, feeling all the while how much more blessed it is to give than to receive.

The next place of call was London—the great Babylon of modern times—where the voice of the truth had scarcely been heard in the din of commercial, political, and ecclesiastical turmoil. There have been a few brethren in the great place for a number of years, but no attempt has ever been made to bring the truth under public notice. It seemed at all times hopeless to make such an attempt in such a Leviathan centre of population, where only great things and great folk have the smallest chance of attention. But within the last few months, a strong disposition has grown among the few friends of the truth there, to give the metropolis a trial. This disposition has received a notable impetus from an accession which bids fair to be the most fruitful victory the truth has achieved for a number of years. We refer to the case of Mr. (now brother) Thomas Boshier, of the firm of Zimmermann, Vernon, and Boshier, city merchants, having large premises in Bishopsgate street and Houndsditch, and doing an immense fancy trade, both in England and on the Continent. This gentleman, who, chronologically speaking, is the father of the firm in which he is partner, adds to business energy, a high order of intellectual and moral vigour. He is a devout and intelligent man, and is possessed of considerable speaking talent, in addition to general ability and culture. He is a man after the order of Cornelius. He is at the prime of life, and has, heretofore, spent himself in the cause of dissent,

temperance, and every good work, according to common conception. He was for years a leading man in the Baptist congregation, led by the "Hon. and Rev." Baptist Noel, and has exerted a wide-spread religious influence, extending beyond his metropolitan connections into little circles and coteries in various parts of England, into which his business avocations bring him three times a year. His introduction to the truth is an interesting story. He was in some measure prepared for it by circumstances, for which we refer the reader to an address delivered by him at his immersion, and reported by bro. Arthur Andrew, of London, and appearing *in extenso* farther on. In this state of preparation, he was told of the Birmingham Christadelphians and their views, in a commercial room, by a gentleman who did not sympathize with them. He expressed his surprise that he had never heard of such a people, as he had visited Birmingham three times a year, for 20 years, and had a great part of the time been in eager pursuit of anything bearing on the topics constituting the subject matter of their faith. His informant told him of the *Twelve Lectures*, but could not give him the name of the work, or tell him where to get it. He asked Mr. Boshier when he was due in Birmingham. A reference to a diary showed it was some time afterwards, upon which his informant (ascertaining his hotel in Birmingham) undertook to forward him the name of the book and the address, where it could be procured, when he should be in Birmingham. Mr. Boshier did not ascertain the name of the gentleman who made him this promise. Time passed on, and Mr. Boshier forgot all about the incident, and was surprised on reaching Birmingham, to find a note awaiting him at his hotel, stating that such a book would be found at such an address in Birmingham. The note was signed, but he did not recognise the name, and it was dated from a totally different place from that in which the conversation referred to took place, so that there was nothing to recall the incident, and he did not recall it, and did not know what the note meant. However, he thought he would go to the place to get the book and see what it was. Accordingly he came to the place (Athenæum Rooms, Birmingham), and it so happened that at the very time he called, (a Tuesday night), a lecture was in progress. He heard the lecture out, and then bought a copy of the *Lectures*, which were offered for sale at the door as the audience dispersed. He took it home, and for the rest, we must refer again to the speech already referred to. We will only add that the truth Mr. Boshier has embraced, he has not kept to himself, but has introduced it wherever there was an opening in the wide circle of acquaintance which his business rounds have created for him throughout the country. He has circulated many copies of the *Lectures*, and exerted

himself much in conversation among his friends, with results of which our readers are likely to hear in due course. From pulpits that he used formerly to occupy on Sundays in his commercial rounds, he is, of course, now excluded, but there are many openings which he is turning to the fullest advantage. He was anxious that his own town—the great city of London—should have an opportunity of hearing the truth; but it seemed a doubtful experiment. Friends thought it would not succeed, but he resolved to try. Accordingly arrangements were made for the Editor to give four lectures in Myddleton Hall, Islington, one of the north districts of London, being the district in which brother Bosher resides. The result exceeded the most sanguine expectations. Hundreds came every night, and paid the most marked attention, the last meeting being the largest and most successful of all. The audience was of a superior class, both as to organization and culture, the middle class among whom the truth is most likely to germinate. Twenty copies of the *Lectures* and fourteen copies of the *Defence* were sold at the meetings—care being taken by Mr. Bosher (who occupied the chair) to explain that it was no book-selling speculation, but the publication of books at cost price for the enlightenment of the public. The interest of the meeting was greatly enhanced for the London brethren by the presence of six brethren from Wales: brethren R. and A. Goldie, T. Randles, D. Clement, J. Lowe, and another whose name escapes memory; also brother and sister Sargent from Devonport, and several enquiring friends from Maldon. At the close of the lectures, a vote of thanks—excruciating formality—was proposed. The gentleman who seconded it—Mr. W. Vernon, of Dorchester—said he had come 120 miles to hear the lectures. The Editor was spared the pain of a response by the interruption of several who dissented. It grates upon one's feelings to be thanked on such an occasion. It seems like submitting to have the eternal truth of God patronized by the fleshly mob, and consenting to recognize them as patrons, and, therefore, higher than the truth, to whom the truth is very much obliged for their condescension; whereas the truth is King Eternal, and they, the swinish masses of the flesh, from whom it comes to gather all who will bow down with abject servitude in its presence. However, disagreeable things have to be submitted to sometimes, and this was one we were glad to hurry out of as fast as possible.

On Thursday, the 13th of August, arrangements having been made in the brethren's meeting-place, Crowndale Hall—a small projection from a dwelling-house in Crowndale Road, capable of holding about 300 people, Mr. Bosher made confession of the faith, and was immersed in the presence

of about twenty brethren and friends. We subjoin a report of the proceedings, furnished by brother Andrew, who made shorthand notes:

THE EDITOR: We know, brethren, that our only guide, in the day in which our lot happens to be cast, lies in those things that have been written by men who were sent from God. No man now living can communicate that will. We know that the men whose words we have read were qualified to do so, because inspired to do so; God bearing them witness with wonderful signs, that what they did was His. We can, therefore, with great confidence and safety, rely upon what they taught, and obey what they commanded. Now Paul, in writing to those who were in a position that was acceptable to God—about whose case there could be no doubt—says "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized unto his death?"—(Rom vi, 3.) Now, that must refer to something that had occurred in the history of those who were thus addressed, and it must refer to something specific—something in particular that they did in being baptized into Christ. What was that? God has mercifully provided—in the record that he has transmitted to our day, of these things—that we shall be in a position to know distinctly and exactly what it is that is here referred to, and what relation it has to the position we now occupy. We begin the discovery of it in those words of Christ—"Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved." If, however, we had no other guide than this, it might be a matter of doubt what exactly baptism was, but we have the actions of the very men to whom that communication was entrusted, as a real guide, and an unmistakable exemplification of what precisely Christ meant. We discover, for instance, that water has something to do with it, from the words of Peter, who having been sent by God to the house of Cornelius, and having preached to his household, said "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Spirit?" This leaves no doubt as to the means—the element—to which this act of baptism is related. That element is water. This further appears from the case of the eunuch, who, after hearing Philip, said, when they came to water, "See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?" "And they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch." Jesus says "Except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God;" and, considering that water is associated with the promulgation of Christ's will by the hands of his apostles, we can see that the birth of water he refers to, was that which he commanded them to ad-

minister. We see what the birth of water is, in the words of Paul (Gal. iii, 27), who, writing to those that previously had no hope, and were without God in the world, says "As many of you as have been *baptized into Christ* have put on Christ." Now, if that means anything, it means that the baptizing they went through was the means appointed by Christ to put on his name. This is confirmed by what he says in Rom. vi: "We are buried with him by baptism into death." Again (Col. iii, 12): "Ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ, *buried with him by baptism.*" This description of baptism, as a burial, becomes highly significant, when we take into account the position of those to whom it is administered. The individual related to baptism is a mortal man,—a man under the sentence of death, and that mortal man must die, because the sentence of death must be carried out. But carried out literally upon him, it would destroy him. It was carried out literally on Christ, but Christ being righteous, He survived it by the resurrection. Now by this act of baptism, the subject symbolically, goes through this process with Christ. God has appointed it as a means by which we metaphorically and legally participate in the real process by which Jesus accomplished our salvation. This process was a real dying, a being buried, and rising again; and how beautiful that God should have appointed a figure of the real thing as the means to get the real thing. Yet men will not submit to the appointment. They look upon the water and say,—“A man can get nothing by going through the water in this way; it is merely a matter of taste; we do not find fault with those who do it, but we do think it is a matter of no consequence.” What leads to this view of the matter? simply a looking away from God, a keeping God out of sight, and looking only at the thing. Now that is a mistake; the education of the mind in the study of scriptures will bring us to this view, that God's will is paramount, and that whatever He commands, becomes imperative law; that it does not matter how trivial and insignificant in itself, a thing that He commands may be; the very fact of its being commanded constitutes the importance of the thing. The people who say that baptism is nothing, forget that in that very expression, they identify it as the thing that Paul practised. For what does Paul say with regard to the means God had put into his hands for the purpose of saving men? This is what he says, and we can see its application. He says, in 1 Cor. i., 26—29: “God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of

the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and *things which are not*, to bring to nought things that are, that no flesh should glory in His presence.” This description is strikingly applicable to baptism. It is a thing that in itself is nothing. It is a thing which is despised, a thing which is weak, a thing between which and the result associated with it, there is no natural connection. The result produced by it, is not a result in the individual, but a result in God's mind; and this is the greatest result we could possibly achieve; for God's mind is the ultimate standard of even material existence. Any alteration in His will will ultimately produce an alteration in fact. In a proper state of mind, therefore, God's will, God's regards, will be esteemed as the highest consideration. In the present state, man's will determines much in an arbitrary fashion, and sets up arbitrary ways of regulating it. To these, the most sensible of men, who it may be, spurn God's appointments, readily submit. In their treatment of God's appointments, they are strangely inconsistent. They do not reason with regard to God's things as they do with regard to men's. The efficacy of a thing in matters of civil law, does not lie in the thing itself, but in the conditions recognised by the general mind in connection with it. Take a familiar illustration,—marriage. Now what is there in the saying certain words that bind a man and woman together in the bonds of matrimony? it is not the utterance of words or the locality or place that marries them; it is the recognition *created in the general mind*. Human law recognises that these two individuals have a mutual obligation which they had not before, it is not the ceremony that unties them, but the result created in the general mind by the ceremony. The want of recognition by society is the want of marriage, even though the ceremony may be gone through. It is the same in other things. One man transfers property to another. How does he do it? By writing his name to a certain deed. Now what does that writing do? In itself, it does nothing. The writing has no literal relation to the property. All the efficacy that springs from it, arises from the recognition created by it in the general mind. So in the case of a railway ticket, and other arbitrary appointments of human law.

Now men are very submissive in regard to all these appointments. They defer with alacrity to anything appointed by man in regard to their own interests, but when they come to God's things, they won't accord that common deference which they accord to their own things. They draw away from His appointments, and say “It cannot be so.” Those who have learned to fear God and tremble at His word, will act differently, and bow in the presence of His commandments and teach men so. It is quite useless

for people to speak of such as being uncharitable, and it would be quite a mistake for us to allow ourselves to be scared away by such a cry. God has revealed His will in the matter, and we must stand by that. The great majority of people do not know God's book, and therefore in shaping our conduct in regard to what it teaches, we must not take them into account, but act with great independence of mind. We must consider the Bible as if it were an angel of God, and come before it with reverence, and decide for ourselves whether we will do what it says, or be guided by the sentiments of those who do not submit to its teaching, a multitude, it may be, of perhaps friendly people. Now, that this is God's will in the matter I have shown clearly, and what can we do but perform it? We are by nature under condemnation,—cast out,—children of the ground,—are destined to return to dust,—without hope and without God in this world,—having no title to anything good that is coming; and how can we get out of this position? Can we get out of it except in the way that God has appointed? Our only question is, "What must we do to be saved?" And the answer is,—“Believe the gospel and be baptized.” And when people scoff with regard to the matter, we can only feel—“Well the day of the scoffer will come to an end. A single generation will silence him. A hundred years will shut all mouths that are speaking now;” and let us remember this,—that the future that is to be developed from the grave, will only be in accordance with the divine mind. Human law is powerless to determine anything in regard to future existence. Men, however numerous and influential, will be nowhere when the dread issues of the tomb come to be decided. Therefore our wisdom is to get on the Divine side, now—to come under the operation of the Divine law. Then, as regards friends who are not scoffers, but who are not enlightened, who, from one cause or another—and it matters not what,—would turn us aside from the way of life, we can only say to them—“We are sorry that we must, in our actions, place ourselves in antagonism to you; we believe you to be conscientious in your motives; but we cannot allow you to come between us and the obedience of God's commandments.” A conscientious mistake in such a matter is just as much a fatal thing, if it keep a man from the obedience that God has required, as scoffing disobedience, because if we are not in the way of life, we are still in death. People ignore the fact that we are in death by nature, and that there is only one way of getting out of it, and it is the way God has appointed; and if people do not come out in that way, they do not come out at all, however conscientious.

Another point remains to be considered. That is, that some people, strongly smitten with the conviction that baptism is a duty,

at once go and are baptized, without at all considering the circumstances under which God has required it. They go and are baptized in ignorance of the truth. Now everything must be in its right place. If we do a thing in a connection other than that which God requires, it is equivalent to not doing the thing at all, just the same as in human law. A man and woman may stand up and join hands in the presence of a company, and say, “We agree to take each other as husband and wife;” but if the legal forms of the country are not complied with, they are not legally married and their union is not accomplished. Now the one condition upon which the validity of baptism depends is the belief of the gospel. The precept is, “He that believeth and is baptized.” The example is, that only those who believed the gospel ever were baptized. Baptism was never commanded to any but those who believed the truth; when a man believed the truth, he was baptized. This was the invariable fact of apostolic practice, as appearing from the Acts of the Apostles. In addition to this, both Paul and Peter's allusions to baptism connect it with the truth as giving it its validity. “Cleanse it with the washing of water *by the word*.” (Eph. v. 26.), is Paul's description of the process by which the church is purified. There is no cleansing in baptism apart from the word. It is no use a person being baptized who does not believe the gospel—the baptism of such a person is no baptism, but a mere religious ceremony, performed in ignorance. The baptism that God requires is the baptism of a believer of the truth. The baptism of an unbeliever does not fulfil His will. This has a bearing on the case that brings us together this morning. I will not say anything about that case in particular, as Mr. Boshier himself will probably say something to us. I will only say that Mr. Boshier has been baptized before now, but has attained the conviction that when he went through that baptism, he did not believe the gospel. It cannot fail to be a source of great joy to those associated with the cause of truth, to see a man of his character and standing, come forward and humble himself as a little child to do what God requires. It will cost him a great deal to do it. By what he does this morning, he alienates friends, and repudiates the religious experience of a life time, but he is wise in taking God's side even at a great sacrifice. Man's side is nothing at all in these things. Man's side is everything for the moment and for the creature of the moment. One is impressed with this in a great city like this, where there are teeming multitudes of people, and where the things men set up for their own pursuit, seem all-important, and God's book as nothing, and God's things as madness. One is apt to be overcome by the powerful

current of the fleshly mind, that sweeps along every street, as it were, and carries all with it to destruction. But with an enlightened apprehension of the past and the future, we are enabled to see that wisdom at present is in the dust, and that this "still small voice" that is speaking to men out of this silent world, is the only voice of wisdom, and that the great world in its heedless throngs is but following after vanity, chasing bubbles that will burst in the attempt to seize them. It is our wisdom to calmly listen to the words of God, and patiently do them.

Let us, as Paul says, "Give earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip." Mr. Boshier then addressed the meeting as follows:—

MY DEAR FRIENDS.—I need scarcely say to you this morning that I feel as I never felt before. A pressure rests upon my mind that seems almost too much for me, and somewhat incapacitates me to speak to you this morning as I should wish. It must commend itself to every man's judgment, whether he knows anything of the circumstances of the case or not, that there must be some substantial reason for a person in my position, who has lived out at least two-thirds of the allotted term of life, and for the greater part of that term has considered himself in the way of life, coming forward and saying that he has discovered, at fifty years of age, that, after all, he was only in the way of death; that whilst he had a name to live, and thought he had the witness of the spirit in his heart, he was dead in the sight of God; that though he has long been recognized amongst his brethren and friends as a child of God—some saying "Whatever doubt I have of myself, I have no doubt of you; I wish I had your standing and your place;" yet it turns out that they and he were equally mistaken. You can easily understand, that in such a case, it is very difficult for one to tear himself away from all the circumstances with which he has been linked, and throw away, as worthless, all the past, upon which he has rested for so long a time. I can say, since my attention has been directed to the things I now hold to be the truth, as I followed them out to their legitimate conclusion, and, step by step, realized them to be the truth of God, that it would apply to my case—certainly, though in an insignificant way compared with the original to whom it has reference—that I am one born out of due time. The occasion on which we are assembled necessitates that what I should say to you should have relation to myself, to a large extent; not that I have any wish to speak of myself, but I have some hope and desire that in thus speaking to you, it may go out from your circle into the circle in which I have been wont to move, and that

the words I utter from this place may be somewhat of a reply to the many voices that have said to me "Why do you take this step; why are you carried away with such enthusiasm with reference to a thing that you may find out to have no connection with God?" The only hope of my friends, while they weep for me, is that I will return to the old faith. They say "The only hope we have is that, after all, he will find it is nothing, and be turned back to the way from whence he came, and be saved, though as by fire." I want the reasons I have to lay before you this morning to reach them. I want to be able to put them into their hands when they ask me such questions, and to say, "There is my answer; read it over, and think it out for yourself." It happens this morning, that in passing through this ordinance in your presence, and in the presence of God, to identify myself with the Lord Jesus, as I believe according to his own appointment, and with you as a poor, feeble folk, struggling to represent his truth in this mighty metropolis, I go through this for the third time in my life. I suppose it does not often happen that a person is baptized three times in his life; but it will happen so with me to-day. In the early part of 1818—so that you see I have just passed my fiftieth year—I was taken, an unconscious infant, to what is called by some "the font of God," the "waters of regeneration," and there, without knowing what took place, the ceremony of what is esteemed in this great country, this enlightened England, as the ceremony which unites men and women to the true church of God, was passed upon me. I was taken to the Church—the Established Church—though my father was professedly a dissenter. In those days, as, unfortunately, in these days, principles did not go for much with those who made religious professions, and, in those days, there was not that amount of liberty we have now. It was necessary that every child should have his name registered in the parish, that he might be enabled to lay claim to any property that might accrue to him, or to legally settle other matters that might occur to him during life; and the only way of getting into the parish register was by going through this ordinance of baptism—as the sprinkling of infants was called—and, therefore, as a matter of policy, and of convenience, and of duty—a duty to the child, perhaps—in things that related to this world, without thinking of the duty to truth, it had to pass through this ceremony, and the parents thought they were doing right.

During the first part of my life, I had a very reverential mind. In my earliest childhood, I had strong thoughts about God, about my relation to Him, about the future which was before me; and it was to me altogether a dark mystery, which I could not solve, which I could not penetrate in the



least, and, therefore, I was obliged to rest upon my leaders. In due time, I found myself an apprentice in the great city of London, in one of the prominent houses in the trade in which I am now occupied myself. My master was not a churchman. He was an Independent, of the high Calvinistic school. I used to go with him and his family every Sunday to chapel, to listen to the preacher, and from a sheer desire to know God, and a veneration for that which related to God, I got attached to these things, and I got attached to the minister; but, as I have just hinted, he was of the high Calvinistic school, and you may imagine how little he was adapted to lead a child on in the things of God, and to shew to an undeveloped mind the way of salvation. Just at the conclusion of the term of my apprenticeship, it fell in my lot to meet with a Baptist friend, and, for the first time, I had the command in relation to the ordinance of baptism, pointed out to me from the word of God. My friend just told me to look and to see if there was anything in infant sprinkling that could answer to that command. I at once saw that there was nothing at all in it, that it could not be so, and, realizing the fact that the baptizing followed upon the exercise of faith in connecting men with his church, I sought for baptism at one of the largest Baptist churches in London, the well-known church of John Street, Bedford Row, now presided over by the Rev. Baptist Noel. At that time, the Rev. James Harrington Evans was the minister, a man, amongst "orthodox" christians, considered to be pre-eminently a man of God, a man of deeply-sanctified mind, and earnestly searching into the truth of God; and I felt he was such a man. He laid hold of my sympathies and affections far stronger than the first one did, and he seemed in his ministry to open up to me a path of life, in theological matters, that was glorious and beautiful, such as I had never seen before, and I used to run into it and drink it with an avidity, that can only be understood by those who have appreciated these things in their young and ardent days. Of course, being young and of an energetic turn of mind in all the capacities of my boyhood, I was soon noticed by the members. The minister took notice of me, the deacons took notice of me, and used me in a way which perhaps, was far beyond what was due to my age and position. In the course of God's providence, this minister died, and if I ever wept at the death of a man, it was at the death of that minister. I felt I had lost my guide, my counsellor; and I shall never forget the fact that on that occasion, I sat under the pulpit and sobbed and wept for grief that such a man was gone; that I had lost his guidance in the things of God.

At that time, the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel was dissatisfied with the question of

the connection between the church and state. He came out just at that juncture, and became our minister, and I was associated with him in connection with that congregation. With him and the other, I was in membership I think for twenty-two years, a term of long standing in connection with one church, and during the whole time, I think I may say without egotism, that I was highly-respected and esteemed; but at the latter part, for reasons I shall afterwards point out, they began to look upon me with suspicion and coldness.

These are the circumstances of my second baptism; but what position was I in then? I thought I believed the gospel. As a Baptist, I then used to refer not only to the commands of Christ, but to apostolic usage, to the precedents and examples that we had in the time of the primitive church, and I used to rejoice that I had an answer to those who would object to the step I had taken, by referring to such a fact that in those days, they did such and such things, and that we had followed their example; and if anyone had suggested to me, twelve months ago, that in that act, I did not follow the example of the primitive church, or at least that my baptism was of no avail, I should have been astonished at such a proposition. But I am here to-day to give in my adhesion to that proposition, I do so for scriptural reasons alone. I read in the 8th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, verse 11, "When they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women." Now when I was first presented with the truth in Mr. Roberts' *Twelve Lectures*, and when I saw that baptism was a very prominent feature as an indispensable act of obedience, I said to myself, with reference to that, "It is all right; I have been baptized, so I shall not have to go through the initiatory right again." Of course, there were other points of doctrine at which I stumbled very much, which, to use a common expression, almost took the breath out of me. I thought at first that I could take the wind out of them, but it was just the reverse when I came to try the experiment, for I found that the further I got into it, the deeper I was involved, and the more difficult it was to extricate myself from the scriptural and logical conclusion to which I was led. So when I came to look back on my baptism in 1842, the question pressed itself upon me, "What faith had I?" I had to ask myself that, Had I faith in the things that the scriptures taught? What did I know, for instance, about the kingdom of God and the coming of the Lord Jesus? Why! it is the very thing that I have been longing to know about for the last twenty years of my life, and about which I could get nothing satisfactory. I laid hold

of whatever I could get on the subject. I got hold of "Fleming on Prophecy"; I ran after Dr. Cumming, and whoever came in my way saying anything about the things of the second coming, I was anxious to hear. Mr. Noel came out dead against it, and said there was no such thing as the second coming of Christ, but to destroy the world—to burn it up, leaving the wicked in the flames of eternal torment, and taking the righteous with him to heaven; and he endeavoured to prove it from a scripture stand-point, I was not at all pleased with what he said. I was dissatisfied when I came away. I said "Mr. Noel is a very clever man, but his arguments on this subject are not worth a straw." There were certain passages in the Bible that could not be interpreted, except in connection with Christ's coming again to reign on the earth. But I had no notion, satisfactory to my own mind, of what was taught in the scriptures about the second coming of the Lord Jesus, and the things relating to the kingdom of God. I might also refer, in the same way, to what is taught of the nature of God, of Christ, and of the devil, and other things concerning which my mind has undergone a change. But there was one doctrine that lodged in my mind at the time of my baptism at John Street, which, above all, I can now see to have made it worthless. I believed in immortal-soulism. I thought, and Mr. Noel very positively taught, that every human being has an immortal, indestructible soul, which must live in eternal happiness, or writhe in the misery of hell for ever; and he laboured hard to establish that position. To that I did not then make any positive objection, though I could not make it square with my notions of justice, and often had very painful thoughts in relation to the wicked, and, more especially in relation to the untold millions of heathendom. I never could reconcile it with the least pretensions to justice, that those poor creatures, who never had a chance to find out the way of salvation, should be doomed to eternal torments. But I had no light upon the subject, and I used to shake my head, and console myself by saying "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" Well, it happened, some fifteen years ago, that a friend of mine introduced me to the Rev. Edward White, who is a minister in this neighbourhood—Camden Town. He had just then come from the city of Hereford, which he had been obliged to leave on account of "heterodox" notions which he had on the subject of immortality, and had come to London almost a castaway, and esteemed as an infidel, and worse than an infidel, by his fellow-ministers, and those under their influence. His transgression was that he had discovered in the Scriptures that man was not an immortal being, and that there was no immortality to be obtained

apart from Christ. As to the wicked, he taught that they would pass away after punishment, but that if there was no accountability in law, they would perish in death. He referred to several passages of scripture which seemed, to my mind, to support that proposition, and especially the one in Rom. ii, 12, where it is said that they that have sinned without law shall perish without law. I think I never felt a greater relief than when that one text was opened to my mind. I read through Mr. White's somewhat large work, and a beautiful work it was in my estimation; and indeed I think so now, though, of course, it does not come up to my present views. I shall never sufficiently thank him as an instrument, nor God as the author of the incident, that put the work of Mr. White in my way. It is entitled "Life in Christ."

Well, that satisfied my mind as to the great question of immortality, and I was wonderfully relieved. I went about everywhere among my friends, and like a man that had found a precious jewel, I wanted to make it known, and thought there would be no difficulty in getting them to listen to it; but they turned away from it as if I had a serpent in my possession, and, instead of looking at it, they looked down upon me with coldness and suspicion. On one occasion in connection with John Street Young Men's Institute, I objected to a person who had endeavoured in an essay to prove the immortality of the soul. I said "Our friend has quoted heathen writers: what are they worth? Why doesn't he quote the scriptures, and shew that the question of immortality can be decided there?" The reply to me was "Well, Mr. Boshier, our friend would like to hear your side of the question;" I said I should be very much pleased to give my views on the subject. Accordingly in the programme prepared for the next quarter, my name was inserted for an essay on the subject. The fact got to the ears of the deacons, and they said that they could not suffer the school-room to be used for the discussion of that question. They came to me very kindly and said "Mr. Boshier, cannot you take some other subject next quarter, at our Young Men's meeting?" I said, "No, I cannot; I have not the time; I could not do any other so well as that, and besides, I am not inclined to give you another; you called upon me to give you that, and I must keep faith with those who expect it, and I must do my duty to those who wish to hear this." Well, they seemed to see the force of this, and went back to have another conference, and tried me again, and found I was inflexible. The next time they came, they said "Mr. Boshier, there is a great objection to what you wish to bring forward in an essay; we do not know what we shall do." "Oh," I said "go through with it." I said, "Who

is it that objects? I will go and see them myself." They said they could not mention names. Someone was pulling the strings from behind, but I could not get at them. At last, at the next committee meeting, they decided that they would not have an essay at all, but would have a night of reading. "Well," I said, "I think that this is a very arbitrary decision on your part, but I have my duty to perform. I will be there, and if the people want to hear my essay, they shall have it;" and I went; but they shut the door to prevent a storm, and would not have it at all.

I just mention this to indicate my position with reference to the doctrine of the immortality of man. That position brought me coldness and ill will, and to some extent loosened my attachment to John Street. In course of time I removed to a distant part of London; and it was inconvenient any longer to attend John Street. Accordingly I tried to associate myself with another Baptist Church, in the neighbourhood to which I had removed. Ultimately I started one myself, with one of Spurgeon's tutors. This man, however, did not like my ideas of immortality, and it was understood that I should not bring the matter forward very prominently. On this understanding, we worked tolerably well. By and by he left, and a second one came, who introduced some articles of faith, one of which went directly against my views. I said "I object, as a rule, to articles of faith at all, but if you do have articles of faith, I must look over them, and see whether I can sign them." When I came to that article which affirmed the doctrine of eternal torments, I said "I cannot sign that. If you will insert any text or texts of scripture bearing upon the subject, I will sign that." To this, the young minister said "dear brother, we cannot do better than keep close to the word of God," and I expected he would act upon it, and substitute a verse of scripture for the objectionable article. It was arranged that we should have a meeting to consider the articles; but when the time came, instead of having done as I expected, he retained the dogmatic clause, and the others agreed to it, and I was voted out of my own little arrangement. This shut me out of the little "cause" I had been instrumental in getting together. I just mention this to shew you where I was when, in the providence of God, that slender thread which has now linked me to you in a strong bond that I hope never shall be broken, brought me in contact with Mr. Roberts' *Twelve Lectures*. You may judge my state of mind when these Lectures came into my hand. I was just ready to receive the truth; I was without what we call a spiritual home, a man of an active mind, without anything to do in the religious direction, spending my Sunday afternoon at home, instead of being out

actively engaged; I was ready to consider any further elaboration of divine truth that might come in my way. It was at this juncture that I was indirectly, through a commercial friend, thrown in contact with the truth among you. I first heard Mr. Roberts lecture, and then went back to my hotel and read his book. I read the first lecture that same night; I was entranced with it; I had full sympathy with it. I had had experience of the difficulty of working with priestcraft, even in its modified form, as among dissenters, and was, therefore, prepared to hear it questioned that a set of men had authority to expound the scriptures: that just laid hold of me. The second lecture I got some light from; the third the same, but some other matters came which, as I have said, took the breath out of me; I did not stop reading however. Finding that those I did read were supported by scripture, I thought it was my duty to go through the others, and, doing so, I found they were supported by scripture too, and I felt bound ultimately to give in my adhesion to what I could not deny was the truth of God.

Now, my reason for repudiating my first baptism; (if baptism it can be called,) is that when that ceremony was passed upon me, if English words mean anything according to the teaching of the prayer book of the Church of England, I was "regenerated," made a member of Christ, a child of God; nay, even further than that, an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven. This, I hold to be altogether opposed to the most simple teaching of the word of God; I say further, that inasmuch as it was done without any consent, I utterly repudiate it, and did so as soon as the light of reason dawned upon me.

With regard to the second, I must touch a little more tenderly, because to some minds, the error involved in it is not so palpable. My friends around me are as much astonished at this as at anything, that I should think it right to go through baptism again in the same form as I went through it before. Their astonishment perhaps is not surprising; I should, doubtless, feel as they feel, if I were in their position, and therefore there is a duty devolving upon me to endeavour to explain my reasons to them. My first reason is, that baptism, in the apostolic usage, followed a profession of the faith—a belief of the gospel. Now it must commend itself to anyone's intelligence that before we can believe the gospel, we must know what it is. At my first immersion, I did not know what I now see to be the gospel. The uppermost thought in my mind when I went down into the baptistry at John Street Chapel, was "I now identify myself with the Lord Jesus. Oh! how I love him. Oh! I should like now to die; not to come out of that water again, but to leave this worthless body now,

that my immortal spirit might flee to him and dwell with him, and not to come into contact and contamination with this evil world again." That was the thought that just laid hold of me, and for the time seemed to swallow me up, and with that thought, I have gone through life from that time to this. Now, what did that involve? A theory that had no foundation in the gospel—that I had an immortal soul, which would leave my body at death. This I now believe to be a fable. I believe that if my wish had been granted, and I had died then, instead of escaping from the baptistry into the upper regions of the sky, I would just have gone back again to the ground, and my life would have returned back again to the God who gave it. The opposite idea which I entertained, viz., that there was a prospect of eternal happiness in which to spend my immortality; if I did unite myself with Jesus, I esteemed as part of the gospel and it had a considerable hold upon me to the very day I came in contact with the *Twelve Lectures*. Oftentimes, the force of this idea prevented me from going into the way of temptation, and yet I now see that all in connection with it was a mere fancy of the brain, and had no foundation in the word of God. As I repudiate that, and believe it not to be true, but a part of the fables into which Christendom has fallen, I must hold that my baptism, which was based upon that instead of upon the gospel of the Bible, was worth nothing. And now to find me in that position has weighed very heavily upon me for the last six months; it has grieved me to discover, after years of religious exercise, that in my relation to God, I was without hope, being outside his covenant of grace and mercy, as given to us in our Lord Jesus Christ, as made known in his word. As our friend has put it before us this morning, baptism, though a very simple thing, is the thing that he requires, and what he requires is imperative, even if we may not see the significance of it; but when, as in this case, we can see how beautifully it is adapted to illustrate the thing that is given us to teach, oh! how binding it is upon us as it comes to us as a command from our Father in heaven, and as it puts us into such a blessed position in relation to our Lord Jesus Christ, giving us the hope of the resurrection in Him, and

the prospect, if we are faithful, of living with him as the peers and princes of the future age. These thoughts possessing my mind, I could not rest until I had identified myself with that which I now believe to be the truth, and in the presence of God, and in the presence of you, dear friends, I thus once again go through this ordinance of baptism, and I hope that, in the providence and blessing of God, my humble efforts among you may be blessed, to spread the truth of God in this vast metropolis. The idea that there is a necessity for such effort has pressed upon me as a thing that one is incapable of realizing. It seems really so overpowering, that when one wakes up to the thought, it seems it must be a fancy that this gigantic City of London should be without the truth of God; that with all its archbishops, and bishops, and clergy, and dissenting ministers, and temples for worship, each of them with the Bible in their hands, expatiating upon it in their way; and that this has been going on for centuries, tens of thousands attending to worship every Lord's day; and yet that we, an insignificant few, should assume to come and introduce them to the precious pearl of the truth of God—the gospel of Jesus Christ—I say the thought is almost impossible to realize. It is overwhelming in its apparent improbability. And yet when we come to the question—"What is the truth?" we are compelled to the conclusion, improbable though it seems, that it must be so, and if God has called us to this honour, oh, let us see that we do not go back; that no present advantage, that no intimidation, that no fear of man, that no love of man, that no affectionate entreaties of those whom we most tenderly love, should prevent us earnestly and sincerely following this glorious, this noble course which God has set before us; that we may so work that when he comes and all these grand distinctions in relation to men shall have passed away, Jesus may beckon us from amongst the crowd, feeble and weak, and insignificant as we have been in the eyes of men, and that He should say to us, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant, thou hast been faithful in a few things; I will make thee ruler over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." May we reach to this happy termination, for His name's sake.

(To be continued.)

---

## FELLOWSHIP.

---

LAST month, the pressure of space compelled us to withhold the following extract quoted in the letter of "Friend,"

and also the comments we had written by way of reply. Both were in type last month, and embodied in last month's

article, ("Pre-immersional Examination,") but had to be lifted out to bring the pages within limit.

*Extract referred to in the foregoing.*

By an undue, may we not say criminal, protrusion of the sectarian phase of religious life, a most erroneous idea respecting the church has been encouraged. If a man has not accepted a sect, it is often contended that he has not entered the church. It has been said the act of joining the church is a *transaction between man and man, whereas is it not entirely a transaction between the spirit and Jesus Christ?* Take as illustration, in some places the approach to the table of communion; or the Lord's Supper, is considered as the sign of church membership; but before that table can be approached, the intending communicant must undergo some kind of *official examination as to his theological views.* WHERE IS CHRIST'S AUTHORITY FOR THIS? Does not such an enquiry proceed upon the principle that the Lord's supper is an *administration* rather than a *communion*, something to be dispensed by a superior hand, rather than taken with a trembling joy by the man himself?

ECCE DEUS.

REPLY.

As to "Ecce Deus," his sentences are worthless, because they assume a false case, and fight a shadow. He takes it for granted that "the church" is not a sectarian institution, whereas it is entirely and intensely sectarian, depending for its origin upon the reception of defined and "narrow" doctrines, and for its continuance upon uncompromising fealty to these doctrines. The "shadow" is to be found in his "illustration," which, in the form he puts it, is inapplicable to the Christadelphians. Breaking of bread is not regarded as a "sign of church membership," but as a memorial act, in

which all, without distinction of locality, are bound to engage, who have believed the truth and been immersed, and are walking steadfastly in the faith. True, a collective performance of the act is a symbol of collective unity of faith; and he who is faithful to the truth will refuse to break bread with those who are not; but the whole institution is based upon *perfect freedom*. "Ecce Deus" recognizes freedom on only one side—the freedom of the claimant to unite in it, if he feels at liberty; he ignores the freedom of the others to decide whether duty justifies them in acceding to his claim to unite with them. The liberty on both sides must be maintained. "Ecce Deus" upholds individual liberty as against collective liberty. This is a fallacy. The liberty of one is the liberty of many; but the "Ecce Deus" class of thinkers fall into the mistake of denouncing as tyranny the liberty of the individual in plural form. Doubtless, there is a little excuse for their theory in the absurd pretensions of the Church of Rome, and similar institutions: but their own is only a little less intolerable an extreme. They set up the tyranny of the individual for the tyranny of the community, and do not give the compensating order, definiteness, and compactness of the tyranny they destroy. Such are the unwitting advocates of anarchy. The true medium is to be found in the maintenance of perfect freedom on all hands to decide all questions of duty, individual or collective. The maintenance of this freedom involves the practice of the pre-immersional examination, to which "Friend" objects. He admits the "prudence and propriety" of the matter, as "a dictate of common sense." Let him now see that it is scriptural as well as philosophical in the best sense, and, sending his objections to pre-immersional examination, after those which he has dismissed on the subject of immersion itself, let him tarry no longer, but "arise, and be baptized, and wash away his sins."

EDITOR.

THIS MONTH'S NUMBER OF THE AMBASSADOR.—In consequence of the Editor's absence from home, "Intelligence" and several miscellaneous matters, are unattended to, and space filled with long articles. The balance will be restored next month (D.V.)

# THE AMBASSADOR

## Of the Coming Age.

---

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

---

No. 52.

OCTOBER, 1868.

Vol. V.

---

### TOUR THROUGH ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND.

---

(Continued from page 265.)

FROM London the journey lay to the West Riding of Yorkshire. The truth has taken root in this part of the country somewhat extensively as regards geographical area, but not with great vigour or success as regards numbers. There are representatives of the truth in Halifax, Heckmondwike, Huddersfield, Leeds, and Ripponden, places which cluster within a comparatively short distance of each other. The largest and the oldest ecclesia is that of Halifax, which numbers somewhere between twenty and thirty. It has stood at this figure for nearly ten years, not that stagnation has prevailed all that time, but deaths and removals and withdrawals have equalled the additions, leaving the numbers about the same. The truth, therefore, is at least holding its ground. This is better than if it were losing, but not so good as if it were gaining on the outer darkness. There is no condition so wholesome for an ecclesia as that in which it is achieving triumphs over the unbelieving, through the active ventilation of "first principles." Nothing strengthens or purifies more than the truth in its elementary simplicity; nothing invigorates the soldiers of Christ more than the earnest contention for these against the high thoughts and imaginations that uprear themselves all around, like the everlasting hills. "Building up," properly understood, consists of the application of these in the solution of enigmatical forms of Bible speech; and in the enforcement of those results of thought and action which logically spring from their reception. When an ecclesia suspends the agitation of first principles, it will not long continue pure or healthy. "Building up" will become a pulling down: the clear lines of primitive truth will become lost in the haze of speculation; those practical fruits of the spirit which it is the supreme object of the truth in the present time to develop,—benevolence of action and deportment, holiness of sentiment and affinity,

dignity, humility and rationality of behaviour, will be suffocated in the smoke of spiritual vanity; and those evil manifestations of the flesh will prevail;—pride, high-mindedness, hatred, envy, emulation, wrath, strife, sedition, to the endangerment of the eternal interests of all. Mere ingenuity of speculative exegesis should be smitten on the head with an iron rod, when it attempts to occupy the throne. The truth in its glorious simplicity, is king; this must sit on the royal seat and wear the crown. The other must be content to wait at the footstool, servicable if need be, for the promulgation of the royal will, but not to be tolerated when he usurps the sceptre. The truth, in its simplicity, will beget humility, love, and goodness. "Vain janglings and strivings about the law" corrupt the simplicity of mind with what God must be served, and our salvation accomplished; and create that feverish appetite for novelties which develop the spiritual Athenian who looks down upon the simple glories of the truth as common things, and exalts to importance mere methods of solving enigmas, and glorifying the most whose who are most prolific in the ingenuity of gratuitous and startling suggestions. The cure for all evil is the exaltation of "the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ." These must always constitute the staple; anything that would lessen their importance, or dim their glory, is evil. Deep things (as some speak) are only accessory, and the depth is more in the mode of their expression than in the things themselves, when understood. The true deep things are "the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ." These are the feast of fat things upon which the soul will fatten; all other deep things take the flesh off the bones. Pepper and mustard are good in their place, but healthy men will demand a considerable basis of roast beef.

The place visited was Halifax. Invitations had come too late from Leeds and Manchester. At Halifax, brethren gathered from the surrounding region, and spent a pleasant season. There were four lectures,—one on Friday, August 14th, two on the Sunday, and one on Monday. The attendance was as good as possible for the size of the place, but the place—the brethren's meeting house—was small, so that the public had not much chance. The public will only come to a public place where nobody is compromised by attendance. The public, as a whole, are doubtless unworthy of the truth, but we must remember that it is from among them that Christ's brethren are to be created, and that a large number of them have to be brought together, in order to get a few good and honest hearts within hearing. A little gold in a large quantity of quartz is the order of the day, and to get at the little gold, we have to operate on the preponderating rubbish in which it is distributed. You cannot get the quartz in much quantity into a "Christadelphian synagogue;" you may hope to get at it by going straight to the diggings, and offering the truth from a public platform. Where the diggings are inaccessible, we must of course be cheerfully content with road pickings. We only speak of cases where there is a choice. The means at command is doubtless the gauge of operations. It is reckoned according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not. The poverty of the brethren will doubtless often be a barrier in the way of the public proclamation of the truth, but it is no

disgrace. The Editor would rather speak in a coal cellar, than that a saint of God should be burdened by the exactions of the hall keeper. It would wring tears from his eyes, and money from his pocket, to see Christ's brethren hurt from over exertion. He speaks not of what cannot be done, but of what may be done, but which may be left undone for want of thought and enterprize. Aim high if you can, and there is some chance of a good hit. All over the country for several years, the audience has been according to place of meeting. Come out to the public, and the public will meet you; stay in the corner, and a few may answer the invitation, but these for the most part will consist of curiosity hunters and intellectual idlers, who have nothing to lose by their great boldness. This lesson begins to be learnt with good results.

After Halifax, came Beith (Scotland.) Three lectures in the Assembly Rooms were well attended for a place so small, and so effectually under the dominion of the clergy. The first was not so well attended as the two last. The audience at the first meeting would number about fifty; on the other two nights, it would reach about one hundred. Whether there was any good soil to receive the seed, it is impossible to say, appearances were unfavourable, but this is not a matter to be practically taken into account. We know not which shall prosper, this or that. All we can do is to do our duty, and leave the rest to God, who will give the appointed increase. There is the prospect of some fructification from the past efforts of Brother Gillies, who labours with unostentatious perseverance in the good work. Dr. Ramsay, of Galston,—twenty miles off—has become obedient, and thrown his heart into the truth, which is a source of comfort and joy; the Doctor's brother—a resident in Beith—has intimated the intention of early following his example, which is also likely to be taken by a son-in-law,—A. C. Gillespie, Tarbolton, schoolmaster.\* There is thus a good prospect for Ayrshire. May the Lord multiply the number of those who will give themselves to him with their whole hearts, and spread his truth and his praise for the salvation of men.

The next place of call was Glasgow. Here the mistortunes which have attended the truth from its first introduction to the town, still continue, to the grief of all good men and true, of whom there are some to be found even in Glasgow. We do not refer to the various outside factions, which in connection with one man's name or another, put forth some profession of the truth, but make it void through admixture with crotchet or tradition, or put it to open shame by their practices. Of these, little good can ever be expected; they are part and parcel of the theological chaos, apocalyptically represented by the Old Mother and her Daughters, and must be left amongst the hopelessly incurables till the Lord come, who will make a clean sweep, and organise the world anew. With them, misfortune is chronic; sorrow loses its edge from use; but it is different as to those who had leagued themselves for the defence of the gospel. Good hopes were entertained that by unity, love, and zeal, they could wipe out the stain from which the truth had suffered for years in Glasgow; and establish in the midst of it a warm, intelligent, healthy, loving testimony that would win its way in so vast a population, and perchance develop a prosperous ecclesia to the praise of Christ's name and the good of every soul concerned.

\* These immersions have since taken place: see *Intelligence*.



These hopes have not been utterly destroyed, but they have been considerably weakened by the state of circumstances which the Editor found existing. Discord has riven the ecclesia. Nine have withdrawn from fellowship on account of alleged misconduct on the part of one of the remaining sixteen; and refuse to resume their places until the one in question is expelled. This is a matter of deep regret. It is one of those cases that bring painful consciousness of the absence of the regulating authority that existed in the apostolic churches; when inspired men sat as judges, and gave decisions which were binding. In the absence of such authority, what are we to do? We can only proceed on certain general principles, to which all rational people will consent. A brother accused of wrong-doing, and denying the accusation, is entitled to have the benefit of investigation. That investigation must be conducted by the ecclesia, or brethren appointed for the purpose, in whom the rest have confidence. Whichever method is adopted, the voice of the majority must rule, for there is no other principle upon which a decision can be arrived at; the views of the majority in such a matter should bind the rest. The minority could not be aggrieved or compromised by it, because on a question of fact, there may always be mistake, and the minority if composed of reasonable minds, would give in to the probability of the majority being right upon such a question, and be prepared to waive all doubt in favour of the deliberate decision of the greater number. Even supposing the minority were morally convinced that the party accused was a Judas, they would not be justified in giving effect to their impressions in the face of doubt and a favourable opinion on the part of a majority. It is in a case of this description that we are not to judge. In a case of open, undoubted, unrepented sin, duty would compel dis-fellowship, but where the sin is denied and in dispute, and a majority think the accused innocent, the only rational course is to give the accused the benefit of all doubt, and let fellowship take its routine way. Those who fear complicity with sin in such a case have only to remember that Judas was allowed to remain in the company of the disciples until he made himself manifest; and they must also realise this undisputable fact, that the present state of the ecclesia, is one in which good fish and bad, swim together in the same net, until the net is drawn to the shore to have its contents classified at the coming of the Lord. All cases of doubt must needs be left to the unerring Judge, who will render to every man according to his ways. Many such cases there will always be in the present state, and if we resolve to withhold our fellowship till perfect holiness prevail in every professing saint, we may make up our minds for a hermit life. In such matters we must follow Paul's injunction, "Judge nothing before the time, till the Lord come, who will bring to light the hidden things of darkness; and make manifest the counsels of the heart."—I Cor. iv, 5. It is to be hoped the seceders will realise the force of these considerations, and sinking all doubtful questions, return to the obedience and the breaking of bread from which at present they have departed. Let the good overcome the evil: calamity indeed will it be if the petty mischief of gossiping tongues, is to keep honest men and women from the path of duty. It should be the part of the latter to

see that no such thing could possibly take place. Let them stick to their posts, whatever the devil may do, instead of letting him drive them into the corner. Let "No surrender" be their motto, while the strife continues between good and evil,—a strife which will rage among men till the Messiah returns to break the neck of wickedness, and establish righteousness in all the earth.

There is a very effectual method of preventing the evil that has happened in Glasgow, and that is, by carrying out Christ's rule, which is exactly suited for all such emergencies. If a wrong is done, it is the duty of the brother or sister wronged to go to the wrongdoer and obtain satisfaction if possible, failing which, to take others, and finally, should no success be realised, to lay the matter before the brethren and sisters collectively. Until these steps are taken, the brother or sister wronged has no right to report the grievance privately; and when he or she attempts to violate this rule, the party to whom the complaint is addressed, should refuse to hear anything except in the presence of the accused. The adoption of this simple rule would prevent an enormous amount of mischief. It would stop the tale bearer who separateth very friends, and nip many a conflagration in the bud. No doubt it would deprive the gossipmongers of many a feast, but their loss would be the general gain.

Four lectures were delivered in Glasgow, to audiences which were not so large as they ought to have been in a city of 500,000 inhabitants. They were as large, however, as could have been expected under the circumstances. On account of the weakened state of the ecclesia, the brethren were obliged to stay at home, and ask the public to come to a room, at 280, George street. On the Sunday morning,—August 23,—the public more than half filled the room, and in the evening, crammed it. On the Monday and Tuesday evenings following, the meetings were held in a large room connected with the Bell Hotel, Trongate, but without much improvement of result. At the close of the last meeting, one of the seceders showed his tender regard for the interests of the truth, by getting up, and indulging in wholesale denunciation—Glasgow style—of those he had left. The Editor was fortunately able to contradict some of his statements, and to put the extinguisher on his malicious attempt. On the same occasion, the Editor was assailed by a fiery champion of the Rough King, who, being denied liberty to pervert the truth in the pages of the *Ambassador*, fell into a Glasgow rage, and pouring forth a stream of invective, disappeared through the doorway of the building, unable any longer to endure the arrowy retorts with which his onslaughts were met. The truth has many obstacles to combat in Glasgow, but nevertheless a good work is to be done in it, if there were but a man to do it. A pure-minded, independent, able brother would soon draw together a large ecclesia, and find warm-hearted co-operators in the good work of preparing a people for the Lord. Man, or no man, let the brethren do their best, and they may yet redeem the work of the Lord from the disgrace that has heretofore covered it in the great metropolis of Scotch industry.

The next place on the list was Paisley, a large town—about 50,000

inhabitants,— about eight or ten miles from Glasgow. Here the truth has existed for something like the same time, and under similar drawbacks as in Glasgow. There used to be a large meeting on a somewhat loose foundation, but that was broken up through personal discord. There is now a meeting of some dozen persons or so, but the doctrinal basis of it is not exactly defined enough to enable a friend of the truth to determine his attitude in the matter of fellowship. This may be clear enough by and by. In the present case, the Editor was invited to lecture, which he is free to do wherever there is a door of utterance. Three lectures were given in the lecture room of the Artisans' Institute. Notwithstanding the wet state of the weather, there was a full audience each night, and considerable apparent attention.

Next came Wishaw, a large mining village,—about twenty miles from Glasgow,—straggling over a considerable geographical area, and comprising a population of about 10,000 persons. Here the truth has existed for some time, having for several years found a warm and constant friend in brother Richard Hodgson,—Inland Revenue officer.— There is an ecclesia numbering over fourteen souls, which, after sundry tormented experiences, principally owing to Glasgow influences, has finally settled down upon the solid basis of uncompromising fidelity to the truth. They have cast off Fordycianism, Dowieism, and every other influence hostile to the free and healthy development of the truth. The loss in numbers which this act has involved, has been very slight, while the gain in enlightenment, zeal, love, and peace is past computation. They have recently, as our readers have been made aware in the intelligence department, been the object of two public attacks, one by the Methodist minister of the place, "the Rev." Mr. Harrison, and the other by Mr. John Bowes, an itinerant Plymouth-Brother preacher, who enjoys some notoriety as a disputant. Both gentlemen were unsparing in their public assaults, and both declined public controversy with the parties assailed, although the latter of them—as will be seen from a correspondence appearing in this number of the *Ambassador*,—declared his willingness to meet any competent Christadelphian in debate. This fact was stated in the placarded announcement of the lectures, in the hope some additional interest might be created, and people brought within sound of the truth. However, both sections of the religious public of Wishaw, had been well warned not to come, and obedient to the shepherds, they stayed away. The first meeting was very poorly attended; the second was rather better; the third better still, and the last had a full house. Results must be left with the future; we can only do our duty in prayer and faith.

After Wishaw, came Tranent, another mining village, about ten miles from Edinburgh. The appointment for Tranent was extra to the original arrangements. The population of this village is only a fifth of that of Wishaw, yet there are nearly three times as many brethren. There is an ecclesia of thirty-two souls, when every one on the list is reckoned. This is a large company of believers for such a small place, and their influence ought to be palpable in the neighbourhood. Appearances

would indicate that it is. There was a good turn-out at each of the lectures, particularly the last, for which brother Strathearn had announced the following as the subject, "The doctrine of the Trinity proved to be idolatry." The Methodist parson of the place was present at all the meetings, but did not avail himself of the liberty given to test the matters set forth, by putting questions. It was currently reported that his congregation were highly dissatisfied at his having played the part of dumb-dog. He probably foresaw disaster as the result of any other course. The meetings were held in a new hall which had never been used, and which the brethren have engaged as a permanent place of meeting. They therefore answered a dedicatory purpose. Before time, the brethren met in a loft over brother Strathearn's warehouse, which though endeared by pleasing associations, was incommodious and uncomfortable. They will be more comfortably housed in future, and will have the prayers of the brethren, that they may be preserved undefiled in the ways of truth, walking in unity, love, and gladness. They have come through their trials like brethren elsewhere, before attaining their present peace and purity. The Edinburgh Dowieites held their wings over them a long time, and it was with difficulty that the brethren got rid of the suffocating encumbrance. Finally, the bondage was thrown off, and the Dowieites set agoing another meeting in the neighbourhood, with three sympathising seceders as a nucleus. These, by the aid of orthodox revivalists have been considerably increased in number, and there is now a fairish meeting; but having no root in themselves, it is not to be expected that the new meeting will endure. Between the truth and orthodoxy, it will probably be absorbed in the surrounding elements, — orthodoxy taking the larger, and the Christadelphians perhaps the lesser half, and Dowieism surviving alone in its original representatives. Such a change will be no subject of regret to those desiring to see the truth prosper. This however, is not the day of the truth's prosperity, and we must not look for great things. Saturday, Sept. 5, permitted of a pleasant drive for several miles by the sea shore, in the company of brother Strathearn, on a visit to Hare Law, where sister Shiells lives, to whom brother Strathearn owes, in a great measure, the happy circumstance of his enlightenment in the truth. Sister Shiells is the wife of a farm labourer, but possesses an unusual amount of intelligence and excellence of spirit. For many years, she has stood alone in the profession of her faith, and the prospect is, that she will be still further tried in this respect, but her faith fails not. She has been for years an encouraging instance of faithfulness in small things.

After Tranent, the Editor visited Edinburgh, which was the last place on the list. The brethren had arranged for five lectures in their place of meeting, which is a more public and commodious place than the one they occupied this time last year. They now assemble in Cockburn Hall, which is situated in one of the principal thoroughfares of the town, viz., Cockburn street, a new street lately constructed so as to conveniently connect the old and new towns for vehicle traffic. The hall is a roomy quadrangle, lighted from the roof, and sufficiently far from the street to

be free from the noise that distracted the meetings in the old place. The room is seated to hold about 300 people, so that altogether the brethren have taken a large step in the right direction in moving from Temperance hall to Cockburn Hall. They are in a position to give a public testimony for the truth, without going out of their way. The meetings were highly successful. On Sunday,—Sep. 6th,—there was, for such an hour, on such a day, in the capital of Presbyterian Scotland, a good audience to hear the time-honoured and universally-revered doctrine of Plato blasphemed and pulled to pieces. In the evening, the room was quite full, the endeavour being not less sacrilegious than in the morning, viz., to show that the universal resurrection and judgment of orthodoxy, was a myth,—that those only would be brought into judgment who are responsible,—that of these, the accepted would be made immortal, and invested with authority to reign in the kingdom of God; and the rejected, given over to shame, suffering, and ultimate destruction, that the residue of mankind, embracing heathens, pagans, idiots, and children would never see the light, but pass away like the beasts. The audience sat patiently for two hours, while these propositions were reasoned out. On Monday, the audience was smaller: subject, "The Kingdom of God as an element of the gospel." On Tuesday, a rather larger company assembled to hear it proved that the doctrine of the Trinity is a caricature of Bible revelation concerning the Deity, and that it is impossible to comprehend the scriptural doctrine of God manifestation, so long as the Creed of Athanasius was retained. On Wednesday, there was a still better audience, nearly filling the place; subject: "The Second Advent." On the Sunday afternoon, there was a tea meeting, at which the brethren from neighbouring places were present, and also brethren J. J. Andrew, and A. Andrew, London, and W. L. Hipwell, from Birmingham. Some profitable addresses were delivered, and a pleasant time spent. On Monday, a visit by a company of eighteen, to Hawthornden, a romantic spot some ten miles from Edinburgh, was on the whole agreeably spent. Buffoonery is no improvement on such occasions. It is a condescension in Christadelphians to give it countenance, far less indulge in it. It is highly incompatible with that rational frame of mind and sensible deportment which the truth is designed to create, and which will certainly prevail where the truth is in the ascendant. Wednesday gave opportunity of a visit to Braehead, in the company of kindred spirits. This was a treat; by the brink of a gurgling stream in a wooded dell, there was sweet intercourse on things divine,—refreshing off-set to the constant turmoil of battle. Braehead has been for years a resort of friends from Edinburgh, through the presence in a neighbouring lady's household—in the capacity of head servant—of an aged sister, who is much respected for her intelligence, zeal, and goodness in the faith, and to whom access has at all times been permitted. She is familiarly known as Nancy. Her fellow servant "Cecilia" is also in the faith. They attend the meetings of the brethren, but are under a great disadvantage in being so far off—five miles.

The Editor returned home on Thursday, Sep. 10, having been out five and a half weeks. On his journey, he disposed of nearly 100 copies of the *Lectures*, and 130 copies of the *Defence*, besides 690 Tracts and smaller matters. Some of these were left in the way of stock on the hands of brethren. Cynically disposed have only to be reminded that the *Lectures* are under cost price, and the *Defence* very little above it, which is an answer to the low surmises that one meets at almost every corner in these sinister times. While to those who are not so minded, but desirous of the advancement of the truth, it will be a fact not uninteresting or without significance, that so many books have found their way into general circulation.

The expenses of the journey were liberally provided for at every stage, and indeed, largely overpaid. To one and all, the Editor returns sincere thanks. He begrudges that any should be burdened, and would rejoice to go always and everywhere at his own charges, had it pleased God to put it in his power; but the truth having—as ever—fallen into the hands of the poor, they can only accomplish their ends by co-operation in which private objects and private delicacies have to be sunk in the objects of common effort. God prosper His word! Let the truth prevail: let the brethren prosper and increase in love one toward another, and to His name be all the praise!

EDITOR.

---

## THE VOICE UPON THE MOUNTAINS.

---

### THE PARABLE OF THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS.

"THIS is no real occurrence: 'tis a parable," says the author of *Twelve Lectures*. "Prove it," says Mr. Govett. This we shall do. First, from the evidence surrounding it; and secondly, from the evidence its details adduce.

1st.—The external evidence of its being a parable: the motive which induced Jesus Christ to speak to the people in parables. "that seeing they might not see, and hearing they might not understand;" and that which guided him while instructing his disciples—his only speaking to them plainly as they were able to bear it, and his speaking to them in parables what they were not able to bear—discovers a principle in Jesus' teaching, which accounts for many things in his varied instruction which appear strange. It accounts for the apparent consent he gave to the superstitious ideas of his time, by his use of the language which expressed those superstitions: such as "devils," "evil spirits," and the like. It accounts for the peculiar manner of speech in the four Gospels, concerning many things

which are not spoken of, save in a very few instances, in any other portion of scripture. There appears in the four gospels, compared with what we read in the scriptures which precede, and in the epistles which follow the events which the gospels give account of, something like a confusion of ideas, as of a struggle between something coming into being with that on the face of it: a collision as it were between the tenacious hold of long-established beliefs and the grappling of a new upon the mind of man; a transition state begun, in which the ordinary language of the time is taken to express, in some sense, the same relation to the new ideas as it does to the old. This may be somewhat exemplified in the fact that, mix in conversation Christadelphians with those of ordinary belief, and each class will speak of "devils," "evil spirits," "Hell," and the like, with different senses. And supposing they were not to know each other, and each to assume the other of their own belief, what an amount of confusion of ideas and mutual misunderstandings

would take place. And suppose further, one reported such a conversation, and in accordance with a reporter's duty, made no comment, how would the public understand it? Some would have it to mean this way, others that, a third, another way, and, probably, a fourth would have it overboard as altogether inconsistent with itself. Now, something like this appears in the four gospels. The people supposed Jesus like one of themselves, and accordingly heard him from their own point of view. Jesus, on the other hand, did not let them understand what his point of view was. He, in speaking to them, used their own familiar terms with a sense of his own, different from their sense. And according to what, in these circumstances, transpired, so did the evangelists report, with very few comments of their own. For example, when Jesus said "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up," we are not to suppose he then added "I speak of the temple of my body." This we must perceive to be the reporter's remark, not Jesus', otherwise the people would not have so egregiously blundered as to his meaning. Here Jesus used the word "temple" in a sense very different from what the people were accustomed to mean by it, and they understood him according to their own use of the term; but, notwithstanding, *his* use of the term had an intimate relation to the temple before him. On another occasion, he said to his disciples, "Lazarus sleeps;" and, on a third occasion, to others, "She is not dead, but sleepeth;" and on both these occasions, the persons referred to *were* dead. The disciples misunderstood him and replied "If he sleeps he shall do well." As for the others, "They laughed him to scorn." Again, how spake he concerning the bread of life? and what said the people? "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" These are examples of what was frequently his manner of speech, and of how his hearers understood, or rather misunderstood him. So a very natural question is suggested here: Was not Jesus responsible for the people's misunderstanding him; and was he not himself to blame for the accusation brought against him before the high priest? "This fellow said 'I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days?'" And if we look at it from a human point of view, or from the standpoint our adversaries take, while they say "Jesus, if he had not believed in 'devils' and 'evil spirits,' would not

have countenanced such a superstition, by the use of words which implied this;" we would say, yes. But as he was a man "of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord, who judged not after the sight of his eyes, nor reproved after the hearing of his ears," and, therefore, reasoned not as man reasons, the evidence is clear, that we cannot judge of his acts by any notions of our own, drawn from that which should obtain between man and man, but by a far higher standard—the will of God. Had he done his own will, *then* we might have judged him from the human idea of what is right and what is wrong, but he spake and acted not to do his own will, but his Father's only.—(John vi, 38.) We have no right to assume, therefore, that Jesus was of the ordinary belief, because he used certain words expressive of that belief, and because he was silent as to the sense with which he used them. If he was of the ordinary belief, it must be proved from something else, not from this. For so far from the terms he used being, in their ordinary meaning, an index to what he meant by them, they are, from his frequent manner of speech, rather an index to his having been of a knowledge and understanding quite contrary to what they express, or rather an index to something they have a figurative relation to, not an exact relation. The question we have to ask, therefore, is not, How stands Jesus' manner of speech with honesty of statement and straightforward action, but how stands it consistent with the principle and object of his teaching? How does it coincide with the motive which induced him to speak to the people in parables, and to instruct his disciples very clearly, other times very darkly?—(John xvi, 12, 25, and see the same principle referred to in 1 Cor. iii, 2; Heb. v, 11, 12, 13, 14.)

We can only judge of an act by the principles from which it emanates, and hence, can neither justify nor condemn the withholding of truth, until the reason for it be ascertained. If Mr. Govett can condemn the principle of Jesus' teaching, then he may consistently condemn his method, but so long as he misapprehends the method from not knowing the reason for it, he may quote passages of scripture by the thousand, make assertions by the ten thousand, and all the while be only beating the air, or disputing with one of his own imaginary spirits, or immortal souls. In Jesus' case there was no other course for him to pursue than the one he

took, unless it may have been to pursue his own will; but, even then, judging from what all great teachers have done, he would have proceeded much on the same plan. As a servant he was sent to fulfil the prophets, and this he partly did, in so speaking and acting "that seeing, the people might not see, and hearing, they might not understand." Mr. Govett does not seem to believe this; but let him believe it or not, as he pleases, there it is,—the fact. But not only this, Jesus was a wise teacher, and hence only imparted plain truths, as those he instructed were able to bear or receive them. Does Mr. Govett do otherwise. or rather, would he do otherwise if he had such to teach? Supposing for example he went to the interior of Africa, to teach the natives the motion of the planets, how would he begin? Would he first begin with such primary principles as would be calculated to lead them to his own conclusions, or would he try to force his conclusions upon their minds by simple dogmatism? In order to be consistent with his teaching, would he drop his conventional phrases concerning the apparent motions of the sun, and tell them "the sun does not rise, the sun does not set?" If he did the latter, how would his hearers receive his negations? Would they bear them? What would they reply? "Do we not see it move, do we not feel the earth firm under our feet." Are we blind! Are you mad! Would they not laugh him to scorn? And if he did the former, would it not take a course of years to instruct them, and yet all the while, he himself would be speaking to them as occasion required, in terms such as they use themselves concerning the sun's motions, and this apparently in direct opposition to his own teaching. Now, so may we justly reason regarding the teaching of Jesus Christ. He went among men ignorant of the truths he had to teach them, as the Africans are ignorant of the science of astronomy, and therefore began his instruction among them in their accustomed speech; but concealing his direct meaning, lest he should unwisely oppose their superstitions, and unceremoniously hurt their prejudices. By this means, he gained a hearing, and though they did not understand his real meaning, they at least understood by the terms he used, what he was referring to, or in some way speaking about. For had he used terms as expressive of the truths he taught, as the terms he used were expressive of the superstitious ideas of his time, he would have spoken in a language as foreign to the understanding of the

people, as the ideas it would have expressed were foreign to their belief; and this simply because they were not prepared or sufficiently far advanced in intelligence to receive the one, and therefore incapable of understanding the other. He was misunderstood therefore, because he spake to the people in their own familiar terms with a sense foreign to their customary meaning. He spake parabolically; in *their* sense, "he cast out devils," in his *own*, he cured maladies; but had he said this, what would he have gained by it, in the face of so long and widely established belief to the contrary, but the derision of the multitude? He could have said it, as they could have received it, without their being first instructed in much that would have taken a course of years to acquire. He therefore, did not undertake to explain in their then state of knowledge, what indeed he could not have made intelligible, save by a miracle. He spoke and acted therefore with a reservation of his meaning, reserved for those only who were made able to bear it. These few he instructed, and left the many to their superstition, but this not without hope; for though the many did not understand him, an impression was nevertheless conveyed to their minds, which would bear fruit afterwards. It would make the truth of easier apprehension for those he was instructing to follow him in his teaching. The new thoughts instilled into his disciples as they became mature and fruitful, would with the other be more successful in destroying in the many, their superstitions and prejudices. Now what better evidence could we have of the wisdom with which Jesus instructed the people, than this? Here, while he appeared only to consider the wants of a few, he was the while providing the means through which his favors would pass and take effect more powerfully upon the many. And as it was really a few, and not the many he himself instructed; is this not a decided proof in itself, apart from anything else, that the parables he spake to the multitude were not intended for their immediate enlightenment? Mr. Govett, however, reasons as if they were all as plain as one might read who runs. And so also does the author of "*Are these things so?*" (Is the author of this tract ashamed to furnish his name? See page 46, near the bottom.) But here, we have both the practice and testimony of Jesus, **THEY WERE NOT.**

Now apply this to the story of Dives and Lazarus, concerning which the anonymous author says, "it is so plain and positive in



its teaching, that one would think a child even, would not fail to discern its primary meaning." And Mr. Govett says, "It is a statement of facts." Well, apply to it what we have been stating, and if it is a statement of facts, and so plain as that a child may discern its primary meaning, then it is inconsistent with the whole practice and scope of Jesus' teaching, and with the will of God. But more than this, as related to the very class for whom it was spoken, it is in particular inconsistent with his whole conduct as relating to that class. Is this not the fact, that he warned the people to "beware of the leaven of the Pharisees." And is it not also a fact, that he denounced the Pharisees as the most wicked of the wicked, the most hardened of the nation. In these circumstances therefore, were they not the least worthy and the least capable of receiving instruction? And does this not present the strongest reason in their case for his the more strictly enforcing the principle on which he spake parables to the people at all, seeing, if there was one class more than another deserving of being blinded, the Pharisees were that class? How then could a statement of facts blind them? Let Mr. Govett answer this question. Had Jesus spoken from his own knowledge, in place of their tradition, they would have both seen and heard that he approved, countenanced, and taught just what they taught; whereas he spake only their own, they were thereby blinded as to what was his. In their case it could be no exception to his common practice, for they were the last people in the world he would have made an exception of, and to have made such an exception would have detracted much from the weight and reason of the character he gave them, and his caution to the people "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees." They make void the law by their traditions. They taught for doctrines the commandments (or opinions) of men.

Next, we may ask, what were those opinions the Pharisees taught? what were their traditions? We need not enquire after more than concerns the parable. Josephus' account of Hades corresponds very clearly with Dives and Lazarus. Where then did the Pharisees find their knowledge concerning it? This we may simply answer by saying, Where did they not? Wherever they may have got it, they certainly did not find it in *their* scriptures. We may be referred to Isaiah xiv. 9 to 15, and such like passages. In these, however, we see figure only, not reality; whereas, in the story before us, we have what Mr. Govett

calls facts; and we cannot prove the facts by the figure; but more anent this presently. We do not dispute the long currency of the tradition regarding Hades; it is the assertion that there is such a place as the parable describes which we dispute. Neither do we dispute the currency of the tradition concerning souls existing separate from the bodies; it is the assertion that there are such, which we dispute. Further, we quite understand, the word "Hades" possesses a different meaning from the word "grave," but this matters not. It is not the meaning which it by itself possesses, that can determine the point, but the connection in which it stands. And this connection is not the mere context alone, but also the whole scope and spirit of God's teaching. All scripture is to some extent a parable. Nothing in it so far as doctrines are concerned, is clearly laid down. Everything must be got at by close searching, and comparing scripture with scripture. Here then, the first question we have to ask, is, if "Hades" is a word which means more than the grave, why is it found in scripture, if there is no such place? Superstition, like every other belief, creates ideas, and these, words to express the superstition; and as the superstitions of idolatrous nations were often common amongst the Israelites, so would there also be common Hebrew terms to express the ideas of those superstitions. Now if it was a common idea that there was such a place as "Sheol" or "Hades," (and there is reason to believe the idea was common), the reason is obvious why the word was used. It conveyed a sense more intelligible than a new term would, and thereby made that with which it was used more expressive, inasmuch as it expressed in some sense the same relation to the doctrines of scripture, as it did to the superstition which gave the idea its birth. But it does not follow from this, that though the word "Hades" means in the superstition more than the grave, it means more than the grave in scripture. We have the tradition it means more, but we have no revelation for it. As a Hebrew word resulting from a superstitious notion well understood, it is a more fitting one than the word "grave" could be, to support a figure of speech, but beyond this, nothing more; and as it is alleged that "almost wheresoever the mere abode of the body, the tomb, or grave is spoken of, both in the Old and New Testament, a totally different word from "Hades" is used, (see "*Are these things so?*") We have in this, just what we want to show, that

in all those passages where the word "grave" is used, there are but plain facts stated, in which there is not the smallest room for figure, or emblem; whereas, in those passages where the word "hades" is used, there is ample reason for it without at all implying there is such a place. As regards "grave" for example, take the following passages:—

"Jacob set a pillar upon *her* grave."

"In *my* grave which I have digged for me, there shalt thou lay me,"

"Whosoever toucheth *a* grave,"

"Cast the powder upon *the* graves."

These are all statements of very plain literal signification: they need no interpretation whatever. But as regards "Hades," the phraseology associated with it appears different: for example, "Thou wilt redeem my soul from the power of the grave (Hades.)" Here we have figure or metaphor, and therefore the Greek word "Hades," or the Hebrew word "Scheol," both meaning the same thing, is used, because with the meaning common to either word, it is more appropriate. For as "Hades," according to the pagan idea, means a place of captivity, a prison house for souls, so also does the grave as associated with the doctrine of the resurrection appear the same; but as the latter is not in general associated in its literal meaning with anything like life, the other word is more in harmony as an emblem of what the grave is. In view of the resurrection, the grave presents an idea more akin to the notion concerning "Hades," than it does in its ordinary signification. In its ordinary signification, therefore, when used, the metaphor or figure is dropped and plainer words are used, such as "though worms destroy the body." Here are words of literal signification, pointing not to "Hades," but to the literal grave, and so in harmony therewith, while the same faith is expressed, the figure also concerning the soul is also dropped, and in place of "Redeem my soul," we have the plainer terms "yet in my flesh shall I see God." And it is Job's phraseology which should explain David's, and not David's Job's. We see no other reason, therefore, for the use of the word "Hades" than as a figure of speech. For the same reason we have death called "a sleep," not because it is really so, but because the resurrection makes death like a sleep, from which one awakes on the morning of the resurrection. Hence, it is said of those who die in the faith, "They have

fallen asleep in Christ." Here in view of their rising again, the word "sleep" has a more fitting application in figure than the word "death." Here it is not strictly true, but nevertheless, it is more expressive than the plainer word, death. So of "Hades;" in all the passages where the word "Hades" is used, it will be found associated with some figure of being, or poetic imagery of life, and this without any reason whatever to regard the imagery as expressive of exact truth. Take the proverb of Isaiah against the king of Babylon. Consider it was uttered for those who believed in such a place, and perceive the force which, in these circumstances, the expression of the prophet fell from his lips on those concerned: "Hell from beneath is moved for thee, to meet thee at thy coming." If the Babylonians had not believed in such a place, the prophet would not have conveyed his curse upon them in such terms. So also with the Israelites, they also were superstitious, and as a whole probably believed in the like thing, for they were then but shortly removed from among the midst of superstition. Hence, the same force would apply to them from the words "a fire is kindled in mine anger and shall burn into the *lowest* hell," (Hades.) But it does not follow from this, that their belief in this matter was right; it only implies they had such a belief, and therefore would be more likely to understand in some sense the words spoken to them. The use of such language was but the necessity to convey through their own ideas some sense of God's anger and consuming power. It does not at all imply that God taught such a thing as these words by themselves would imply, but simply his having made himself intelligible to them by their own use of terms as associated with their superstitious notions. He as it were, spoke to children after the fashion of their own ideas; and if our readers consider the details of that fearful curse in the verses which follow Deut. xxxii, 22, and compare them with Jer. xv, 14; xvii, 4; Lamentations iv, 11, they will see clearly that the 22nd verse of Deut. xxxii. is a mere figure of speech from which no scriptural meaning can be drawn, save as associated with the said passages. Of course, viewing it by itself, and from the pagan view, it is all that can be desired to enforce the doctrine of eternal punishments on the unthinking mind, for it appears as nothing else than a reflex of a superstitious notion. But apart from this, and as linked with its context and

the scope of prophecy, it is the remotest possible for the purpose.

Well, recurring to Mr. Govett, he says, "Hades never means the grave."—Be it so. So may he say, "sleep never means death." We have given instances, however, where "sleep" is used to mean death; and so also "Hades" where it as evidently means the grave. We care not therefore what it may never mean by itself; it is only with what it means as it is applied in scripture, we have got to do. We repeat therefore that "Hades" in scripture does mean the grave. What did the Sadducees mean by its equivalent in Hebrew? They read Moses, and as they neither believed in spirits, angels, nor the resurrection, they could not have understood it to mean anything else but the grave; and there is no reason to assume here, they did not understand it rightly, because they did not believe as the Pharisees believed. If they made void the writings of Moses by their belief, or no belief, they at least did not

make them void by their traditions. This was never brought against them, and the probability is, that if the word had as clear a meaning which our adversaries now say it has, or had, this little word with its wonderfully clear meaning might have altered their faith entirely, for they believed Moses as far as they could; and that it did not, is evidence enough that to them the word had conveyed no other meaning than the word grave conveyed. On the other hand, there is the fact that the Pharisees had a tradition concerning Hades, and having this before us, and what Jesus has said of them, the evidence is, irresistible, that they were the people who made the word void of its scriptural meaning by this said tradition.

In our next we shall consider the internal evidence of the story, against its being a statement of facts, and at the same time deal with Mr. Govett's silly objections against its being a parable.

W. D. JARDINE.

### "TOUCH ME NOT."

*"Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father."*—JESUS.

IN that celebrated discourse, commonly styled "the Sermon on the Mount," Jesus said to His disciples, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy," (either) "but to fulfil," (both) "for verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in nowise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled."—(Matt. v, 17-18.)

The justification of Jesus was necessary to convince men that he had fulfilled that which he so often declared the Father had sent Him to do. Now the Father had sent Him to "magnify the law and make it honourable."—Isaiah xlii, 21. To do this, Jesus must fulfil the law. The law demanded the death of the Messiah. This demand must be met by Jesus who claimed the Messiahship for himself. But we cannot stop here. To have gone no farther than to yield himself a sacrifice, would not have fulfilled the law; it would have availed nothing whatever to the grand purpose thereof. The essential and the crowning act, was the coming back again from the dead, and the justification by the open bestowal of life for ever more. These

facts cannot be confuted, and hence the fulfilment of the law cannot be questioned. The fulfilment was not comprised in one or two acts; it was a long and arduous process, a severe probation. The question arises, at what particular point of time was the justification of the fulfiller accomplished? The answer is, at the moment Jesus received His reward, which was the undeniable assurance to witnesses that he had been justified or accepted. The Father gave unmistakable signs of His approval of Jesus, in his official capacity, but everybody will concur, that without his immortalization, the previous signs would have been unsealed, and therefore invalid. In harmony with this, Paul at Thessalonica alleges "that Christ *must needs* have risen again from the dead."—Acts xvii., 3. And in his letter to the ecclesia at Rome, he alludes in most emphatic language to the same event, saying, "It is Christ that died, *yea rather, that is risen again,*" &c.—(Romans viii, 34.)

The next question is, did the mere coming out of the sepulchre constitute the justification? From what is written of previous, and also subsequent resurrections,

we should be inclined to say "by no means." For others, as Lazarus, and the young man who fell down from the loft where Paul was preaching, were not changed in being resuscitated, when nature was the same after as before the event. It is therefore clear that a *change*, as well as a resurrection, was essential to the justification of Jesus, and to the fulfilment of the law of Moses. But where is the proof that that change did not take place just as Jesus was awakening from his three days' "brazen sleep?" This question might be off-set by another, viz.: is there any proof that the change did occur at the point of time referred to? And to this it might be answered, that Paul in 1 Cor. 15 and 52, says, "the dead shall be raised incorruptible." It will, however, be obvious to every cool and candid thinker that to finally conclude so important an enquiry, by the citation of an isolated text, although that text should appear conclusive, would be too hasty a proceeding to be safe. Let us go to the sepulchre, where the most illustrious dead was laid. Let us imagine we are present at the mouth of the horrible pit, at the time marked by the heading words of this article. Jesus is saying to Mary, "*Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father*;" but go to my brethren, and say unto them, *I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God.*"—(John xx, 17.) Strange expression this, think we; and we say insensibly, as it were, why forbids he her to touch him? and notwithstanding the reason given, viz., that he has "not ascended," the question seems still unanswered, and we say again, "Why must he not be touched *now*?" Well, let us now go away awhile, and consider from our present point of view, the question of the ascension.

Luke informs us that from the resurrection to the "going up into heaven," was forty days.—(Acts i, 3, 11.) To ascend is just the same as to go up. But there are different kinds of going up. A man is said to be going up or getting up in the world, when his affairs are prosperous, and he is making money fast. On the other hand, he is going down when commercial clouds and thick darkness are upon him. Merchandise is said to be going up or to be rising when the value is increased, and so forth. This being so, we come to ask, was the ascent spoken of by Jesus at the grave's mouth, the same as the going up mentioned by Luke forty days afterwards? To answer this question discreetly, regard

must be had to the reason given by Jesus, why Mary might not touch him: "Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father." Now if Jesus would not permit any person to touch him before he had ascended to his Father, it is quite certain that the ascending to his Father was not the same thing as going up into heaven, and here is the reason: after Jesus had gone up into heaven, there is no account that he ever came down from heaven, at any rate so as to be touched, though it is held that he did come down at the siege of the holy city, by the Romans. If he was never approachable to the touch after his going into heaven, it would have been superfluous and meaningless to prohibit such a thing, for it could not happen. Is it not clear, therefore, that the ascent spoken of at the mouth of the tomb, and the going up which took place forty days after, are different matters in nature as well as in time? The ascent spoken of to Mary viewed in this light, reminds us of what is written concerning the nature of Jesus. The old and new scriptures agree that he was "a little lower than the angels." There can be no doubt whatever that the term "lower," refers to his nature; for the Apostle says, "he took on him the nature of angels."—(Heb. ii, 16.) If at the first then, he was made *lower* than the angels in nature, he must by change have *ascended*, or he would be still *lower* than they. But the same word which contemplates his "weakness," his "sinful flesh," also anticipates his "unchangeable" state, and foretells his being worshipped by angels. What is well-deserving in attention is that, after Jesus had come forth from the grave, he himself declared that this change from the lower nature to the angel nature had not transpired. He was, therefore, still for the time being clothed with mortality. Mortality had not up to that moment been "swallowed up of life." His "mortal body" was still "unquicken'd." Now Paul conclusively shews in his arguments in Hebrews, that it was absolutely needful that in nature, Jesus should be like his brethren. The Apostle's words are, "Wherefore in *all things* it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people: for in that he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted."—(Heb. ii, 17, 18.) Paul seems quite to harmonise with this in what he says to the Corinthian brethren concern-

ing resurrection from the grave, and the change to follow in the case of those found worthy of it. "We," says the Apostle, "shall not all sleep." Now is it not plain that Paul here had in his mind, the fact that some of the same faith as those to whom he wrote, would be alive at the coming of the Lord? "But," says he, "we shall ALL be changed.—(ch. xv, 52.) There is no difficulty in perceiving that the first "we," and the last "we" comprehend both dead and living. As he said to Timothy; "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 Ti., 4, 1.)

The change is predicated of the body. Certainly not of the *dead* body, for how could a dead body be judged, and nothing can be found to support the idea that change is prior to judgment. "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal."—(Matt. xxv. 46.) Read the whole chapter. How has this arrangement been made? by judgment, and by such a method as gave every man a chance to answer for himself, so that by his own words he was judged. All this is impossible in relation to bodies without life. Besides, it is not straining anything to point out that the Corinthian element of the "we," cannot be said at all to exist. They must, centuries ago, have gone to dust again, and whatever is in store for them, their re-formation is the indispensable pre-requisite. As sons of

Adam, they were dust of his dust. As concerning the transgression, they have returned to the dust from whence they were taken. Can God judge dust? Will He hold converse with the clay of the pit? Can that dust or clay be properly called "the dead?" Are those imaginable particles the dead who are to be judged along with the quick? Surely everybody will answer in the negative. How then are the dead to be judged? By reproducing them, for in no other way can it be. But suppose no more were done than to reproduce the dead, could they be judged then? that is to say, could reward or punishment be carried out in them, who were but formations of earth, like Adam before God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life? Certainly not. They must therefore stand forth as living souls, or soul-bodies. To assign judgment to any other epoch than that of the coming forth from the graves, is to flatly contradict Paul's words to Timothy, for says he, "the Lord Jesus shall judge the quick and the *dead* AT HIS APPEARING AND KINGDOM." It is worse than idle after this to talk of the dead being judged in this life.

If, by "touch me not," Jesus would not permit contact with Mary, there must have been a reason for avoiding that contact before the change or ascent to his Father. What this reason was, I should not like to say dogmatically. Has it any connection with the Mosaic law concerning the clean and the unclean? Z.

## THE POLITICAL HEAVENS AND THE SIGNS THEREOF.

THE darkness and sultry oppressiveness which have for months prevailed in the political aerial, deepen in intensity at every moment. "Pacific assurances" are bandied from one capital to another, but war preparations are on the increase, and public apprehension grows more wide-spread and acute; an outbreak cannot long be delayed, if it has not already commenced. Spain is convulsed with revolution which threatens to gain the mastery, and the programme of the revolutionists is one that is calculated to strike terror into the hearts of kings. It is not simply the removal of an obnoxious dynasty, but the establishment of democracy that the insurgents aim at; and in this object they are supported by

a great portion of the army and navy, who have risen in insurrection under the leadership of the suspected generals who were awhile ago banished the country, but have now returned from exile. Past history has illustrated the contagiousness of a successful revolution; and who can tell what may befall Europe in the present inflammable state of the popular mind, should democracy succeed in Spain?

For the general situation of affairs, we refer our readers to the following newspaper extracts, from which they will discern political and military fermentation tending to that general strife of nations, which will inaugurate the war of that great day of God

Almighty, which will shatter the world to pieces, and establish the kingdom of God,—that great desideratum of this afflicted planet, when the righteous and infallible despotism of Jesus Christ will administer universal power in the supreme interests of God and man, and bless the world with peace and happiness, such as it never has known since the disobedience of Adam.

#### THE CRY of "PEACE, PEACE."

"The more sovereigns and ministers talk of peace, the less their people believe them. Even the French Emperor's latest device, that of holding his tongue, will fail to inspire confidence. In taciturnity the Bourse will perceive a more dreadful symptom than even in the fulness of speech. From whatever cause it arises, there can be no doubt of the fact that particularly in France, the public mind is deeply impressed with a sense of apprehension which nothing serves to remove. This condition of affairs is forcibly and accurately summed up by the *Semaine Financiere*, a Paris journal which corresponds very much in weight and character with the London *Economist*. "On the one hand," says the French writer, "every government in Europe multiplies pacific assurances in the columns of the most influential organs each can command. On the other hand the public, whose most ardent wish is for the maintenance of peace, as well as its most pressing requirements, persists in its incurable distrust in a dread of the future, and in the belief that the gravest complications are close at hand. It is impossible to deny the existence of this curious basis of the public mind, and equally impossible not to note its bad effects on the financial market, and its far more serious consequences as regards trade and manufactures, which suffer from a paralysis in all their branches."

"The worst feature of the state of mind above described, is that it tends to bring about the evils it anticipates. Although it is probably too much to say that France is actually drifting towards war, it cannot be denied that the general uneasiness, as indicated in monetary fluctuations, and in the warlike tone of certain journals, prepares the way for war. Yet, when we endeavour to analyse the causes of this distrust, they elude the quickest grasp, and defy the most searching enquiry. If, as is no doubt the case, suspicion points towards Prussia, there seems no tangible grounds for alarm, when the attitude of Prussia comes to be examined. Prussia, indeed, has quite enough to do to consolidate her power in Germany; and this labour leaves neither leisure nor desire for a conflict with France.

"The truth would seem to be that France has nothing to dread from her neighbours, and that any danger of war, if such danger

really exist, must proceed from herself. The enormous army which is maintained by the Imperial Government in itself constitutes a fertile source of alarm. Having created an instrument of such magnitude so perfectly fitted for aggression, and so difficult to be kept in order without use, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the Emperor may be inclined to use it. This, we suspect, is what the French journals really mean by their warlike articles; and this apprehension would account for the feverish uneasiness which seems to have fixed itself in the public mind. It is in political and dynastic considerations, arising mainly if not entirely in France, that the real cause of danger is to be sought for; and here, it must be admitted, there is ground of alarm. Recent elections, resulting in government defeats, are known to have irritated the Imperial circle, if not the Emperor himself; and other events of the same nature are believed to be impending. It may happen that with the view of recovering *prestige* at home, the Emperor will seek for "glory" abroad. This was the policy of his uncle; and this is known to be his own cherished idea. The danger is that with ampler means of making war than he has ever possessed, the ante-dynastic movement beginning again to make themselves visible in France, may drive him to take the field. As yet, however, there is no positive sign of such a disposition. The future is not only dark, but impenetrable. In the meantime, however, we have the fact of alarmed expectation filling the minds of all classes of society, and echoed constantly in the journals. If this continues and increases, it may happen that to escape the paralysis of suspense, France may really come to desire war as a relief. In that case, there can be little doubt of the issue: the moment France presses him in earnest, Napoleon must give the signal that will set Europe in flames."—*Birmingham Daily Post*, September 15.

#### RUMOURS OF WAR.

Another piece of intelligence, which will not pass without causing just emotion in those who are concerned by the present state of diplomatic relations and armaments in Europe—Russia is *echeloning* on the line of the Pruth, so celebrated in the history of the complications in the East, a corps of 40,000 horse. Behind these regiments of the advanced guard, are doubtless ranged 300,000 infantry, ready to renew at the first signal from St. Petersburg the redoubtable adventure of 1854. Turkey, anxious about this display of forces, is massing in her turn, a nucleus of troops of 35,000 men in the environs of Schumla. We see in this again manifested that disposition to take up arms, in a sudden manner and without any known cause, which is the deepest cause of the disturbances in our time. We do not know whether we are on the eve of some great war of which the

East will be the pretext, and of which it will give the signal. Such as it is, however, this incident appears to us to be very consistent with the character of the general situation. One may say that there is not a diplomatic path in Europe where one does not tread on explosive matter. People are astonished that public opinion is alarmed. How, on the contrary, could it not be? what man of sense could take the present situation for one of peace, in which liberty can develop itself and labour prosper. Take any time of our history during the last fifty years. Place in it one only of the incidents which are grouped together to form the present state of Europe, and consider what impression would formerly have been produced. Suppose that, thirty years ago, in 1838, we had been told—The Prussians have driven out the Hessians from Mayence, and they are accumulating works of defence and ammunition in that fortress; or, the Russians are filling Bessarabia with troops and seem to be forming corps of invasion on the line of the Pruth. What would the excitement of the public have been! How lively would have been the sense of peril! And now the position of Europe is so disturbed that all these things exist together; and to suit the optimists, we are not to feel alarm.—*La Presse*, April 26.

#### WAR PREPARATIONS.

The *Camarade*, an Austrian military organ, contains an article on the *warlike preparations of the surrounding powers*, from which it draws the conclusion that a large increase in the army of Austria is a matter of necessity. It gives the following as the military strength of the States "from whose attacks Austria may be called on to defend herself." The Confederation of North Germany 843,000; Landwehr, 185,000—total, 1,028,000, Southern German States permanent army, 157,000; Landwehr, 43,000—total, 200,000; giving a total force to Prussia, in consequence of her alliance with the South German States, of 1,228,000. France, regular army, 800,000; National Garde Mobile, 550,000—total, 1,350,000. Russia, regular army, 827,000; localised troops, 410,000; irregulars, 220,000—total, 1,466,000. Italy, regular army, 348,000; National Garde Mobile, without reckoning the Venetian Province, 132,000—total, 480,000. "From these figures," argues the *Camarade*, "Austria ought to have a minimum military force of 800,000; on the military frontiers, 53,000; Landwehr, 200,000 total, 1,053,000. Austria cannot have less than this number of men under arms if she desires to remain a great Power, to preserve peace, or, in case of need, to repel attack." *Express*, May 2.

#### FORTIFICATIONS AND FEARS AT ROME.

The fortifications of Rome are being pushed on with increased expedition. A fort is now

commenced on Monte Parioli, opposite the Pincio; another is advancing on Monte Mario; and a *tete de pont* is constructing at Ponte Mole, the ancient Pons Milvius on the Tiber. The Aventine is also being fortified, and the ancient cloister of St. Sabine, belonging to the order of the Dominicans, is converted into a barrack. The road up the hill is closed to the public, and the other night the sentinel was shot at, but fortunately without effect. The police have failed to discover the assassin. Large siege guns continue to arrive at Civita Vecchia from Toulon, and a fortification is no sooner completed than it is furnished with a heavy armament. The French corps of occupation has been reinforced, and is now supplied with every requisite for taking the field. The Pope, whether from these manifestations, or from private information, is firmly convinced that we are on the eve of a great war; and the other day he deplored to a great personage the bloodshed that would attend it. At the same time, he believes that the result will be very advantageous to the Papacy and the temporal power; which is by no means the opinion of Cardinal Antonelli, who dreads the future.

The Pope has communicated to Count de Sartiges his determination to admit to the Œcumenical Council a representative from the Emperor Napoleon, independently of any decision he may come to respecting the other Catholic Sovereigns. The Ambassador, who was a little out of heart, has been cheered by this success, considering it an evidence that he is again in the good graces of the Vatican. With respect to the other Sovereigns, Cardinal Antonelli remarked, "who can assure us that the kings now reigning will be on their thrones at the end of 1869?" Rome is as full of rumours of plots as before the insurrection of October. The police have seized several chests of arms, which were being surreptitiously brought into the city, and have arrested a number of suspected persons. Many Italians have been ordered across the frontier, and as many Romans have voluntarily emigrated, in order to form themselves into free corps. Others have established a rendezvous for drill in lonely spots near the city, and a few nights ago, a party at the tomb of the Brothers Caioli, on Monte Parioli, were surprised by the police and taken to prison.—*Manchester Guardian*, August 6th.

#### THE EASTERN QUESTION.

The news from the East is anything but satisfactory. Turkey is not content with fortifying Varna and sending troops to the confines of Servia and Montenegro; she is likewise organising a Mussulman landwehr. In the frontier provinces all Mussulmans able to bear arms have received orders to be prepared to assemble when called upon. Their number will amount to about 15,000—

all horsemen. These measures will produce a certain effect, if the insurrection does not break out at several points at the same moment, but they are also attended with grave dangers. Once armed and enrolled, will not these irregular soldiers commit excesses from which even the regular troops do not always abstain? and may not these excesses kindle the explosion which is apprehended by all Europe.—*Avenir National*, (quoted in *Express*, May 7.)

Never, perhaps," says a letter from Constantinople, in the *North Eastern Correspondence*, "was the situation of the Ottoman Empire so grave. A fresh invasion far more serious than the last, is in preparation. Along the left bank of the Danube, from Galatz to Belgrade, the formation of new bands is going on openly. Volunteers are arriving in numbers, and arms are being sent across the Russian frontier and Roumania in abundance. Russian officers are directing the movement. The whole of European Turkey is covered with a network of intrigues and conspiracies, of which the Russian consuls are the promoters.—*Birmingham Daily Post*, September 15.

THE PRINCIPALITIES.—From the East it is reported that the Turks were preparing to cross the Danube, in order to enter the Principalities, and it is further stated that orders have been issued from Paris to the commander of the French squadron in the Levant, to support Turkey against the attack. Both these rumours want confirmation, but the fact of their existence is evidence of a very critical state of affairs in that quarter of Europe.—*Express*, September 21.

TURKISH PREPARATIONS.—A letter from Nisch, a town in the Servo-Bulgarian frontier, says: The Porte is assembling in all haste the nizams and redifs, and sending them forward to the Servian frontier. The heights that command Nisch are being armed with cannon. The troops are concentrating in the camp near Viniki, not far from Kamiowitz. Four powder wagons have arrived here. The redifs say that more troops are coming from Sophia. It is difficult to say what is the object of all this, for no danger threatens the Porte on the part of Servia.

TURKEY AND PERSIA.—The *Liberte* in its latest intelligence gives the following: We learn from a good source that England is, at the present moment, making every effort to effect a reconciliation between Persia and Turkey. On the other hand, Russia is endeavouring to embroil them more and more, and there is every reason for believing that war has become inevitable between the Persians and the Turks.—*Express*, April 29th.

#### THE INSURRECTION IN CRETE.

On returning to Syria, after a whole year of changes and changes—after the French Exhibition and the Abyssinian war, and

President Johnson's trial has been begun and brought to a close—I find just such news from Crete as I found here on my former visit. There is fighting in Sphakia and fighting about Heracleon. The Turks assert that they are soon going to make an end of it—so they said last year; and the Christians still hope that Europe will pity them and save them. It is well nigh a year since Omar Pacha was reported to have conquered the island, and to-day we are told of fresh successes gained by Sawas Pacha. It may be that Turkish financiers are weary of so much success, and will persuade their master to withdraw, with flying colours, from that troublesome field of fame. If they should not so persuade their masters, the financiers will have to prepare for yet further outlay, as it seems certain that the Cretans can defend themselves for a good while to come. Although somewhat crippled in the extreme west of the island, the insurrection is very strong in the central districts, and has a secure footing in the eastern districts, where a year ago, it was only beginning to be felt. These two years of war in Crete have cost Turkey about forty thousand of her best troops, and she has at present a much weaker army of occupation than obeyed the orders of Omar Pacha last summer. There are probably less than 30,000 men at present disposable, which will explain the cautious strategy and slow progress of the block-houses in Sphakia.—*Correspondent in Daily News*, July 7.

The Turks of Rhythymno have sustained a severe check in their advance upon the province of Amari. \* \* \* The effect of this victory will be out of all proportion to the number of Turks killed and wounded. It has given fresh vigour to the insurgent cause, and has shown to the provinces east and west of Amari that the Amariotes are no less resolved to defend themselves than are their neighbours. Whether the Pacha of Rhythymno, who has the name of an active commander, will sally out a second time to retrieve the disaster of Monday last, we cannot tell. It is rumoured that he has been reinforced, and that he has vowed to punish the Amariotes. But as everything is ready for defence, the country roused, and the Cretan posts watchful, there is not much danger to be feared for the moment.—*Correspondent in Daily News*, Sep. 14.

#### RUSSIAN ARMAMENTS & ADVANCES.

According to the *Invalide Russe*, Russia is showing her anxiety for the preservation of peace by her activity in making preparations for war. In its issue of April 24, we find the following:—We have before us the report of the work done in the arsenal of St. Petersburg for the year 1867. The activity displayed is four-fold more than in preceding years. In the course of 1867 the arsenal has cast 350 4lb. cannon of the new pattern, and about 100 of the 9lb. calibre cannon. It has more-



over converted 100 old guns of 12lbs. each, into rifled breech loaders for the defence of fortresses. This extraordinary activity has not prevented the improvement and construction of brass guns of large calibre. Besides the artillery arsenal at St. Petersburg, there exists a foundry at Bransk, in which workmen have been employed night and day during 1867.—*Express*, April 30.

A Russian pamphlet on the revolutionary agitation in Turkey, bearing the significant motto, "O Russia, one step more, and the whole world is yours!" has lately been published at St. Petersburg. It says that the Bulgarian revolutionary committee has been for two years in existence, that its headquarters are in countries inaccessible to the Turkish authorities, and that the central committee consists exclusively of Bulgarians and South Slavonians, who are scattered in every branch of society, and even of the administration. The branch committees, it adds, which chiefly exist in Bulgaria itself, are very numerous, and the patriotism and discretion of their members is such that not one of them has been discovered by the Government, although it has used every means to ascertain their whereabouts. The pamphlet concludes by hinting that this organization is devoted to Russia, that it is sufficiently powerful to raise all Bulgaria in insurrection at twenty-four hours' notice, and that so effective an instrument would be of the greatest service to Russia in case of a war in the East.—*Pall Mall Gazette*, May 13th.

The Vienna correspondent of the *Liberte* mentions that information has been received in Vienna, announcing the formation of three enormous camps of Russian troops. The first of these will be in the neighbourhood of St. Petersburg, the second near Warsaw,

and the third on the plains of the Pruth. Count Berg will command the second of these armies, and the Grand Duke Constantine the third.—*Express*, May 1.

The Emir of Bokhara, Muzaffar-ed-din, is dead. Such is the report which a telegram, dated September 10th, conveys to us from St. Petersburg, and as there is no doubt about the authenticity of the news, I shall be amply justified in commenting upon this most eventful accident, an accident which will certainly cause essential changes in Central Asiatic politics, particularly in the relations of England and of her Indian possessions, towards Russia. \* \* \*

Whether illness or poison put an end to his life has not yet been ascertained, although I am much inclined to believe the latter. According to the telegraphic despatch, he is to be succeeded by his son, a lad scarcely 16 years old, who lived with a relative of the Emir in Shehri-Seby; and as there was, even in the lifetime of his father, much talk in Russian papers about that son being supplanted by the discontented Bokhariots, or rather by Russian influence, we may take it as granted that the young prince will have a Russian tutor. All further conquests will be for a while suspended, and the court of St. Petersburg is very likely to obtain in this way advantages which she could never have gained by warfare. In consequence of the death of the Emir, Russia will turn her hostile attitude towards the Khanates into a friendly one, and should she gain a firm footing on the right bank of the Oxus, not as an invading enemy, but as a protecting neighbour, her position as regards Afghanistan and British India will be a most formidable one.—*Correspondent of Daily News*, Sep. 14th.

## INTELLIGENCE.

BIRMINGHAM.—There have been four immersions since the last record. Two were specially interesting as the direct results of the Sunday School, which has now been in operation about twelve months. These were two girls, daughters of those already in the faith, viz., EMILY BAILEY (17), daughter of brother Bailey, and MARY ANN LEA (16), daughter of sister Smith, by a former marriage. Their desire towards obedience is of some standing, and as time seemed to prove its genuineness, and examination made manifest the requisite intelligence in things divine, their wishes were complied with, and their names added to the list of those who in Birmingham have begun the race for the prize of the high calling. The third case of obedience was that of FREDERICK MARLER LESTER (22), belonging to Leicester. He

has come to a knowledge of the truth through his cousin brother Hipwell, of Birmingham, and will, with brother Buckler, (railway guard, hailing from the same place, immersed some time back) form the nucleus of an ecclesia in Leicester. He is a young man of some education and moral energy, and will probably turn the talent committed to his hands, in the shape of truth, to good account. A few weeks back, an anonymous pamphlet, bearing the title "*Are these things so?*" written against the truth, was distributed at the door by two strangers, as the Sunday evening audience was dispersing. Doubtless, it was an act of benevolent enterprise on the part of some unknown individual, and will not be without its good results; for every attempt to overthrow the truth increases agitation and

study, and the result is to settle it more firmly than ever on the immovable foundations of the apostles and prophets. An answer to the pamphlet was read by brother Henry Flint on Sunday evening, August 23rd. Our readers may hear more of it by and by.—On Monday, September 14th, an open tea meeting was held, when there was a large muster of brethren, sisters, and friends. The editor was called upon to recount proceedings during his absence for the previous five weeks and more.—Brother Skinner (of recent addition) has removed to London, where he has united with the brethren meeting in Crowndale Hall.—On Thursday, September 24, JAMES HARGOOD (26), letter carrier, formerly Wesleyan, was immersed in the presence of a number of brethren and sisters. He had previously given evidence of his apprehension of the faith once for all delivered to the saints. He belongs to Stratford-on-Avon, and came from that place for the purpose of obeying the truth.

BEITH.—Brother Gillies, writing September 25th, announces that on the 9th, ALEXANDER C. GILLESPIE, teacher, Ann Bank, Tarbolton, and ALEXANDER RAMSAY, currier, Beith, were united to the glorious Name by immersion, after making an intelligent confession of their faith in the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ. Brother Dr. Ramsay, of Galston—brother in the flesh to one of the immersed—was present on the occasion. The cause of the truth in Ayrshire receives strength by this addition. Brother Gillies, and those united with him in the faith, feel encouraged.

DEVONPORT.—Brother J. W. Moore, writing August 26th, says "The room in which we hold our meetings is in general three-fourths filled, so that we hold on to what we have attained, and have occasional droppers in. Some have attended several times, and admit that our teachings overthrow orthodoxy, and two admit that orthodoxy is altogether wrong, but from some cause, are prevented laying hold with a firm grasp of the truth as it is in Jesus. We cannot rejoice in recent additions, but we must wait patiently, leaving the result of all labours in the hands of a faithful Creator."

EDINBURGH.—Bro. Ellis writes as follows: "Your visit and lectures have given a new impetus to the truth here. On the Sunday after you left, brother Andrew, of London, lectured in the evening on "Jesus Christ considered as a prophet, or the preaching of Protestantism contrasted with the preaching of Jesus." The audience was good as to number. During his remarks brother Andrew stated that one of the main elements of the preaching of Jesus was totally wanting in the preaching of the day, viz., the "gospel of the kingdom of God." At the

close, a gentleman asked permission either to reply then to this point, or the privilege of the hall on a Sunday evening. To neither of these results could we agree, but proposed to discuss the point any week evening. This being agreed to, and the hall engaged for the Tuesday week following, the enclosed advertisement, from the *Scotsman*, indicated the point of discussion:

"PUBLIC DISCUSSION as to whether the teaching of the Protestant religion is in accordance with the religion of Christ, as the result of a lecture delivered on Sunday, September 13th, by Mr. Andrew, of London, in Cockburn Street Hall. The subject will be publicly debated this (Tuesday) evening, at 8.15, in the same place, by Mr. W. Danks, on behalf of the Protestants, and Mr. Charles Smith, as representative of the Chriptadelphian faith. The chair will be occupied by Mr. John Richardson. Admission, 2d., to defray expenses."

By the time of meeting, the hall was pretty well filled, and before it closed, a seat could scarce be had. The order of debate was half an hour to each for the opening speeches, and ten minutes each after. Mr. Danks, after some preliminary remarks, made his strong position on Luke xvii, 21: "the kingdom of God is within you." He contended from this, that the kingdom of God was in every man, believer or unbeliever, and that the unbelievers were so many revolted provinces. That the question of the Pharisees was prompted by the popular mistaken notion of a temporal kingdom, and that the answer of Jesus was to the effect that the kingdom of God was existing already and within them. The gospel he defined as God's message of salvation, and that the reason of the word kingdom being joined to the word gospel, was that it defined the condition of those who received the message: the kingdom was then in their hearts. He quoted Peter's sermon on Pentecost as a model, and contended that it contained no reference to the kingdom. Here he stated that there was nothing in the gospel of the kingdom as contended for by Mr. Andrew, to meet the wants of man, or give rest to a poor sinner. He next quoted certain passages to prove that the kingdom of God was already in existence. These were Mark ix, 1: "There be some standing here who shall not taste of death till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." From this he argued that as these persons were not living now, the kingdom of God must have come long ago. Matt. xi, 11: "He that is least in the kingdom of God is greater than John the Baptist." This he stated received its fulfilment at the commencement of the christian dispensation. Matt. xii, 27, 28, and Mark xii, 34, were quoted to the same effect. Romans xiv, 17, was used to prove that wherever righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit

existed, there the kingdom of God had come in power.

Brother Smith, instead of taking up the particular passages quoted by Mr. Danks, entered into a full demonstration that the gospel of the kingdom of God was preached and defined as the gospel when the disciples were prohibited from telling that Jesus was the Messiah, and while they personally did not understand that he was to die; and that, consequently, the main element of Protestant preaching contended for by Mr. Danks, could not have formed an element of the gospel during the preaching of Jesus. He next identified the promises of the prophets with the preaching of Jesus and the apostles by numerous quotations from both, shewing that whatever those particular passages quoted by Mr. Danks meant, they could not set aside the fact that the kingdom of God is yet a matter of promise and matter of hope; that believers of the gospel are not invited to be subjects, but heirs of the kingdom which is not to be temporal, but to last as the days of heaven before the Deity (Deut. xi, 21; Jer. xxxiii, 25, 26); that it is to destroy all other kingdoms, and to stand for ever.—(Dan. ii, 44, and vii, 14, 26, 27.) Brother Smith then referred to the model sermon of Peter as Mr. Danks defined it, and shewed that so far from it not referring to the kingdom, Peter had demonstrated therein that Jesus was now made both Lord and Christ of that kingdom; and that the incident of the healing of the lame man at the Beautiful Gate, called forth the clearest statement on record that Jesus Christ shall return to establish his kingdom as the prophets have foretold.

"Time" being called, Mr. Danks added nothing to his former positions, but complained that Mr. Smith had not met them; that as to there being a kingdom to come, he had no fixed opinion; it might or might not be; but that future kingdom, whatever it might be, had no connection whatever with the gospel of Christ. Brother Smith shewed the fallacy of this position by referring to the fact that the gospel was preached to Abraham (Gal. iii, 8), and that of necessity, a promise must precede its confirmation; and as the death of the Christ constituted the confirmation of the things covenanted, and also a covering for the sins of those who believed the promises; that now the death of the Christ for the putting away of sin and the ratifying of these promises must be preached as an integral part of the gospel, and that as Protestantism ignored these promises relating to the kingdom of God, it was utterly defective, and its proclamation of the death of Christ was a meaningless and pointless exhibition of things true in themselves; but that on account of this sad defect, could never benefit those who supposed they believed them.

At this stage, the chairman was in the act

of calling upon the audience for their verdict—who by the way conducted themselves in a very orderly manner—when one asked brother Smith whether he had intentionally omitted to refer, in any of his replies, to the passage in Luke xvii, 21, and considered by Mr. Danks as unanswerable. He replied that it was an unintentional omission. It was, therefore, proposed and agreed to that Mr. Smith be allowed time to refer to this one passage, and Mr. Danks equal time to reply. Brother Smith's remarks were to the effect that it was a coming of the kingdom still future, to which the question referred, but that the answer of Jesus was that he and his disciples, as the nucleus of the future kingdom, were then present among them. In illustration, he quoted two or three instances where the word king and kingdom were interchangeable, and one where kingdom is put for king.—(Mark xi, 10.) The reply of Mr. Danks was that he could not admit as evidence what brother Smith adduced, and that his position was still not overturned. The chairman then called for the audience to signify, by a show of hands, which of the two had, in their judgment, spoken most in accordance with the scriptures. The show of hands being taken, he declared himself unable to say which had most, and as some demurred to the proceedings as in bad taste, they were not counted.—I think I state the truth when I say that the impression was general, that although the particular passages quoted by Mr. Danks were not referred to, that his position was demonstrated to be perfectly untenable: indeed this seemed to be his own conviction from the admissions he made regarding the kingdom to come. Whichever way, the truth has had prominence given to it more than it had before, and, I have no doubt, that some will be induced to enquire more fully into what the scriptures do teach, and I therein will rejoice.—WILLIAM ELLIS.

GRANTHAM.—Brother Joseph Wootton writes from this place as follows:—"According to promise, I now forward account of my endeavours to set forth the truth. For eighteen months I had been revolving in my mind how I could do this, when I determined to invite a few persons to my house, urging them to hear what the Bible taught concerning salvation. The time I commenced was the first Sunday in the year, and the subjects spoken upon as follow:—Jan. 5th, The Kingdom of God; 19th, The King; 26th, The Aristocracy; Feb. 2nd, The Restoration of Israel; 11th, Eternal Life; 20th, The Mortality of Man; March 5th, Reward and Punishment; 10th, The Mystery of Iniquity; 17th and 24th, Discussion on the Immortality of the Soul; April 7th, Repentance and Baptism; May 19th, Review: Objections stated and

answered. The attendance upon the sixth lecture was good, and comprised representatives of different faiths, and some Wesleyans among the rest. My views having got ventilated, I was favoured with more of the Methodistic class, and, upon giving the eighth lecture, a young man, who had been educated for the Wesleyan ministry, took exception to my views, professing to be a Hebrew scholar. The result was the discussion upon the immortality of the soul. As it may be interesting to you or your readers, I give you a few of the arguments used on both sides.

*Methodist* :—God said let us make man in our image.—(Gen. 1, 26.) Man then is in the image of God. God is a spirit, and a spirit hath not flesh and bones, therefore, man in his bodily structure, is not in the image of God; therefore, it is his spirit that is in that image.

*Christadelphian* :—Genesis ix, 6 : Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made He him. The man who bore the image of God was a being having blood in him. A few weeks previously, I had received a letter from an avowed infidel, wherein he uses the same argument, viz., God is a spirit; a spirit hath not flesh and bones, therefore, God is no body. Such an argument becomes an infidel, but is not worthy of a professing Christian. My friend does not understand a scriptural spirit; he thinks that a spirit which Professor Pepper has demonstrated to be a thing only of the imagination, capable of creeping through keyholes, and getting through chinks in shutters; but it is not so. Jesus says "a spirit—a phantom such as the apostles supposed they saw—hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." Jesus had flesh and bones, and Paul says of Jesus that he is "the Lord the spirit." The spirit of the Bible is, therefore, different from the "spirit" of orthodoxy.

*Methodist* :—In the account of Elijah raising the widow's son, it says (1 Kings, xvii, 22) "the child's soul came back into him."

*Christadelphian* :—His breath came back; if not, he was alive without breath; his life came back; if not, he was alive without life. In verse 17, it says his breath went out of him, in verse 22, his soul came back; would it not be more logical, in this instance at least, to say breath and soul are interchangeable terms? We learn from this narrative that the immortal soul—supposing it is immortal—is a very useless thing. The widow wanted her son back; why not quietly bury the body and call the immortal soul back to live with its mother? who would then have her real son again; and her flour and oil would have lasted longer, for the immortal soul would not have required

such earthly stuff. But no; the widow did not believe in the immortal soul; she wanted the mortal body restored to life.

*Methodist* adduces Eccle. xii, 7: "The dust returns to the earth as it was, and the spirit to God who gave it."

*Christadelphian* never denied that the dust returned to the ground, or the spirit to God who gave it, but denied that the spirit is immortal. *Methodist* thought it immortal because it came from and returns to God, but that does not follow. In Acts xvii, 25, we read "God gives to all life, breath, and all things." Job xxxiv, 14, 15, we read "that if He takes away His spirit and breath, all flesh will perish together." Did *Methodist* suppose *all flesh* had immortal spirits? He shifted his ground. This is a discussion on the immortality of the soul, and he has tried to prove the spirit immortal; he feels the weakness of his position, for he has now shifted to spirit. If he plays see-saw after this fashion, he may prove too much; for man is composed of body, soul, and spirit; and if spirit is immortal and soul is immortal, he has two immortal somethings in him. After a good deal on Lazarus and Dives, the thief on the cross, &c., I said it was remarkable that all the persons recorded as having gone to heaven should have gone bodily; my opponent replied, one went in each dispensation to show to the righteous then living that there was a heaven for them. I asked how it was they didn't do the same now? he replied it would be necessary now to convince such as me. I thanked him for the compliment in making the righteous such as me.

At present, I regret to say, my views do not meet with much approval, Methodism and other isms rule undisputed here; nevertheless, I don't intend letting the matter drop; hoping that after many days, the bread cast upon the waters may be seen to the eternal advantage of some.

LEICESTER.—See Birmingham intelligence. Brother Lester will have the occasional company of brother Buckler (also a resident in Leicester), who was immersed some weeks ago. May they prove but the nucleus of a devoted ecclesia, which shall be a witness for the truth in the neighbourhood, whose testimony shall not be without result in the great work of separating from the Gentiles a people for the name of the Lord.

MUMBLES.—Brother D. Clement announces two additions, one on Tuesday, June 30th, (Mrs. WINSTONE, wife of brother Winstone), and another on Tuesday, Aug. 4, (ELIZABETH JENKINS), both of whom were obedient in the appointed manner, after giving evidence of their apprehension of the one faith and hope of the gospel.

NOTTINGHAM.—Brother Phelps reports the obedience of GEORGE WYLES, (40.) framework-knitter, previously neutral in religious matters. He was immersed on

Saturday, Aug. 8th, at the Nottingham Public Baths, after confessing his faith in Christ. The ecclesia now numbers forty-two brethren and sisters.—During the month of September, there was another addition by immersion in the person of LOUISA OVERTON, wife of brother Overton, formerly Primitive Methodist.

STRATFORD-ON-AVON.—See Birmingham intelligence. Brother Habgood is the beginning of the truth in this place. May he soon be joined by such as shall be saved.

TRANENT.—“The brethren in this place have shared with other ecclesias the holiday labours of brother Roberts, who was accompanied by brother Hipwell of Birmingham. Our only regret is that his stay was limited to so short a time—three days. During that time he delivered three lectures as follows:

1st—The Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul—Is it of Heaven or of Men?

2nd—The Doctrine of the resurrection of the Dead and Eternal Judgment, scripturally considered in relation to the time, nature and extent of their application.

3rd—The Doctrine of the Trinity, proved from the scriptures to be idolatry.

The announcement of such subjects naturally caused some alarm, and many were prepared to come forth and do battle against the lectures. They found it, however, the better part of valour to refrain from firing a shot while the lecturer was present. They are now firing their blank cartridge by way of “review.” The lectures gave no uncertain sound, and we have reason to believe that they will not be without result. We have also to record with pleasure, that brother Charles Smith, of Edinburgh, was with us on the following Sunday, and delivered two lectures as follows:

1st—“The Faith once delivered to the Saints proved from the scriptures, to be the faith held by the Christadelphians,”—of whom thirty were present at the breaking of bread.

2nd—The Kingdom of God and the Kingdom of Men.

The attendance at all the lectures was very good. The truth is making progress, notwithstanding the opposition which it meets on every hand.—T. CORNWALL.

WHITBY.—The month of July witnessed the rare phenomenon of a Quakerish onslaught on the truth. The nature and bearing of it will be apparent from the following advertisement which appeared in the *Whitby Gazette*, of July 4th:—

“A PRESENT CHRIST, in contradistinction to the doctrine of a FUTURE CHRIST, as taught by the Christadelphians. A Paper on the above-named subject will be read by a member of the Society of Friends, in the Reading Room of the Mechanics’ Institute, Church Sreet, on Thursday Evening, the 9th instant. To commence at Eight o’clock. No religious services connected with the lecture, which

will be given on the responsibility of the writer only. Christians of all denominations are specially invited. A lengthy “syllabus,” for which we have no space, accompanied the advertisement.”

Brother Shuttleworth writes in reference to the matter as follows:—“During the middle of this week, we have been called upon to take up the defensive on behalf of the ancient faith, assailed in a paper read last week by a member of the Society of Friends. The paper was entitled ‘A PRESENT CHRIST in contradistinction to the doctrine of a FUTURE CHRIST, as taught by Christadelphians,’ purporting to have been suggested by your lectures here at the beginning of the year. The title of your Rejoinder to the ‘Rev.’ Barnett came in admirably to head some large placards, which were issued by an interested outsider, to advertise our reply. We had a rare muster. The ‘friend’ was kind enough to lend me his paper, so I wrote my reply, and read it. Several ‘ministers’ were present. It is not unusual during the visiting season for us to have such among our hearers. We have also been favored with visits from brethren Cheetham, Smith, and Taylor, from Halifax and neighbourhood.”

Brother Shuttleworth further writes:—“During the month, we have had a refreshing visit from brother and sister Hayes. Our good brother permitted us to announce him to appear before the public during the second and third weeks of his stay. He lectured upon the gospel, baptism, immortality, and future punishment, besides speaking for the edification of the ecclesia. His officiation in this way gave me an opportunity of fulfilling a promised visit to Scarborough, where I lectured twice on the sands, and twice in the Temperance Hall. Our meetings occupied about three hours each time, and were well attended on each occasion.” Bro. Shuttleworth’s reply has been forwarded to us in M.S., and will appear in the *Ambassador*.

#### JOHN BOWES AT WISHAW.

#### DISCUSSION INVITED, PROPOSED AND DECLINED.

On the publication of the report of Mr. Bowes’ anti-Christadelphian proceedings at Wishaw, which appeared in the *Ambassador* for June last, Mr. Bowes’ friends were troubled at the sorry figure which that gentleman made therein, as an assailant, who was very noisy and confident when his foe was tied hand and foot, but who made off with a scamper when it was proposed to try the matter at issue in an equal encounter. They accordingly wrote him on the subject, and he replied that he could not help what the opponents of his

views had said. The meeting had decided that the proposed defenders of the truth were incompetent; this was the reason for declining the debate, a thing so unusual with John Bowes, but should the Christadelphians bring forward "a competent man," he should gladly meet him. Brother Hodgson, on seeing the letter in which this was stated, wrote to the Editor, and obtained his sanction to a challenge. The following is the correspondence, which will speak for itself.

*Letter from J. Bowes to R. Walkingshaw.*

Westfield House, Dundee, July 3rd, 1868.

Dear Sir.—I cannot help what the opponents of my views say; the audience declared Messrs. Smith and Ellis incompetent. Should they bring forward a competent man, I should gladly meet him. I did them on the whole as questions including the immortality of man. JOHN BOWES.

Wishaw, July 11th, 1868.

Dear Sir.—Having seen your letter of the 3rd instant to Mr. Walkingshaw, of Slamanan, in which you state you will gladly meet any competent man we may bring forward, I communicated the matter to Mr. Roberts, of Birmingham, and asked him if he would meet you here for discussion, and he has expressed his willingness to do so. I, therefore, by his authority, send you a challenge to meet him in Wishaw, for the discussion of those questions which formed the subject of your lectures in this place, on the 10th, 11th, and 12th of May last. Should you accept of this challenge, arrangements can be commenced as soon as you please. Perhaps you will be so kind as appoint one or more of your friends in this place to act along with us, in procuring a suitable place, and Mr. Roberts and yourself can arrange the preliminaries of debate. Awaiting your reply, I am, Sir, yours truly, R. HODGSON.

Westfield House, Dundee, July 17th, 1868.

Dear Sir.—I received yours of the 11th; consulted my friends in Wishaw, and, after your *untruthful* account of my lectures and the discussions, as given in Mr. Roberts' monthly magazine, they decline, at present, to have anything to do with any more discussion, being satisfied with past results, in which I also fully concur, without giving our opinion about competency. Yours, &c., JOHN BOWES.

Wishaw, July 22nd, 1868.

Dear Sir.—Yours of the 17th instant came duly to hand, and while it is nothing more than I anticipated, I am not the less sorry that you refuse to meet Mr. Roberts in Wishaw, for public discussion. You state that my report of your lectures and discussion is *untruthful*; but as you do not condescend to particularize anything of that character, you afford me no scope either for admission or defence. Should you think proper to specify anything which you

consider *untruthful*, it shall have my attention.

Your refusal to meet Mr. Roberts appears to me to be based more on the disinclination of your Wishaw friends than your own, as you say *they* decline to have anything more to do with discussion, being satisfied with past results. If this is the only obstacle to the discussion—being satisfied with past results—it may without difficulty be got over. Although we would much prefer the discussion to take place here, where you made an unprovoked attack upon us, we are prepared to set aside personal feeling, and give you a wider choice. Mr. Roberts will meet you in any city, town, or village in Britain; this will leave the felicity of your Wishaw friends undisturbed, and, at the same time, afford you scope to confer benefits on your friends elsewhere, similar to those you say are enjoyed here.

Hoping this will meet all the requirements of the case, and induce you to give a fair and impartial public hearing to those whom you have attacked, I remain, &c., R. HODGSON.

Westfield House, Dundee, July 24th, 1868.

Dear Sir.—As to yours of the 22nd, having no providential call to what you propose, and being busy with a new translation of the New Testament, I must decline. As to your "untruthfulness," I shall take some notice of it as publicly as you gave it. Wishing you blessing, I am, &c., JOHN BOWES.

Wishaw, July 27th, 1868.

Dear Sir.—Yours of the 24th is to hand; and after all your bravado, both in Wishaw and afterwards, to Mr. Walkingshaw, of Slamanan, it is a limping termination to your boastful pretensions, and renders the whole very like sounding brass and tinkling cymbal. Under the circumstances, your "providential call" is quite unique and peculiar, and suggests a theory, the flexible principles of which are neither amusing nor edifying, yet an earlier advent of which might have put a better face on your side of our correspondence. Had you a providential call to Wishaw for the dissection of "Thomasism," and when unexpectedly challenged to a public discussion on the subject, to slip out under the plausible pretext of other engagements? Were you providentially called seven weeks after, to state to Mr. Walkingshaw, of Slamanan, that you *would gladly meet any competent man we might bring forward*, and when we have now procured one, to shy off again with a similar pretext? Were you providentially called to allege to that same gentleman, that your reason for not accepting Mr. Ellis's challenge was, that the audience voted him incompetent, when, before the audience was called to move in the matter, you had refused three different propositions to continue the discussion with us? These circumstances shew the true bearings of the

matter, and plainly prove that you have taken upon you more than you can sustain, and that a questionable policy has now to be adopted to conceal this from public view. I quite believe you are just sufficiently acquainted with what you derisively call Thomasism, to know that in fair and open combat, it affords you no scope for triumphant demonstration: hence your extreme care to avoid us, not only on the platform but also by excluding our replies from the pages of your magazine, wherein you have several times before attacked us, and I suspect the same game will be resorted to in your public notice of my error. Your ungentlemanly deportment in these matters has led me to contemplate the publication of this correspondence, and, at the same time, to bid you adieu, until your duty (which is justice) toward your neighbour is better understood, more highly appreciated, and exalted to a higher place among your principles. I am, &c., R. HODGSON.

Mr. J. BOWES, Dundee.

#### THE TRUTH IN SCOTLAND—TOUR BY BROTHER ELLIS.

Brother Ellis, by request, has written the following account of his summer tour:—

"During the end of July and the month of August, having leisure, I purposed as usual to visit brethren in various parts of Scotland, who are so located as seldom to see any of like precious faith with themselves. The village of Innerleithen, situate about thirty miles south of Edinburgh was my first place of call. Here there are four brethren and two sisters, who carry on the unequal warfare against the existing traditions. Their contentions are, for the most part, private and desultory, as they almost feel unable to attack the enemy in public. Occasional lectures have been delivered there, which have scarcely received the common courtesy of a fair hearing. On the occasion of my visit this time, a revival missionary had been preaching on a green of public resort. Some of the brethren went to hear with the object of speaking a word in favour of the truth. A remark of the preacher to the effect that if any who heard him remained impenitent they would go to hell immediately after death, caused a brother to ask the preacher how he knew such would be the case. This question led to a good deal of discussion and inquiry. The brethren thought along with me that it would be a good opportunity of getting some of the truth set before the villagers. On the Sunday evening, therefore, we repaired to the green, and began to read portions from the prophets referring to the matters of our faith and our times, and made the announcement that on the morrow evening

I should continue to point out other parts of the neglected scriptures. On the Monday evening, the audience was larger, and after reading a few portions in order to bring them together, I chose, as the centre of my remarks, the words of Jesus to Peter: "On this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." These remarks occupied fully an hour, during which with slight exceptions, the attention was very good. The closing statements that good and bad were together in hell, and would remain there until the resurrection morning, called forth a slight interruption, and a number of the stale questions about the "Thief on the Cross," Stephen committing his spirit to Jesus, &c., were asked; and these being answered, and no more proposed, the brethren and I took our departure for brother Milne's house, glad of having had the opportunity of witnessing to the truth. A goodly number of the crowd honoured us, and at the same time shewed their appreciation of the truth by hooting, yelling and casting stones and clods after us; but we received no hurt. Two in particular were convinced of the truth of some of the things spoken, and wished to enquire further, and received from the brethren the loan of books.

On the Tuesday evening, we repaired again to the same place, but did not think it wise to speak any more, because of the disposition manifested. Alas for the truth and those who advocate it, if left to the mercy of rabble, as exhibited in this small village. The brethren, like Lot, will be successful if they save themselves. From this, I journeyed partly on foot and partly by rail, to Biggar, some twenty-two miles in a westerly direction, where brother and sister Cree have been for years the solitary representatives of the truth. Although removed from the company of brethren, they keep company with the prophets and apostles, and also with those who believe their writings, by reading the various publications issued. Biggar is an agricultural village thirty-six miles from Edinburgh, which is the most accessible point for having the fellowship of the brethren; but brother Cree's occupation prevents him from having this often. They are therefore in the wilderness anxiously watching for the indications when "our God shall come, and be no more silent, but speak out, and call to the heavens and the earth, that He may judge His people, that they may declare His righteousness abroad."

From Biggar, I returned to Leith, and on Saturday, together with sister E., went to Tarvet Cottage, in the neighbourhood of Cupar, where we stayed a few days with brother and sister Smith, of Edinburgh. From Tarvet, we went to Dunkeld, where four brethren and five sisters represent the truth, by meeting almost every Sunday in a small room. Here, the Woman peeps and

mutters forth unheard, her protest against the traditions and delusions through which the devil now leads captive the unwary at his will. The brethren throughout the country act too much on the defensive and apologetic, and like Moses, say they are of slow mouth and of a slow tongue; and practically say the Deity reaps where He has not sown, and gathers where He has not strewn, instead of buckling on the armour of righteousness, on the right hand and on the left, and boldly attacking the enemy in his stronghold of imaginations, casting these down, by the demonstration of the truth, and thus commend it to the understanding of any man, and save themselves from the blood of all.

Happily, we are not left to invent the testimony, nor even to write it, but simply to remove the traditional lumber, the accumulation of ages, that it may shine into the minds of men, in all its divine and majestic grandeur, and turn them from darkness to light, from being enemies of the Deity to be His children, and to wait for the Lord from heaven.

From Dunkeld, I went to Grantown, eighty miles. Here I found brethren Grant and Gordon devoted and earnest lovers of the truth; from them and another friend of the truth who has not yet obeyed the truth, I received much kindness, but had no opportunity of publicly witnessing for the truth. From Grantown to Fetterangus, (N.E. of Aberdeen some 40 miles,) where I had arranged to spend the Sunday, was my next move. Here from one to two dozen brethren and sisters meet, every alternate first day. I spoke in the morning upon the heaven and hell of the scriptures in contrast with those of christendom. The audience was not large but most attentive; and although an opportunity was offered for questions, none took advantage of it. The subject in the evening was "Popular Traditions concerning the Devil subversive of the Gospel of Salvation." This brought out a larger audience; but, although the privilege of question was given, one only availed himself of it. While here, I saw the *Messenger of the Churches*—not that the brethren here subscribe for it; but the promoters are so anxious to lighten them with their foolishness, that they send them free of charge wherever they are likely to gain a hearing. The number for August presents the usual amount of contradictory stuff. There is J.C. who proves to a demonstration, that heresy is division or separation from the church; W.G., that separation from the church is separation from Christ; and D.L., announcing that no error in faith or knowledge justifies separation. Had J.C., W.G. and D.L. been contemporary with the apostles, and continued living till now, we should find them all three in Rome, bewailing the heretical condition they sustain to that church. The church at Rome is the lineal descendant of that which was planted by the apostles;

and as there is only one church, separation from which is death, we would earnestly exhort J.C., W.G. and D.L. to return to the bosom of the Mother Church, before it be too late, as Jesus Christ may come any day, any hour, and transport his servants to the Jerusalem above, where they shall be ever with him, during the time that the world and all that is therein, is being burned up; while they, if they continue their unreasonable state of separation, must for ever abide in death. These are the men who pretend to contend earnestly for the faith, whose contentions amount to this—that there is neither faith nor knowledge upon which you can agree, or have a right to contend for; but let us call ourselves a church, believing in and contending for, all sorts of contradictory things, and whosoever believes we are the church shall be saved; but he who believeth not, shall be condemned.

From Fetterangus, I went first to Balfaton, and spent one night with brother Clark and family, and the next day, by the invitation of brother W. Gall, visited Fraserburgh, a fishing town on the north-east corner of Aberdeenshire. Here I found several who have for some time given attention to the truth, and who wished I should deliver a lecture or two, they agreeing to defray the expenses. This request was agreed to, and a hall procured, and the information given by the town crier that a lecture would be delivered, showing the popular traditions concerning the devil to be contrary to the scriptures. The attendance was not large; one or two dozen. The second evening's lecture was announced by bills, under the general term: The Second Coming of Christ. The audience was considerably better, but still small; notwithstanding, the attention was very good, and the effort I hope will not fail to provoke enquiry on the part of some, that will end in their becoming heirs of the promised life. Brother Gall is a devoted friend of the truth; if two or three of such were to bind themselves together, and put their light on the bushel, some of the honest who are entrapped in the meshes of superstition, might be delivered.

From Fraserburgh, I next went to Cumminstown, twenty-seven miles, where reside brother and sister Reid; in the evening brother Reid accompanied me to Turriff, where resides brother Robertson, who has been the chief means of enlightening those in the outlying parts of Aberdeenshire. There are a few earnest devoted friends of the truth in Turriff, who I hope will not be deceived by the foolish sophistry of the *Messenger*, which fails to distinguish between truth and error, and unwittingly has become the advocate of the latter. Brother Robertson's wife was confined to bed, then and for several months before, a circumstance which has caused him to remain at home more than usual, and which has also reduced his means



considerably. As a community, they seemed happy and united, and devoted to the truth.

From Turriff, I booked for Aberdeen, as I purposed to call on one or two there. I do not feel toward those in Aberdeen as I used to do. As a community, I do not know them—save two or three at most. Indeed, this is true of all the churches more or less. I believe there are individuals among them, as among all the churches represented by the *Messenger*, who know the truth, but whose attachment is more to the men who believe and advocate all sorts of foolishness, than to the truth. And because they now take the *Messenger* by the hand, and say to them God speed, I cannot now say to them God speed, nor be partaker in this crusade for unity of spirit and fellowship with all sorts of doctrines and opinions. The Spirit is but another name for the Deity, and the Deity is one, and all that He has said, or caused to be written, constitutes a unity. To keep the unity of the spirit, is to keep the sayings and doings of the Deity free from the traditions and doctrines of men. Now this unity becomes a possibility when men agree to prove all things, and hold fast what is good, but utterly impossible upon the principle of ignoring all differences of doctrine, or, as expressed by D.L., "that no errors of faith or knowledge, even the denial of the resurrection, will justify exclusion from fellowship." I received much kindness from brethren Mowatt and Gill, with whom I spent the evening and night, discussing our relative positions, without producing conviction on either side. But highly as I prize them, as men and friends, I cannot recognise them as the uncompromising advocates of the truth, but the reverse, while they advocate and circulate the principles contained in the *Messenger of the Churches*.

I arrived in Edinburgh on Saturday afternoon, after an absence of five weeks.

#### UNITED STATES.

OSHKOSH, Wis.—Sister Bucklin, of this place, writes August 18, as follows:—"A few, a very few, of us in this place meet weekly at a private house to compare scripture with scripture, and to review and compare what is presented to us in the *Ambassador* and *Marturion* with the pure testimony. We find comfort and profit in so doing, but when we gather around the Master's table, but two or three, at most four participate. This makes us sad; again and again the question is discussed, what shall we do to enlist others? Many things have combined to make us of no reputation in this place, and to discourage us from presenting our cause to public scrutiny. But believing

our feet are upon the rock, and that we shall be able to stand, we have decided as soon as a public room can be obtained, to lift up our banner in the name of the Lord. Money has been appropriated for the purchase of books, but *how* shall we get them is now the question. I will give you a little of our experience in this matter." Sister Bucklin then proceeds to narrate unsuccessful attempts to procure books by application to parties in America. "Now what shall we do? We propose to have an agency of our own, to get direct from you—can we do so? If we send an order for books, how long before we may expect to hear from it? If you favour this proposition, please give us an early answer, with the information we need about sending money, &c."

[Since the reduction of American book postage to 1s. per pound or 3d. per quarter of a pound, it has become possible to send small parcels of books to any part of the United States at reasonable rates. Anyone therefore writing direct to the Editor, and enclosing sufficient money to cover the order, with postage, (and taking care to state the address exactly) will receive the books ordered within four weeks of the despatch of the order. For prices, see statement made on cover. Paper dollars may be sent. Sums above 8 dollars should (if possible) be sent in bank drafts on London, which any local bank, in any of the States, will procure from New York for intending remitters.—EDITOR.]

#### NEW ZEALAND.

OTAGO.—Brother W. W. Holmes, writes, "The *Twelve Lectures* have met with a fair amount of sale, being duly advertised in the *Dunedin Times* by brother Brown. It is to be hoped some of the seed thus sown may fall into good and honest hearts. The brethren speak of getting a place to give a course of lectures in, once a month, in Dunedin. Dunedin abounds with church buildings of all descriptions—Wesleyans, Baptists, Plymouth Brethren, and above all, Presbyterians—but the truth as yet has no place. We are now recognised as a sect that dooms all to annihilation but ourselves, and that only those believing Christadelphian doctrine may look for salvation. Many have been stirred in and around Dunedin to search the word in reference to these things."

# THE AMBASSADOR

## Of the Coming Age.

---

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

---

---

No. 53.

NOVEMBER, 1868.

Vol. V.

---

### THE NEW JERUSALEM EXPLAINED.

---

*"I will write upon him that overcomes the name of New Jerusalem, the city of my God."*—JESUS.

REFERRING to Rev. xxii, 2, 15, a correspondent inquires, "Now, provided the sin-power be destroyed, and we have all the blessings described in the first verse of the chapter before, why do we need the Tree of Life; and why are dogs, sorcerers, &c., said to be without?"

The direct answer to this is, that we have no need; and that dogs and sorcerers, do not then exist without. This answer, however, is on the hypothesis that "the sin-power is destroyed," and that "the blessings" indicated in Rev. xxi, 4, are possessed by *all* the dwellers upon earth, when "the throne of God and the Lamb" exists in the age to come.

But, this hypothesis cannot be sustained. The sin-power is not destroyed until a thousand years after the appearing of the Son of Man in power. It is bruised and chained at his appearing, but not destroyed; as is evident from the prediction that, "when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and the Magog, and gather them together for war; the number being as the sand of the sea."

"The blessings" referred to are postmillennial. It is true, however, that the saints who possess the kingdom will enjoy those blessings during the thousand years. But then Rev. xxi, 4, is not the passage that predicts *their* consolation. The prophecy relating to them reads thus—"I beheld," says John, "and lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands: and they cried with a loud voice saying 'The

salvation (be ascribed) to him who sits upon the throne of our God, even to the Lamb! These are they that came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. Therefore are they before the throne of God, and serve Him day and night in His temple; and He that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them. They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more; neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat. For the Lamb who is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of water; and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes.\* This multitude, whose *representative* number is 144,000, and their representative measure 12,000 furlongs square, about 12,000 furlongs high, and walled in by an altitude of 144 cubits, are the gold and silver and precious stones tried in the fire, of whom Paul speaks in part in 1 Cor. iii, 12, and as "built upon the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner"†—"a living stone, chosen of God, and precious to them that believe."‡ These are the Lord's in that day when He makes up His jewels§—the sapphires, agates, carbuncles, and precious stones—the children of Jerusalem in her exaltation,|| who is the mother of them all.¶

These sons and daughters of faith and tribulation are those who, in the days of their probation, love Jerusalem, and believe the "glorious things God has spoken" concerning her. Believing these promises, they become "the children of the promise who are counted for the seed," who are to inherit the Gentiles. They therefore stand related to the metropolis, or mother city of their kingdom, as mother and offspring—all of whose children shall be taught of God, and great shall be their peace.

This great multitude has a twofold existence—first, as flesh and blood suffering tribulation; and secondly, as palm trees flourishing in possession of the kingdom of God. In the former state their fortunes, or rather misfortunes, are concurrent with those of Jerusalem as "a woman forsaken and grieved in spirit." Hence they are described in the Book of Symbols as "the Holy City trodden under foot of the Gentiles forty-two months."\*\* But, when Jerusalem becomes "free," and she who now "drinks the dregs of the cup of trembling, and wrings them out," shall awake and put on her strength, and be endued with her beautiful garments, and the uncircumcised and the unclean come into her no more ††—then will the great multitude John beheld awake also, and put on their strength and beauty, and rejoice in the prosperity of the Holy City, for her glory will be also theirs. Jerusalem is then exalted and become "the joy of the whole earth." Well may the poet say in view of this, "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning. If I do not remember thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth; if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy." †††

"Jerusalem a rejoicing and her people a joy," compared with anything pertaining to her in former days, is a new Jerusalem—*ἡ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλημ, he ano Hierousalem*, "the higher, or more exalted Jerusalem;" and by

\* Rev. vii, 9, 17. † Eph ii, 20. ‡ 1 Pet ii, 4, 7. § Mal. iii, 17. || Isai. liv, 11, 13. ¶ Gal. iv, 23.

\*\* Rev. xi, 2. †† Isai. li. 17-23; lii, i. ††† Ps. cxxxvii, 5.

virtue of her being the theatre of divine manifestations, and "the throne of the Lord," she is styled "the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem," to which even now all believers come by faith, and rejoice in hope of her glory, of which they are joint-heirs with her "Great King." This being their relation to her, every one that inherits the glorious things spoken of her, is inscribed with her name; as saith the Lord Jesus in these words, "Upon him that overcomes I will write the name of the city of my God, the New Jerusalem, which descends out of the heaven from my God." Each of this great multitude, then, is named after the Free Woman subsequently to his resurrection; for it is not till then that their acceptance as those who have by their faith overcome the world's enticements, is declared. Now Paul teaches that this multitude of resurrected and glorified saints will be caught up to meet the Lord in the air.\* John saw them there in vision, and represents them as those who had gained a victory, standing on a sea of crystal, mingled with fire and rejoicing.† But these citizens of the New Jerusalem do not always remain "in the air;" for in another vision John saw them as "the holy city, New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of the heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband." But before he saw this, an angel said to him, "Come hither, I will show thee *the Bride, the Lamb's Wife.*" So "he showed me," says John, "that great city, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of the heaven from God." It is clear from this, that the New Jerusalem John saw, was not a city of architecture, but a *polity made up of glorified saints.* The phrase "the Bride, the Lamb's wife," applied to the descending city proves this. In the nineteenth chapter and eighth verse, she is represented as being "arrayed in fine linen, clean and white"; which white raiment is said to be representative of "the righteousness of the saints;" which is equivalent to saying that *the Bride is the aggregate of the saints.* They are collectively the Lamb's wife, according to the teaching of Paul, who says that they are "members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones;" which was Eve's relation to the first man.

This city or body corporate, of Jehovah's glorified sons and daughters, is representatively exhibited and described in Rev. xxi, 11, to xxii, 5. It is set forth as a city having a great and a high wall of Jasper, in which are twelve gates of as many pearls, with wall foundations of choice stones, each one of the twelve being decorated with all manner of precious stones. These rare and brilliant insets, which highly adorn the State, are worked into pure crystal-like gold, by which the city-multitude of its street, or *broadway—ἡ πλατεία τῆς ποτεως, hee plateia tees poteoos,* is represented. In the midst of this polity is the throne of God and of the Lamb, from which issues a life-inspiring stream that flows along the plateia, refreshing and invigorating all the members of the State. There also stands "the Tree of Life in the midst of the Paradise of God," nourished by the river which streams amid its roots; "bearing twelve fruits, through one month yielding its separate fruit, and its leaves for the healing of the nations."

\* 1 Thess. iv, 17; 2 Epist. i, 8. † Rev. xv, 2.

## THE NEW JERUSALEM WALL.

Such is the municipality of the Kingdom represented by most expressive symbols, which I shall now briefly explain. First then, of the "*great and high wall of jasper.*" The wall is representative of a *federal person*; and the material of that person's *preciousness*. That "wall" is used of *person* in scripture is evident from these texts—"What shall we do for our sister in the day when she shall be spoken for? *If she be a wall, we will build upon her a palace of silver. I am a wall, and my breasts like towers: then was I in his eyes as one that found favour.*" This is a Bride that has found favour; and she is styled a *wall*. The Lord said to Jeremiah "I will make thee unto this people a *fenced brazen wall*, and they shall fight against thee, but shall not prevail." Speaking of Jerusalem delivered from her desolators, Jehovah says "I will be unto her a *wall of fire* round about her, and will be *the glory* in the midst of her." "Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion; for lo, I come, and *I will dwell in the midst of thee*, saith the Lord." The bride, then, is a wall, and the Lord is a wall to her likewise; for, being a wall of fire to the city standing on Mount Zion, he is also a wall to that glorious city's corporation. The Lord as the wall of the kingdom's municipality encloses all its members, who, having been "baptized *into* the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit," are "*in God the Father and in the Lord Jesus*"—walled or enclosed in Him, which is the idea represented by the symbol.

The enclosure of the New Jerusalem community—the wall; and their "light"—the glory of God—are both represented by transparent jasper stone. "I will be *the glory* in the midst of her, saith the Lord;" that is, "I will be a stone most precious, even like a jasper stone, clear as crystal unto her." And this interpretation of the jasper-light of the commonwealth, is sustained by the words of the angel, who says, "And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it; for *the glory* of God lightens it, and *the Lamb is the light thereof.*" This is taught without symbol in the prophets. "The man whose name is the Branch," says Zechariah, "shall bear the glory, and sit and rule upon his throne." "Then," says Isaiah, "the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of Hosts shall reign on Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously." These "ancients" are "the City or State, that hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God," and whose Prince is Christ the Lord, its everlasting light and glory.

The relationship to the Lamb and the Bride in regard to the City Wall, will exemplify the idea of "no temple being there." The wall of a house or temple is the building itself; for no wall, no building. Believers *in* Christ in the present evil world are styled in scripture "the house of God," and "the temple of God." "Know ye not," says Paul to the Corinthians in Christ, "that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" "Ye are God's building;" but without the Lamb, that is, not being *built into him*, they were neither house,

temple, nor builded wall. Individually, they were separate and distinct elements, like unconnected stones accumulated for building purposes. While thus, they were neither wall nor temple. But when cut and polished, and built in by the Spirit, through Paul as "a wise master-builder;" that is, "constituted the righteousness of God in Christ Jesus," who became to them "wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption," they became "One Body," having him for their head; and therefore, one wall, one temple, and one building, with and inseparable from him. This being so, such a society needs no temple, being its own temple. This is not to say that there is no temple in Jerusalem at the time. John's instructor is not speaking of things unsymbolical pertaining to men in mortal flesh; but to Saints immortalized. Ezekiel treats of the unfigurative, which become symbols in the construction of the Apocalypse. The temple he treats of is the house of prayer for Israel and the nations; but the temple constituted of the Lamb and his Bride both *in* God, is for them who are "pillars in it, and shall no more go out."

### THE PEARL-GATES.

The Twelve Gates of pearls in the wall represent the relationship subsisting between the New Jerusalem Municipality and the Twelve Tribes of Israel. The names inscribed on the gates show that they are representatives of the tribes; and that, consequently, the members of the New Jerusalem community became such by adoption into the Commonwealth of Israel, on an angel-principle, and so "entered in through the gates into the city." The twelve angels stationed at the gates represent twelve messengers, by whose message, believed and obeyed, the gold and precious stones of the polity came to "enter in through the gates." The names of these angels or messengers are inscribed upon the twelve foundations of the wall, being "the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb." These are the angels of the pearly gates of this glorious city, sent by the jasper-light of it to turn men from darkness to light, and to invite them to God's kingdom of glory. This they did by preaching the gospel of the kingdom for "the obedience of faith;" by which obedience, a people were separated from "all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues;" and adopted as citizens of the Commonwealth of Israel, in the hope of that remarkable and favoured nation. They thus became a part of Israel, and therefore styled by Paul "the Israel of God;" which, in its glorified state, with Israel's God and King in the midst of them, was displayed in vision descending from the air to Mount Zion, before the mind of the apostle John.

The organization of the Israel of God has relation, therefore, to the foundation of the Hebrew Commonwealth in the twelve sons of Israel, and their own engraftment into Israel's Olive, through the ministration of the twelve apostles, who issued from the tribes. Hence, in other parts of the apocalypse, they are represented by *twenty-four elders wearing crowns of gold*, who, with the *four living creatures full of eyes*, explain their own representation in the songs ascribed to them. When exhibited as a city,

the twenty-four are divided into twelves, whose names are inscribed on the gates and foundations of the wall ; and the eyes of the living creatures become the *garnishing precious stones* of each apostle-foundation. They are "the servants of God, sealed in their foreheads"—the "144,000 of all the tribes of the children of Israel," become "Israelites indeed" by that which is sealed upon them : for in relation to the glorified inheritors of Israel's kingdom, "the flesh profiteth nothing."

### THE FOUNDATION-STONES.

Each foundation-stone of the city wall is a great precious stone, "a living stone"—and represents an apostle. Each polished gem would be beautiful alone ; but how much more beautiful when decorated by all manner of precious stones beside ! The meaning of this symbol is expressed in Paul's words to those whom he had "sealed on their foreheads," and brought into fellow-citizenship with the Saints of Israel. "What is our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing ? Are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his coming ? Ye are our "glory and joy." They were not "wood, hay, and stubble," but gold, and silver, and precious stones. There is no use for destructible materials, such as wood, hay, and stubble, in God's municipality ; it is only those who can stand the fire that can be admitted there. Such were the apostles' converts to the faith. They will rejoice together in the presence of the Lord ; and those who have been brought to the obedience of the faith by an apostle, will be to him the garnishment of precious stones in the holy city.

The elements of the wall and the precious stones, are built upon the foundation stones. The idea incorporated into this symbol is found in the words—"Ye are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner ; *in whom all the building, fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord : in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God ; through the Spirit ;*" which in the New Jerusalem association, issues from his throne, and flows through every member of it, as "a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal."

### THE MAGNITUDE OF THE CITY.

The idea of "a great multitude which no man can number" constituting the New Jerusalem society, is represented by the symbolical magnitude of the city. Twelve is the radical number, and multiplies by twelve. Twelve thousand were representatively sealed, and indented as a tribe of the Israel of God. Twelve times twelve thousand give the 144,000 on Mount Zion with the Lamb. Each 12,000 occupies a definite space, which is 4,000 furlongs square ; and for all the thousands representatively stated as 12,000 furlongs square for the whole city, or 48,000 furlongs the four square ; giving 144,000 furlongs for its sectional contents. The symbolical height of the city is equal to its length and breadth. The height of the wall is twelve times twelve cubits ; sufficiently high to in-

dicating the impossibility of "anything entering into it to defile it." Here is multitude innumerable, symbolically represented, by 1,500 miles length and breadth, and altitude besides; showing, doubtless, that this glorious polity is the medium of connection between the nations of the earth and heaven.

### NEW JERUSALEM THE MILLENNIAL GOVERNMENT OF THE WORLD.

Such a community as this can need no lamp, or sunlight, to enlighten it; for "there shall be no night there." Every individual of it will "shine as the brightness of the firmament; and those of it who have turned many to righteousness, as the stars for ever and ever." Being righteous, they shine as the sun; for "the Lord giveth them light; and *they shall reign for ever and ever.*"

This saying proves that the New Jerusalem is a community of kings—"they shall reign for ever and ever"—*εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων*, *eis tous aionas ton aionon*, *to the ages of the ages*. Over whom shall they reign, and where? "He that overcometh and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron:"—"He shall sit with me on my throne, even as I overcome and sit with my Father in his throne." In view of these promises the heirs of the kingdom sing in their new song, "Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests; and *we shall reign on the earth.*" And when the time comes for this to be fulfilled, John sees "thrones," and he says, "They sat upon them and judgment was given unto them—and *they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years.*" "And the nations of them that are saved (survive in the judgment of the saints) shall walk in the light of it (the new Jerusalem government), and the kings of the earth (the victorious saints) bring their glory and honor into it. And the gates of it shall not be shut at all by day: for there shall be no night there. And they shall bring the glory and the honor of the nations into it."

"And judgment was given unto them;" that is, says Daniel, "to the saints." This is their honor. "Let the high praises of God be in their mouth, and a two-edged sword in their hand; to execute vengeance upon the nations, and punishments upon the people: to bind their kings with chains, and their nobles with fetters of iron: to execute upon them the judgment written: this honor have all his saints."\* But the sword only prepares the way for the world's regeneration. It hews down embattled hindrances to the improvement of mankind; but it adds nothing to the spirituality and intelligence of them that escape. The mission of Christ and his brethren, the saints, is to regenerate the world, as well as to "break in pieces the oppressor"—*to heal the nations of all their maladies of soul, spirit, and estate.*

The agency by which this great work is to be accomplished is *the Spirit*



of God operating through Christ, the apostles, and the rest of the saints—the New Jerusalem association of God's kings and priests. The idea is represented by the pure river of living water, the Tree of Life, the twelve fruits, through one month yielding its separate fruit; and the Leaves of the Tree for the healing of the nations. That "a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, issuing from the throne of God and the Lamb," is the symbol of the Holy Spirit, may be perceived from these words: "I will *pour water* upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground; I will *pour my Spirit* upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring; and they shall spring up as among the grass, as willows by the water courses." If thou knewest *the gift of God*, thou wouldest have asked of Him, and He would have given thee *living water*." "He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of him shall flow *ivers of living water*. This spake he of the *Spirit*, which they that believed on him should receive."—(Extracted from *The Herald of the Kingdom and Age to Come*.—By DR. THOMAS.)

(To be concluded next month.)

## PARAPHRASE OF THE APOCALYPSE,

ON THE BASIS OF EUREKA II.—CHAPTER VIII, VERSES 1 to 5 CONTINUED.

DURING the twenty-four years' reign of Constantius, there were also *thunders*, the symbol of international wars, whose echoes reverberated through the heavens of the respective states. The reign of Constantius was distinguished by a continual roar of conflict between the Roman and Persian Empires, the armies of which encountered each other in nine bloody fields, resulting in the slaughter of thousands of Catholics, and the restoration of five provinces to the Persians. In addition to this long war in the East, there were *thunders* also in the West, where a numerous swarm of Franks and Allemanni crossed the Rhine, and inflicted on the Catholics of the Empire incalculable misery. Forty-five flourishing cities, besides a far greater number of towns and villages, were pillaged, and for the most part reduced to ashes. And although their conquests were considerable, their devastations were three times more extensive; for, even in Gaul, which was more distant, the open towns were deserted, and the inhabitants of the fortified cities compelled to content themselves with such supplies of corn as they could grow within the walls. Through the energy and genius of Julian, the Allemanni were compelled to retreat across the Rhine in A.D. 357, and in the following year he *thundered* against the Franks, reducing the suppliant tribes to implore his clemency and obey his commands. In A.D. 359 the *thunders* ceased to roll, and the inroads of the barbarians were, by the victories of Julian, suspended.

These *thunders* were, however, accompanied by *lightnings*, which

denote civil discord and revolutions in the government. Just as in nature, lightnings precede thunders, so do they in the political atmosphere. The thunders just narrated were but the echoes of civil lightnings. The first flash of *lightning* was developed by the tragic *voice*, which announced the death of the Emperor Constans, by the agents of Maxentius, A.D. 350. The authority of this regicide and usurper was acknowledged throughout the whole of the two great prefectures of Italy and Gaul. The intelligence of this important revolution recalled Constantius from the prosecution of the Persian war, which he consigned to his lieutenants and his cousin Gallus, while he marched towards Europe with mingled feelings of hope and fear, of grief and indignation, and a determination to wage implacable war against Magnentius. The contest between those two opponents was both serious and sanguinary. For some time each treated the other with haughty disdain; but on September 28th, A.D. 351, a severe contest took place near the city of Mursa, in Hungary, in which the Imperial army, although suffering a loss of 54,000 men, was completely victorious. And the overthrow of the power of Magnentius, which this produced, was completed by another bloody battle at Mount Seleucus, August 10th, A.D. 353. He was unable, after this, to bring another army into the field, and perceiving that all was lost, he prevented his treacherous guard from delivering him up to the enemy, by the easier and less ignominious death of falling upon his sword. During this civil war Constantius in the blindness of his fury, abandoned to the Franks and Allemanni, the countries of Gaul, which still acknowledged the power and authority of his rival. He even invited them to cross the Rhine, giving them presents, and holding out promises of spoil and territory. Their rapacity being thus excited, they refused to retire when Constantius had no further use for them. By this means was brought about the war between the Romans and barbarians already referred to under the thunders. Thus the *lightning*-flash of civil discord produced the international roll of *thunder*. The latter was but the echo of the former.

The next flash of *lightning* consisted of a civil war between Constantius and Julian. It arose from an order sent by the Emperor Constantius to Julian while in Paris, A.D. 360, for four of the legions under his command to be sent to Persia. Although opposed to his own interests, Julian complied. But the troops refused to march, and further manifested their dislike to Constantius by earnestly announcing their desire that Julian should be made Emperor. The result was that Julian raised the standard of rebellion, and after fruitless negotiations, carried on for several months, at a distance of 3,000 miles, he boldly resolved to commit himself to the chance of a civil war. Fortunately, however, the calamities of this civil war were brought to an end in A.D. 361 by the seasonable death of Constantius, though not until a serious effusion of blood had taken place.

When this storm of *thunders* and *lightnings* had ended, the earth, into which the fire from the angel's frankincense bowl was cast, began to shake. In other words, there was a political *earthquake*. The death

of Constantius raised Julian to the position of Emperor, the duties of which office he discharged with incessant diligence. One of his first acts was to reform the Imperial Court. He transformed the palace of Constantinople from a seat of extravagant luxury, both in dress and eating, into a desert; dismissing the whole train of eunuchs, slaves, household officers, servants, and other dependents. But not only did he correct these abuses of his Catholic predecessor's reign; he also punished the crimes of his predecessor's favourites; and, as many of them consisted of so-called Christians, the apostasy suffered severely by the Julian *earthquake*. Having a devout and sincere attachment for the gods of Athens and Rome, Julian, much to the horror and indignation of the Catholics, bestowed great favour on the Pagans. They were ordered to re-open their temples, and were delivered from the oppressive laws enacted under the reigns of Constantine and his sons. At the same time, the Trinitarian bishops and clergy, who had been banished by the Arian Emperor, Constantius, were recalled from exile, as also were other religious sects. Among these were the Donatists, already referred to as those who were being sealed. Thus it will be seen that the fire of the altar cast out into the earth, developed this Julian *earthquake* in their behalf. With regard to the Catholics, the principal hardship inflicted on them by Julian, was that of depriving them of the power of tormenting those of their fellow-subjects whom they stigmatised as idolators and heretics, in which category the Donatists were, of course, included. This restoration of Paganism revealed a multitude of pretended Christians, who had been Catholics under the former reign, but who now returned to the superstition of Paganism. In his great work of humbling the Laodicean apostasy, Julian proclaimed himself the gracious protector of the Jews. This was caused, not by any love he had for them, but by their hatred to the Christian name. He proposed to rebuild their temple in Jerusalem, but this enterprize was defeated by an earthquake, a whirlwind, and a fiery eruption, which scorched the workmen, overturned their works, and compelled the abandonment of the undertaking. After this failure, he attacked the most vital part of the Catholic church, by transferring to the Pagan priests the management of the liberal allowances granted from the public revenue by Constantine and his sons. He also prohibited Catholics from teaching grammar and rhetoric, to the masters of which arts was entrusted the whole education of the Roman youth. He then invited a free and general resort to the public schools, with a view to paganizing the minds of the scholars. The greater part of the Catholic officers were gradually removed from their employment in the state, the army, and the province, the powers of government being entrusted to the Pagans. By these means he aimed to deprive the Catholics and their clergy of all the temporal honours and advantages which rendered them respectable in the eyes of the world. They suffered much from the tyranny of the provincial governors, their most effectual instrument of torture being the law which obliged the Catholics to make full and ample satisfaction for the temples they had destroyed under the preceding reign. In many cases

they had erected conventicles of their own on the ruins of Paganism. Consequently, they were now compelled to pull down their own buildings, and rebuild the idolatrous temples they had destroyed. This process caused, of course, a great amount of expense, which, in many cases, they were unable to pay. In these cases, the Roman law gave the claimants a right to the debtor's person. They were consequently seized by Julian's ministers, and subjected to severe pains and torments.

Upon hearing, about the same time, from Edessa, that the wealthy faction of Arian Catholics, had insulted the weakness of a sect of "heretics," styled Valentinians, Julian confiscated the whole of their property to the magistrates of the place, the money being distributed among the soldiers, while the lands were added to the state's domain.

It will thus be seen that the Catholic church suffered great troubles from the Julian earthquake, while the only classes who benefited from it, were the idolators and so-called heretics. It was brought to a termination by the death of Julian, June 26, A.D. 363, in his 32nd year, after a reign of only twenty months. He was the last of the house of Constantine, which was consequently left without an heir, and the Empire without a master. The military election of Julian restored tranquillity to the church and state.

---

### SUNDAY MORNING AT THE CHRISTADELPHIAN SYNAGOGUE, BIRMINGHAM, No. 10.

---

*From Shorthand Notes by brother JOHN BUTLER.*

---

ONCE MORE, we have the privilege of assembling in pursuance of the commandment of Christ, delivered to his disciples before he departed from them into heaven. We may be very thankful that he gave that command, for otherwise, we should have had no scriptural ground for periodical assembly, that is to say, not such ground as would have enabled faithful servants to silence quibblers. But for such commandment, many would have been found to say that it was not necessary, and not obligatory to meet together in a stated and collective capacity, to celebrate the love of Christ. It would appear that there were some of that class in Paul's day, even among those who believed the truth, for he says "Forsake not the assembling of yourselves together, as the manner of some is." So that it had been "the manner of some" in those days to stay away from the assembly, to stay at home, to take it easy, to excuse themselves the trouble of coming out steadily to the meetings of the brethren, under the idea, no doubt, that it was unnecessary for them to attend the meetings, and that they could serve God as effectively in the quietness and

seclusion of home as in the assembly. Now, God, in these things is always wiser than we; and the very fact of Christ commanding his disciples to assemble for the purpose of breaking bread, must be taken as proof that it is in itself a wise thing. A moment's reflection will show it is so. Our position in Christ requires us to be active and faithful in the discharge of the duties that devolve upon us in ordinary life. We have not to withdraw ourselves from the world; Jesus and Paul distinctly prohibited such a thing. That they might be kept from the evil that was in the world, was Christ's prayer concerning the disciples. "I pray not," he said, "that thou shouldst take them out of the world, but that thou shouldst keep them from the evil." Paul also says, reminding the Corinthians of an exhortation he had given them, not to keep company with a certain class of individuals, "yet not the fornicators of this world, for they must needs yet go out of the world." But if any man that is called a brother, be of the description that he specifies, then we are not to keep his company as a brother. As regards the world, we are to be in it, but

not of it; we are to bear our testimony in it, but not fellowship it; we are to serve God in it, but not league ourselves with it; we are to glorify Him by refusing the evil in it, and choosing the good, by bearing witness for Christ's name before men; that the light of our testimony may perchance entice good and honest hearts into the right way, and thus multiply the jewels which God will make up in the day of Christ's glory. We could have no such opportunity were we to seclude ourselves in a cloister, as many deluded souls do under the specious idea of giving themselves to God. We must not in any shape imitate their great crime. They err, not knowing the scriptures. They err through the power of philosophy and vain deceit. They think that solitude and bodily inactivity will promote their spiritual interests, which they conceive to lie in the supposed immortal soul, which is a mere invention of the philosophy of pagan Greece; and which, by intermixture with the gospel of Christ, has led men off the path of duty in even these little matters. It has made them reason thus: "The body is of no value; the soul is the pearl; the soul is of God. I must nurse the immortal soul; and I cannot do this effectually unless I get out of the way of human sights and sounds, and keep the body under by starving it—doing penance, &c." Now the religion of Christ teaches us the opposite of this. It teaches us to go into the world, to be active like himself—to develop by experience: to learn obedience by suffering. He is the exemplification of what we ought to be; he mingled with men, and was tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin. It is true he withdrew himself occasionally, and sought opportunity in the retirement and silence of the mountain top, to hold that communion with God which cannot take place in the midst of busy life; and every true son and daughter of the Almighty will resemble him in this, that they will thirst for occasional solitude, to draw deeply from the fountain of spiritual strength and consolation. Yet it will only be to return with greater zest to the work of doing the will of Him who pleases to make use of evil in the development of the highest good. Everyone who realises the position to which we are called in Christ, will appreciate the privilege of retiring from the busy and distracted world, to coolly and quietly contemplate those relations of being which are forgotten and altogether ignored by those who are all the while in the busy stream of life. Now this

gathering together to break bread is one of those opportunities which Christ has mercifully made compulsory. He has not left it to our faithless hearts and undiscerning eyes, to decide what shall be best in such a matter. He knew how we should be beset, without and within. He needed not that any should tell him what was in man, for he knew; and he gave us a very good indication of his mind in the matter, by speaking of a certain class who should receive the word, but in whom the cares and pleasures and riches of the world should choke the word, so that it should become unfruitful. He saw the danger to which we are all exposed in the matter; and that danger is not a small or a remote one. We are of necessity in the world, and engaged in its occupations, and the power of these upon our minds is very great, on account of the strength of things immediately seen and heard, and the weakness of mental discernment; and if there were no counter-acting influence brought into play, we should be overcome of the world. We should devote ourselves to merely worldly objects, and be governed by merely worldly motives, and inspired by merely worldly sentiments. But we must overcome the world, and that which overcometh the world, John says is our faith. "This is the victory that overcometh the world—even our faith." But our faith is a tender plant: it is not a thing that grows with spontaneous growth; it requires culture and constant care; it comes from the outside. "Faith cometh by hearing;" and "faith is the substance of things hoped for." We hope for them because God has promised them; and we know that He has promised them, because we have been informed—because we have heard. But all knowledge grows dim if it is not renewed, and so does this. We must "keep in memory" the things apostolically delivered. If we "at any time let them slip," we lose our anchor, and drift in the current of mortality, to be dashed to pieces on death's inhospitable strand. To bring to mind, to keep in mind, to renew our faith, then, are the great desiderata. This is the true meaning of edification: the building of one another up in our most holy faith. Now that which gives us the faith in the first instance is that which must keep the faith. The reading that will plant the faith is the reading that will preserve and nurture it. The human mind is like shifting sand in relation to everything—not only in relation to things divine, but things human; though more especially things divine. Human memory is a very feeble thing. The

substance of the mind, as it were, is always on the move—always changing, always receiving new impressions, new thoughts. The thoughts and impressions of yesterday are feebler to-day than when first received; and as time goes on, they become feebler and feebler, until we are almost unconscious of them. To keep a thing constantly in the mind, it must be held continually in contact with it in some shape or form. The faces of friends seen daily are not forgotten. Now the truth is our great friend. If we look in its face daily, we shall keep it in mind; but if we live in neglect of it, if we abandon or refrain from reading the scriptures, or assembling one with another, the face of friend Truth will become dim. The impressions that the truth has made upon our minds will gradually fade, until they disappear altogether, and we shall become worldly-minded. What a mistake for any of us to give the preference to any friend above friend Truth. Friend Business, Friend Sociality, Friend Enjoyment, will cheat us at last; but Friend Truth is a tree of life to them that lay hold of her. Happy is everyone that receiveth her; she will never deceive us but be precious and refreshing to our last mortal hour, and crown us with life and joy for evermore.

There is one thing always welling up from within—always active and growing—never requiring cultivation; and that is the disposition that John thus describes. "The lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life." These things grow in the flesh, for they are of the flesh, but the other (the faith of Christ) does not. The other is a plant of heavenly origin, and if we do not carefully nurture the good seed from which it grows, it very quickly becomes extinguished by the rank and vigorous weeds which spring with rapid self-growth. So we can see the great wisdom of Jesus in making this a standing institution for his people, that they should assemble themselves together for the express purpose of remembering him; for this is the object. "Do this," he says, "in remembrance of me." All that is in the world greatly helps to dim the feeble image of Christ that has been formed within us by the belief of the truth, but when we are called round the table, we are called to contemplate him anew. And surely we cannot, if we have received the truth come to the table, without having his image revived before us. We had better not come if this is not the result. Paul teaches a serious responsibility in connection with attendance upon this act, he says: if any man eat and

drink unworthily, he is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, that is, if he eats without discerning the Lord's body, not perceiving, not recognising the things symbolised by the bread and wine. Our duty this morning, therefore, is to realise Christ. If it was necessary for the original disciples, who had seen him, who had sojourned in Judea with him, who had witnessed his living acts, and heard his living voice, if it was necessary for them to do this that they might remember him, how much more necessary is it for us, who have never seen him, and in whose minds the only impression of him is that created by the truth, which is a very feeble impression, except where the truth is most devoutly and most earnestly studied and held. Let us, on all such occasions, pass in mental review, the truth we know. Let us bring forth from the mental treasury things new and old. This, however, is only possible where we are "scribes well instructed in the kingdom," and in our day, we can only get into this condition by daily reading of the scriptures. If we neglect to read the scriptures, we shall find ourselves entirely out of harmony with the system of things that will be manifested at the coming of Christ.

The symbols on the table remind us that we have to fellowship the sufferings of Christ meantime. We may get to the crown afterwards, but at present, we have to fellowship the cross; we have to fellowship the "man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief," who was despised and rejected of men; and this, not merely in the breaking of bread, for that is the easiest part of it, but in the actual shaping of our lives. We fellowship his sufferings to some extent in identifying ourselves with the truth. Many people admire the sufferings of Christ historically, but when it comes to their turn, they act the coward. They cannot stoop to the practical fellowship. The truth is presented, and they say "Yes, it looks like the truth, we cannot gainsay it, but what are we to do? It would isolate us from all society, and cut us off from much usefulness in the world; we should be looked upon as madmen." And they are not prepared for that; they are not prepared to pay the price; they are not prepared to sell themselves to Christ; they like to be part and parcel of the present system; they like to be esteemed of men. It may be that in words they do not reject the truth; but actions are louder than words; they deny Christ before man because of the consequences. We must

steel ourselves against this, even if it comes to wandering in sheep skins, and goat skins, and in dens and caves of the earth. If we are to fellowship Christ in his glory, we must fellowship him in his humiliation. If we are to partake of the glory that shall be revealed, we must partake of the suffering of this present time. There are many sufferings connected with the fellowship of Christ, even in our time, and one of them is indicated in the chapter that has been read this morning.—(Rom. xi). It is the duty of those who are Christ's to be subject to the powers that be, which, in an exalted sense, are ordained of God. The powers that be constitute the order of things necessary for the present stage of affairs. If there were no rule, anarchy would reign. The passions of men—the selfish instincts of men, let loose, would run riot, and bring about universal confusion like what we see in barbarous countries; and such a state of society would be incompatible with the work which God is doing. He is using sinners to subdue the earth, and prepare it for habitation; and He is preparing from among those sinners, a family for Himself, of sons and daughters, by a belief and obedience of the truth. Now if there were no such thing as society, with its law and order—if the world was in a state of chaos, as it inevitably would be without the presence and operation of authority among men, God's work would not be done. We could not assemble here this morning, for instance, if there were no authority. We are under the wing of authority. If there were no government, we should be a prey to the violence and hatred of all who oppose us; we should be pulled limb from limb, instead of being allowed to sit quietly here, to meditate on those things which God has revealed. Towards that authority and those governments, our duty is one of submission. Those who resist the authority resist God. As Daniel says, God setteth up kings and putteth them down. But it may be asked, if the powers that be are ordained of God, why should we look forward with desire to a time when God will destroy them? The answer is, because He has promised it, and because their present use by God is only a controlling of evil, for the furtherance of His own righteous purposes. The wicked are the sword of the Lord. He ruleth in the kingdoms of men, and doeth according to His will; but the kingdoms of men are nevertheless evils of a rank type—necessary evils for the present state—provisionally guided for the

accomplishment of the divine ends. But why is He going to put aside that which at the present stage meets with His approbation? The answer is, that we use an instrument in the crude stage of any process of manufacture which is quite unfit for the more advanced state of work to be done. That is how it is here: the preliminary part of God's purpose to save the world, requires the organisations called the "kingdoms of men." These kingdoms of men have existed for six thousand years; but when the work has advanced to a certain point, He will set them aside, and interpose the kingdom of His Son. He will pull down the mighty from their seats, and Jesus will rule. "The Lord shall be King over all the earth; in that day there shall be one Lord, and His name one." The kingdoms of men will then have been broken to pieces: still Christ's people are at present to be submissive to them. It is impossible that Christ's people can take part in any revolutionary movement. They are prohibited from drawing the sword, and prohibited by the spirit of their calling from taking part in the political movements of their times. They are God's people, "a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a peculiar people," who are unconnected with the movements of men. They are in the world, but not of it. It is their part to leave the world to do its own business. Now it is not agreeable to the flesh to conform to this position. The democratic feeling is very strong in human nature. It is the feeling expressed in the words "We are our own: who is lord over us?" Practically it takes the form of patriotism, and makes a man rejoice in being part and parcel of the institutions of the land, and in having the right to exercise the "sacred duty" of defending the soil. More mildly, it makes a man pride himself in the use of the franchise which he calls a "birthright;" and leads him to join with alacrity in the various movements that politicians set agoing for the cure of the world on the democratic basis. Now it is impossible that these sentiments can exist in a breast where the truth reigns supreme. The divine law will extinguish practical politics. It will fill a man with distaste for Gentilism in every shape and form, and substitute the love of God's kingdom, and God's affairs. The politics pertaining to the commonwealth of Israel will become his politics. It is impossible that a Christadelphian can be a patriot or a soldier. "Christian patriotism" is an invention of the flesh. It is one of the "good words and fair speeches"

by which the simple are deceived. The political attitude of a Christadelphian is submission to the existing powers, living peaceably with all men, except where the truth is concerned. For the truth we are to contend earnestly, and the weapons of this warfare are mighty, through God, to the pulling down of strongholds; though not so mighty as they were in the days of Paul, when Christ's soldiers were armed with the powers of the spirit. This is our warfare. We are not to touch the conflicts of the world. We are to pay tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom is due, fear to whom fear, honour to whom honour. We are to be the most peaceful of citizens, the most loyal of subjects, so far as deference to authority is concerned. We are to submit to every ordinance of man, where it does not conflict with our duty to God. Our submission, however, is not out of deference to human authority, but from obedience to divine law; we submit because God tells us to submit—(1 Pet. ii, 13) as a duty to Christ, not as a compliment to rulers. We must in all things be subject till Christ returns to execute the judgment written; Christadelphians, therefore, are the most obedient of subjects. At the same time we do not for one moment surrender the contention that kings and emperors are usurpers. God allows the wicked to rule for his own purpose, and we submit to him. He made use of Nebuchadnezzar as his servant, although Nebuchadnezzar knew him not. Nebuchadnezzar thought it was his own hand that was doing what God was causing him to perform. That is just how it is in regard to the nations of the earth; they do not know God, but God is using them. Yet we do not surrender the fact that they are mere usurpers; Jesus did not surrender this fact, though he submitted. The taxgatherer came to Peter (he was evidently afraid to come to Jesus) and said, "Does not your master pay tribute?" Peter told Jesus, and Jesus said to Peter, "Of whom do the kings of the earth take tribute, of their own children or of strangers?" In this, he was drawing a premise concerning himself and those who were his, from the fact that tribute was always levied upon strangers; that it was the nations subject to Rome that always paid the taxes—the Romans themselves being free. Peter replied, "Of strangers." Jesus says, "Then are the children free;" as much as to say "We are the children; they have no right to impose tribute upon us." Yet,

though asserting the fact in the shape of a mild protest, he added, "Nevertheless, lest we offend them, go cast a hook into the sea, and the first fish that comes will have money in its mouth; that take and pay for thee and me." This is as good a lesson as we could hear on our political duty. As British subjects, we will submit to British law as Jesus submitted to Roman law, the while protesting against the legitimacy of its claim, and standing apart from the machinery of its politics as he did. As a British subject, a man has to pay a considerable price to become a Christadelphian. It is more than some people are prepared to do, to not only pay taxes but to surrender their political brightlight, and become partizans of "another king, one Jesus," whose service at present is one of ignominy. But it is a glory and a joy to those who comprehend the duty we owe to the position to which we are called. It is one way of suffering with Christ; it is one way of showing that this is not our time; that we have here no continuing city; that we seek one to come; that like Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, being persuaded of the promises, we have embraced them and confess that we are strangers and pilgrims in the earth. There are other worldly drawbacks connected with the service of Christ. Those who receive the truth are mostly poor people, like the disciples of old; and if one may be connected with the rich and the learned, it is a crucifixion and a suffering to have to keep the company of the poor and illiterate; and yet we have to do it—to the poor the gospel is preached. "God has chosen the poor of this world rich in faith, heirs of the kingdom which He hath promised to them that love Him." There is another feature of the case that involves sacrifice and labour and suffering. Christ has said "Let him that heareth say 'Come.'" Everyone is not prepared to be a missionary; yet they must: it is an obligation upon everyone receiving the truth, to the extent of their opportunities and abilities, to say "Come." Now to say "Come" one must labour, do thankless work, spend many toilsome moments, and spend money—some in greater and some in lesser degree—according to opportunity. The majority of people are not prepared for any of these. They are not prepared to put forth labour except in that which will produce some present substantial advantage. They will patiently labour, for instance, for the purchase of some article of furniture upon which they have set their mind, or to procure some distinction; but they are not



prepared to labour and spend and be spent for something that brings them no present return, which those who are Christ's have to do. Above all, they are not prepared to spend money. They do spend money readily enough for that which is not bread; they do lay out their substance upon things that will soon end in the dust; but they are not wise enough to be prepared to invest their money on things which will constitute a treasure laid out where neither moth nor rust can corrupt, nor where thieves can break through and steal; and which will be brought forth in glory to be enjoyed for ever at the coming of Christ.

Then we are commanded to do good unto all men, especially to those who are of the household of faith; we are to give to the poor. This is another thing which few people are prepared to do in the way and in the spirit prescribed. They have no objections to do it, if there is a subscription list, where they can see their name among others; but they do not like Christ's way of doing it—keeping their left hand in ignorance of what their right hand does. The majority do not care for doing good at

all. The majority are not Christ's people. To do good and communicate we must forget not.

These are specimens of what we are called upon to be and to do in Christ. It is no light matter to become a Christadelphian. Jesus might well say to the people that were following him in crowds, "If any man is not prepared to sacrifice everything for me, he cannot be my disciple." "Which of you," says he, "wants to build a tower, and does not first sit down and count whether he is able to do it?" It is no very small matter to believe the truth—though a very easy and pleasant thing. The truth is so clear and so glorious in itself, that this believing it is the easiest part of our duty; but we may nevertheless fail to become Christ's servants in deed and in truth. It is in the doing of Christ's word that we gain the victory. It is in the keeping of his commandments that we have great reward. In the keeping of these, we must needs fellowship his sufferings, and shall then find his companionship at the table a new and delightful and a very profitable thing. EDITOR.

## "THE VOICE UPON THE MOUNTAINS" ANSWERED.

### THE PARABLE OF THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS.

(Continued from page 280.)

2nd.—The Internal Evidence.

MR. GOVERT informs us (see *Voice upon the Mountains*, page 97, No. 22, July 21st), the parable was designed "to trace the flight of soul's both good and evil to the place prepared for them, and to refute just such belief as that manifested by Christadelphians." We on the other hand, from the evidence surrounding it, have shown proof to the contrary, inasmuch were the story a fact, it would be inconsistent with the principle and object of Jesus's teaching, whereby it was not his purpose on any occasion to immediately enlighten the people, far less the Pharisees. And as it is clear, the primary object of the parable was not to instruct the Pharisees, but rebuke them, it was in this the more effective as designed from what they themselves believed, than it could have been from any thing they did not believe. Therefore "if it traced the flight of souls" it did not trace it for *their* information, for they al-

ready believed in what it seemed to announce, as to the good going one way and the evil another. And as it is thus clear it was never designed "to trace it" for them, it is as equally clear from the inconsistency of its statements with gospel facts, it was never designed "to trace it" for others, or trace it at all:—the seeming countenance given to the Pharisees' belief by Jesus sketching it in the manner he did, being sufficiently accounted for, by Jesus's invariable practice of expressing himself to the people in parables, his frequent manner of speech, the reason for it all, and the entire want of necessity that a parable should be literally true in any one particular. These, we say, sufficiently account for the apparent patronage Jesus in this instance, gave to the Pharisees' superstition, without our having recourse to so negligent and blundering a way of interpreting scripture as the taking such things literally as we find them written, because, otherwis-

they do not appear consistent with the general notions of honesty and straightforwardness. This Mr. Govett does. He misapprehends the object Jesus had in view, misunderstands the method Jesus took to accomplish it, and so mistakes darkness for light, light for darkness, facts for fables, and fables for facts. His so-called facts, therefore, anent the question before us, we shall now examine, and see how they can be sustained.

1st.—The story before us, *taken literally*, is not particular enough, and, therefore, defines nothing. Like a pump-well not sufficiently full, water must be poured into it ere any can be drawn out; and so anything Mr. Govett may draw from the story, he must first supply himself, and that which he draws out is of the same character as that which he puts in. He first believes in Hades, and, therefore, draws Hades out of it; he next believes in immortal souls and their being like to their former bodies, and, therefore, draws these out of it; he thirdly believes in a paradise not exactly heaven, and so draws that out of it; he fourthly believes in torments for souls after death, and in like manner draws this out of it. But suppose he had had no such belief, would he have drawn any of them out of it? This is the question we have to decide, and we tell him flatly to his face, he never would.

2nd.—If the story is taken *literally*, it proves too much. The beggar and rich man both died. The one was *carried* by the angels into Abraham's bosom, the other was buried. Were they not both buried? This we are left to conjecture, but the word 'carry' here implies something material was *carried*. Hence, if we are to take the story as "a real statement of facts," we must conclude that the beggar-man was *not* buried but carried like as Eijah was carried. And as, according to Mr. Govett, the place for the departed righteous is not in heaven, but in Hades—beneath the earth—why is burial spoken of in one case and not in the other? Why are not angels spoken of as carrying away the rich man to the place of torment? Did he descend into hell of his own accord? From the *fact* of angels having carried away the one, and the *fact* of the other having been only buried, we are left to suppose that, in the latter case, the law of gravitation had carried him downwards, while in the other, the poor man had to ascend, and so the necessity for *carrying* him. This refutes Mr. Govett's notion

that the place for the departed righteous is on a plain, level with that for the wicked, unless he can prove to us the latter was buried as well as the former, and the former was carried by angels as well as the latter. But Mr. Govett will here tell us "this needs no refutation, because if Jesus was taking up the Pharisees' theory, they did not believe *corpses* were carried to hades, but the souls of men." True, if Jesus had told the story as a fact, but having told it as a fable, it is not to be for a moment supposed he meant to convey to others the Pharisees' idea, though he constructed it from their theory. And, as Mr. Govett says "it is a statement of facts," we must request him not to defend the Pharisees, but himself. And, as he further adds, "this was evidently designed to refute just such belief as that manifested by Christadelphians," we are here the rather led to conclude the story as a fact refutes itself, and hence refutes him; whereas, as a parable, it is self-consistent, in perfect concord with the doctrinal teaching of scripture, and replete with the essential principles of Christadelphianism.

3rd—"And in hell, he (Dives) lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and saw Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. And said Abraham unto him, 'now he is comforted and thou art tormented.'" In this, we have rewards and punishments spoken of as immediately happening after death. How does this agree with the doctrine of judgment, and rewards and punishments, as expounded in the New Testament? Let us quote a passage already referred to in our first article, as quoted by Mr. Govett, for a purpose the remotest from its teaching. "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." Are these recorded as words which are to be said immediately after death, or after the judgment? See the context, and let the reader answer the question for himself. Let him compare it also with Matt. viii, 11, 12, and say if the story here does not correctly refer to the things stated in these passages. Whereas, on Mr. Govett's principle it is inconsistent with the teachings of Jesus and his apostles on the matter. Where, in scripture, have we anything taught concerning rewards and punishments taking place before the resurrection and the second advent? We need not refer to the passages which prove the contrary, they are so numerous. The statement, therefore, of Mr. Govett cannot be a fact, "that the rich man's

lifting up his eyes in hell, being in torments, took place before the resurrection, while his brothers are alive on earth, while Moses and the prophets are still in force, and, therefore, before Jesus had come," while it so comes into collision with teaching so plain as that of the resurrection and judgment to come.

4th.—"Beside all this" continues Abraham, "between us and you there is a great gulf fixed: so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us that would come from thence." "If Dives and Lazarus," says the author of the *Twelve Lectures*, "were immaterial souls, they could cross the gulf which separates them." "Prove it," says Mr. Govett. The fact of there being a gulf proves it. A gulf means a great material chasm: and to a material being a material obstacle. And as, according to Mr. Govett, this is a literal truth, the gulf not only proves the material nature of itself, but also that the beings on either side of it are material. What obstacle could a material thing be to an immaterial soul? Why, if it was simply a gulf, where would lie the difficulty? Here, however, we think Mr. Govett finds his conclusion in the probability that a stream of liquid fire runs between, and deriving his theology from *Tam o' Shanter*, shunts his train of thought on upon the rail of scripture, from words like these of witches:

"Now do thy speedy utmost, Meg,  
And win the keystone of the brig,  
Where at them thou thy tail may toss,  
A running stream they darra cross."

"It is a well-known fact, that witches or any evil spirits, have no power to follow a poor wight any farther than the middle of the next running stream." Now this is called "a fact," and is so much like one of Mr. Govett's "facts," that it appears to be the foundation of his notion concerning the impossibility of immaterial souls passing a gulf. It, however, turns his "prove it" to laughter, and though it may seem inconsistent with the gravity of the subject, it nevertheless illustrates the method by which silly objections are formed against reason, by those who, as a rule, are better acquainted with the classics than with the scriptures. By this we do not mean they should not be acquainted with both, but when we have the sentiments of the poets palmed on us for the doctrines of the prophets, we have a right to object, and turn their sentiments to ridicule. It is but meet

therefore, where

"Men in argument stand up like men,  
We needs must care what we say then,  
But when like children they choose to be,  
We then must muse with the toys you see."

5th.—"How odd," says the author of the *Twelve Lectures* "that heaven and hell should be so close together." "There is neither heaven nor hell," says Mr. Govett, "but Hades, the intermediate place where souls are detained in custody until the resurrection." "Prove it," say we. Mr. Govett's own notions concerning "Jesus preaching to the spirits in prison, which sometimes were disobedient" confounds him; and Matt. viii, 11, 12, presents a description of what has yet to take place after the resurrection, so inimitable in its likeness to Abraham's bosom and Dives in torment, that we may see in the figure the photograph of the reality, and a sufficient proof of the falsity of his assertion.

6th.—"What do you make of the finger, tongue, and eyes?" asks the author of the *Twelve Lectures*. A very apt question. And what can one make of them more than they appear? Mr. Govett may make of them what he pleases; but they evidently refer reasonable men to material bodies. And the fact that it is "in the body" according to the Apostle Paul, "we have all to appear before the judgment seat of Christ, and receive in our bodies according to what we have done," there is nothing left for us to suppose anything else, than that the parable here simply refers to this; for were the story true, and Mr. Govett's facts not fables, it would be inconsistent with the Apostle's teaching. But says he "The soul, or ghost, of a man perfectly resembles his body." Yes, say we, very true; in so far as man's imagination is concerned, as no man ever saw the spectre of a man that did not resemble his body. It is purely the imagination which furnishes this piece of evidence; for no man ever yet saw the spirit of a man to say whether it resembled his body or not. This is as effective a reply to the mere assertion of Mr. Govett as any demonstration could be, but it is still more effective in the light of the second assertion he makes to supplement it. Mark what he says: "The soul, or ghost, of a man perfectly resembles his body, only"—mark this ONLY—"it is not capable of being held by a living man." Now, if he cannot prove the ONLY, he cannot prove that which precedes it. He makes that which follows it necessary to that which precedes it, to

show that the resemblance of the soul to the body is no proof of its materiality. Therefore, if it can be proved that a spirit, a living spirit, *can* be "held by a living man," his proof of its immateriality is the very proof against him. Souls, or spirits of men, argues he, are immaterial beings. Scripture says, "Angels are spirits." Now if spirits are immaterial beings, as he says, and angels are spirits, as scripture says, how came Jacob to *wrestle* with one, and *would not let him go*, if this angel-spirit was not a material being? Let Mr. Govett answer this question, and say whether this does not show that if the ghost, or spirit, or soul of a man perfectly resembles his body, this resemblance, and of course the ghost too—for the resemblance is necessary to the ghost—*must* be a phantom, if it is not capable of being held by a living man. Out of his own mouth he stands condemned.

7th.—"I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain; and they cried with a loud voice 'How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood?'" This Mr. Govett quotes to prove that dead souls are not unconscious, and also to confirm his assertion that souls perfectly resemble their own bodies. A very striking proof indeed! How unmistakable! There is something, however, about his manner of quoting it which creates a suspicion of its being a good proof after all. He quotes it, and says no more. We wonder at this. We wonder he did not dwell upon it a little. We wonder he should have let it so simply, quietly, and perhaps slyly, drop into the discussion without any comment. He probably thought it better to let well alone, lest he should make it worse. And he was wise in this; for never did he make a more remarkable mistake than quote it to support his argument. Here he as remarkably finds scripture against him, as Jacob wrestling with a spirit.

The language used is highly figurative. The altar referred to is not a literal one; neither are the souls literal persons. Heb. xiii, 10; 1 Cor. ix, 13; x, 18, serve us sufficiently to ascertain what the altar refers to. The altar evidently refers to Jesus Christ; and, in accordance with the figure, he is as an altar of burnt offering. And those "who were slain for the Word of God and for the testimony they held," are represented as sacrificed thereon, and their bloods poured at its base.—(See the Mosaic account of the altar and the burnt offerings.) They are represented as souls, or *lives*, because "the soul, or life, of all

flesh is the blood thereof." And just as the blood was poured out, so were their souls *poured out*, like as Jesus's soul was *poured out* unto death, "the blood being the life thereof," as much in his case as theirs. Being "of the altar they were partakers with the altar" in the sufferings, as well as in the blessings associated with it, as the figure of Jesus Christ. In place of "souls," therefore, we read "bloods." We have at once a solution of the enigma, these "bloods" being as the lives or souls of the persons slain.

The word "bloods" is not in the original, because this would have been inconsistent with the enigmatical character of the passage. But the phrase, "underneath the altar,"—meaning round its base, like the blood of the burnt offerings round the base of the Mosaic altar—determines the meaning. And inasmuch as the altar—an inanimate thing—represents in the passage *a living one*, Jesus Christ; so in contrast with this, and in harmony with the enigma, the dead in Christ are represented as living ones. If we are to assume the representation of them as living, to be a reality because they are made, as it were, to speak; so must we assume the altar they were lying under was a literal one, and therefore a thing without life. But here we must go by contraries, and pronounce the inanimate altar the figure of the living, and the living souls the figure of the dead. Those souls, or bloods, are conscious, therefore, not in reality, but in mere figure of speech, in unison with the voice of Abel's blood (or soul) which cried unto God from the ground. Their cry is but the figurative expression of the slowness of God's anger, and the determination of His justice to the vengeance which approacheth. But if Mr. Govett can assert the blood of Abel *was* *conscious*, or that the blood of Christ (the soul of his flesh now perished) *is* *conscious*, because *it speaketh* better things than that which the blood of Abel *spoke*, then may he assume the souls or bloods under the altar are conscious too, and teach it so if he pleases; but he shall do so at his own peril and to his own confusion. We, however, pity his followers—the sheep which have to graze on such pasture—the flock which have such a shepherd; and recommend to them the perusal of *Eureka*, an exposition of the Apocalypse by Dr. Thomas, of America, that they be not carried away by such assertions as this: "The Apocalypse is not a book of symbols."—(See *Voice upon the Mountains*, No. 25, October 1, page 133.)

By this assertion he throws dust in their eyes, that, seeing, they might not see, and, hearing, they might not understand; that he is incapable of discussing the subject he has taken up, save by negative assertions in which there are nothing but words and scriptural quotations without reason or point. Here he even uses words without meaning; and if he has no sinister purpose for this, it must arise from utter incapacity, and the blind determination to say something. He appears baffled. Let those who read this assertion of his concerning the Apocalypse, simply consider it, and say if Mr. Govett does not again confound himself. He tells us "The Apocalypse is not a book of symbols; for God calls it '*the taking off a veil*.'" What does he mean? Does he know himself? What is a symbol? See Walker's Dictionary, or any other. A symbol is that which comprehends in its figure a representation of something else. Well, if it represents something else, it therefore *reveals* that something through its representation. The representation may be misunderstood, but that is not the fault of the symbol, nor of the want of means to explain it; but the fault of the would-be interpreter's understanding. But, according to Mr. Govett, "If the Apocalypse were a book of symbols, it would be the *putting on of a veil of mystery*." Not the mere putting on a veil, let the reader mark; but the putting on a veil of MYSTERY. This word, mystery, he adds to the word veil, to show that a symbol is beyond the grasp of human intelligence. It was necessary for him to do this in order that it might support the assertion which precedes it. And just as one lie requires more lies to prop it up, so does this assertion of Mr. Govett require him to give us a meaning of the word symbol *it never had before*. Apart, then, altogether from the book of Revelations, all symbols elsewhere in scripture, according to him, are VELS OF MYSTERY. Baptism is a symbol, and therefore a mystery. Is it so? The bread and wine are symbols, and therefore mysteries. Are they so? The passover was a symbol, and therefore a mystery. Was it so? And coming to common things, words are symbols of ideas, and therefore as mysterious as though we had been dumb or never written a word. Is this the case, Mr. Govett? Where in all scripture is there a symbol which may be called inexplicable or mysterious? In every instance, the means are at hand to explain the symbol (as a dictionary may be to explain the symbol of science, of literature, of art), though the

men fit to do it may not be. And hence, so far from a symbol being a veil of mystery, it is an apocalypse of truth; a revelation, hidden only to those who do not understand; but not mysterious, because compressed, folded, bound within the narrow limits of a figure which, as related to the things revealed by it, is as a drop of water to the ocean wave. We repeat, therefore, "The Apocalypse is a book of symbols," and by its symbols, in place of putting on a veil of mystery. TAKES MANY OFF, and reveals, with unmistakable precision, "the things that were, the things that are, and the things that shall shortly come to pass." Away, therefore, with such childish, miserable, and pitiable verbiage, as the assertion, "the book of Revelation is not a book of symbols," and shut up the loophole he has made in his argument as a security for his retreat through the following statement,—"*that there are emblems in it is true, but most of them are expiained; and it is on the unsymbolic and explanatory parts that he rests his belief of eternal torments and of conscious disembodied souls.*" What an admission this is in face of the assertion, "the book of Revelation is not a book of symbols!" When he points out the emblems that are *not* explained, the many that *are* explained, and those parts which are *not* symbolical and explanatory, we then will prove to him the Apocalypse is a book of symbols. Meantime, it is quite unnecessary; his own words confess it. He was afraid to say "there are *many* emblems in it," and therefore left out the word "many;" but he nevertheless confessed to it by using the word "most" in the succeeding clause of his statement. He next tells us, *it is on the unsymbolic and explanatory parts* that he rests his belief. Why need he tell us this, if there are only a few symbols in the book? He confesses here, by his mode of putting it, that these *unsymbolical* and explanatory parts are exceptional in their nature to the general character of the book. These exceptions, therefore, upon his own showing, are sufficient proof (considering they come from one desirous of the contrary) that the book of Revelations is indeed a book of symbols. Desirous as he is to make good his cause, his own words condemn him. Let him be put to the test. Let him prove to us *the passage quoted by him from the book of Revelations*, to prove that dead souls are not unconscious, and to confirm his assertion that souls perfectly resemble their former bodies, *is not symbolical*. Let him refute the exposition we

have given of it; and he will do more to establish his case than ten thousand of his assertions will do. But so long as he cannot do this we must believe that those "unsymbolical and explanatory parts" of which he speaks, but which though he has come to the conclusion of his argument, he has failed to point out—so long, we say, as he cannot do this, so long must we believe his statement false; so long must we sup-

pose his "unsymbolical and explanatory parts" are of the same character as "the altar, the souls of them that were slain, and that cry with a loud voice"—the very opposite of what he states, and this the best reason we could have for judging him incapable of distinguishing the symbolical from the unsymbolical, the parts explained from those not explained, or of knowing anything at all about it. W. D. JARDINE.

### CAMPBELLISM AND DOWIEISM IN AMERICA.

DR. THOMAS, under date Sep. 8, writes as follows: "Since my return from Virginia, I have visited New England, I was very much worsted by the intense heat in the south, but of late, I have considerably recovered. I spoke four times in Baltimore, eight times in Richmond, King William County, and Norfolk, and twice in Philadelphia. After I left Richmond, the Campbellites began to roar out blasphemies against me in the paper they publish there, called the *Christian Examiner*. I have been requested to reply; but I do not think the misrepresentations worthy of notice. During the war, the brethren there called themselves Nazarenes, under which name they obtained exemption from military service. The Campbellite in his roaring, styles us all "blind and deluded advocates," and continues, "Nazareneism has been, in its results, a thing of unmitigated mischief. It is void of compensating good. Its influence, is only evil, and that continually." Of myself, it says, "Doctor Thomas, in scholarship, intellectuality, and personal popularity and influence, is the chief man among the Nazarenes or Christadelphians of this country. He is a man of more than average intellectuality, of extensive information, and of superior speaking ability. Years ago, he was very popular in Richmond and in Eastern Virginia. Wherever he preached, listening, attentive crowds hung with deep interest upon his addresses. The novelty to his hearers, of his peculiar views, astonished and attracted them. The novelty has worn off. Sober second thought has come over the once sympathisers with his strange, startling doctrines. They have judged the tree by its fruits." And does Heaven approve their judgment? Let the civil war with its calamities, and the present ruin of Richmond and Eastern Virginia, where

WORD-DESPISING CAMPBELLISM.) Prov. xiii, 13: doth most prevail, be the stern and truthful witness in the premises! "He that despiseth the word shall be destroyed."

I did not stay long at Worcester, Massachusetts, the correcting of proofs not permitting it. The attendance was good, but the three times speaking—about six hours in one day, was too fatiguing in hot weather.

Satan has been at work among the sons of the Deity and brethren of Christ in all these places, sowing his tares according to his practice of old time. His weapons are misrepresentation and falsehood. He has deceived a few weak-minded and ignorant professors, "by good words and fair speeches," but I think they have reached the end of their chain. The following are among some of the follies into which he has seduced them: 1—mortal Resurrection is not taught directly nor indirectly; 2—the righteous are not brought to judgment; 3—all men are earthy UNTIL they are baptized into Christ; 4—Jesus was not raised in a mortal body, BECAUSE the life blood of that body was poured out on the Cross; 5—there are no other than righteous saints; 6—the mortal bodies referred to in Rom. viii. 2, are those the saints had while Paul wrote; 7—those bodies are quickened when they put off the old man, and put on the new in baptism; 8—THE BODY is spoken of as being dead to sin and alive to righteousness; 9—the judgment seat and throne of Christ are identical; 10—saints are now giving account of themselves, and at death the account closes; 11—they are now on trial before the judgment seat; 12—they are clothed with the house from heaven in the grave; 13—the just will spring to life immortal by virtue of being, Christ's body and having immortality before they die; 14—the just will know

their acceptance *before they even see Christ*. It will be the first knowledge that will flash upon them as they look at their graves; 15—Jesus was no more divine than any other man; he was chosen because of his goodness, and some plainly say that Gabriel was his father; 16—there is no need to believe the covenant with Abraham, and the kingdom, to believe the gospel; 17—the saints will raise their dead babes and give them a chance of salvation. But

the blasphemies of these perverts, are endless. They make up the hash of the creatures who denounce me for “the heretic of the age,” “a wily serpent,” “a preacher of another gospel,” and so forth. These are they who have gone out from our ecclesias, because they were not of us. They have somewhat thinned us, but by their secession, diminished the bad element common to our associations, with even the apostolic societies themselves.”

## “A ‘CHRISTADELPHIAN’ AND NOT A CHRISTIAN.”

### “NO LITTLE STIR.”

The following clipping from the *Scotsman* of October 3, for which we are indebted to Bro. W. Mitchell, of Edinburgh, speaks for itself:—

“A meeting of the Parochial Board of Rothes was held last week for the appointment of a medical officer, in room of Dr. Ferguson, who resigned the office some time ago. There were seven applications, but as four of them were from a distance, three only were put on the list, and that list was reduced to two—namely, Dr. Coutts, who has been resident in the village for five years, and Dr. Hay, from Insch. The Rev. George Gray, minister, objected to the appointment of Dr. Coutts, on the ground that he was a ‘Christadelphian,’ and not a Christian, and had distributed a certain publication, entitled *Twelve Lectures*, by Robert Roberts, of Birmingham, which to his, (Mr. Gray’s) belief, were not in accordance with the scriptures. The matter is creating no little stir in the village—indeed, as one of the members of the Board remarked, “since the disruption there had been nothing like it in Rothes.” On the Board dividing, it was found that there was an equality of votes. The chairman declined to give the casting vote, and the meeting adjourned till Saturday week.”

The adjourned meeting, at which the matter was settled in favour of the gentleman who was so obnoxious to the predilections of the “reverend” member of the Board, is reported thus in the *Scotsman* of October 10:

“Much excitement has prevailed in the town of Rothes during the past few weeks as to the appointment of a successor to Dr. Ferguson, lately removed to Fort Augustus, in the office of medical officer to the Parochial Board. Dr. Coutts, who has been practising in the town and district for several years, was first proposed, but the Rev. Mr. Gray, minister of the parish, and others, objected to his appointment, mainly on the ground of his

religious creed not being what they considered it ought to be in a man who aspired to such a position as medical officer to the Parochial Board. At the meeting of the board, two weeks ago, the two candidates proposed were Dr. Coutts and Dr. Hay, Insch. On a division then ten voted for each candidate, and the chairman, Mr. Craig, factor to the Earl of Seafield, declining to vote, the meeting came to a dead-lock, and adjourned till Thursday last, when a crowded meeting was held at Rothes to settle the appointment. The Rev. Mr. Gray, in moving the appointment of Dr. Hay, spoke at great length as to his objection to Dr. Coutts. Mr. Stewart, corn merchant, seconded the minister’s motion. Mr. Green merchant, moved the appointment of Dr. Coutts, stating at great length his reasons for so doing, and producing memorials signed by the great majority of householders in Rothes in favour of Dr. Coutts’ appointment. Mr. Stewart, shoemaker, seconded, and on a division, curiously enough, eleven voted on each side, which announcement was received with great laughter, and caused no small anxiety to know what the chairman would do on this occasion. The chairman (Mr. Craig) gave his casting vote in favour of Dr. Coutts, which announcement was the signal for tremendous cheering. The triumphant party marched in procession through the town, with a band playing at their head. The Rev. Mr. Gray entered his dissent against the decision of the meeting in the following terms:—‘I protest against the appointment of Dr. Coutts as medical officer in this parish, for the following reasons: 1. Because I consider there is not sufficient evidence of his qualification for the office in respect of medical skill. 2. Because he is not in the habit of attending any church, and shows no recognition of the obligation of Christian worship—an example which has a very prejudicial influence on the community, 3. Because he has been the means of circulating in this place a book which contains a denial of many of the most important and fundamental doctrines of the Christian reli-

gion, and is fitted to produce a very pernicious effect upon the minds of many, especially of the youth of the district.'

#### THE KINGDOM OF THE CLERGY, PRESENT AND FUTURE.

Writers in the secular press, would denounce the conduct of "the Rev." Mr. Gray as "bigoted," "sectarian," "narrowminded," "illiberal," and so forth; but judging it from Mr. Gray's point of view, these, perhaps, are not the terms to employ in characterizing it. As a man of the world, allied with his fellows on the basis of natural rights, and bound, therefore to tolerate liberty of opinion without prejudice; or as a Christadelphian, sojourning in the world a stranger and a neutral, recognising the hopelessness of reforming the world, and waiting the interference of God to put matters straight, his conduct would be highly inconsistent and deserving of condemnation. But "the Rev." Mr. Gray is neither "a man of the world" nor a Christadelphian. He is, by profession, one of the rulers of the kingdom of the clergy. This kingdom consists of "the church," and "the church" throws the shadow of its jurisdiction over the length and breadth of the land, claiming the titled and the great among its subjects, and receiving the allegiance of all men, "rich and poor, free and bond." Do not the sacerdotal lights of this kingdom sit on the bench as magistrates throughout the country, and shine with dazzling lustre in the very seat of British power itself, side by side with the scions of "noble" blood? Do they not rejoice in the fulfilment of the prophecy that "the saints judge the world," and that "the kingdoms of this world are become" the kingdoms of Christ, in becoming obedient to his ambassadors, the clergy? Now, as a lesser light in this kingdom, it would ill become "the Rev." Mr. Gray to hide his light under a bushel, and neglect the duties of his office. As one of the kings and priests of the clerical kingdom, he is bound to look after its affairs and to see that "nothing that defileth, worketh abomination, or maketh a lie" enter into any of its positions or emoluments, or gain such a position as to sow disaffection among the peaceful and contented subjects of the clerical millennium. Mr. Gray—beg pardon—"the Rev." Mr. Gray is therefore to be complimented, instead of condemned, for his vigilance in detecting the enemy in his ap-

proach, and exposing to full view the hideous features which mark him as a dangerous intruder in the precincts of the parochial domain. We must sympathise with him a little in the fruitlessness of his attempt to frighten off the foe, and more particularly on account of the cause of his failure. A sad state of things it must be for the clerical defenders of the castle when half the garrison decide to open the doors to the enemy, and the commander of the citadel actually gives his casting vote in favour of the resolution. A sad thing for the clergy, truly, but a glorious thing for the world. It marks the period in which we live—a period in which God has, by divided counsels and clashing interests, so weakened the kingdom of Satan, as to provide a little breathing interval for the truth to raise its drooping head a little before the arrival of the king; for how else would there have been a people "alive and remaining" to meet him at his coming? If the clergy had continued supreme to the last, liberty would have been an empty name. Dr. Coutts, could he under such circumstances have come to a knowledge of the truth, would have found himself the inmate of a worse place than the institution over whose medical interests he will, among other duties, be called upon to preside, to the great disgust of "the Rev." Mr. Gray: and his prison warrant might not impossibly have borne a signature which Mr. Gray (though now he would blush at the thought) would not have been ashamed to acknowledge. The truth, if it had come upon the scene at all, would have been stamped out everywhere; and there would have been the stillness of death throughout Satan's kingdom, except where disturbed by the carousals of his triumphant minions. But, blessed be God, the kingdom of the clergy is not "an everlasting kingdom," as His Son's will be; and the Pope, and bishops, and "Rev." Mr. Grays are not immortal, as His saints will be. It is written, that He will break their power in pieces, and hurl them in indignation into the pit of destruction. Then shall the righteous shine forth in the kingdom of their Father, and bless the world, to its utmost bounds with justice, righteousness, peace, health, plenty, and prosperity, and then shall rise from its every border a loud song of praise, echoing from hill to hill, "Alleluia! Salvation, and honour, and glory, and power, unto the Lord



our God: for true and righteous are thy judgments: for He hath judged the great whore which did corrupt the earth with her fornication, and hath avenged the blood of his servants at her hand."

As to Mr. Gray's "protest," it is a perfectly natural ebullition of the clerical disappointment at the adverse result of the vote. It begins the fire at long distance. "Medical skill" gives him a decent pretext for putting his discontent into formal shape. He is not in a position to impugn the medical skill of the obnoxious officer, but like the cunning slanderer, who is too cowardly to brave an open lie, he can raise suspicion by saying in a damaging way, what may be true and yet most innocent of real import of evil. To say you know nothing good of a man, may be literally true from your ignorance of him, and yet it may be a scandalous libel if said without qualification, for it is to suggest that the man is a scamp. So Mr. Gray begins his protest with foxey cunning: he declares there is *insufficient evidence* of skill; and as this is a matter of opinion or individual knowledge, he can safely say it. He cannot allege evidence of want of skill. But the complaint about skill is a mere decoy. The real grief begins to come out in the second item of the protest; Dr. Coutts "*is not in the habit of attending any church.*" This is the crime: we can quite imagine Mr. Gray sincerely considering it such: but sincerity may be very ignorant and mistaken. If Mr. Gray's eyes were enlightened, he would see that in Dr. Coutts' circumstances, there is very great virtue in "not attending any church," that is, any orthodox place of worship, for when a man sees the truth, it is a crime for him to attend such a place, and an act of courageous self-denial to keep away, when by going, he would make friends—keep himself respectable, and get clerical votes. So long as a man is "in the habit of attending any church," there is scarcely a possibility of his being saved: for in "any church," the gospel is denied, and without the gospel, no man can be saved.

Mr. Gray may speak the truth, so far as he is concerned, when he says that Dr. Coutts "*shows no recognition of the obligations of Christ's worship;*" but so far as this would convey the idea that Dr. Coutts does not recognise worship as divinely instituted, it is a misrepresentation. Dr. Coutts, like every

other true Christadelphian, acknowledges the duty (of all who believe and obey the truth), to assemble weekly, and worship God in the appointed way, in connection with the breaking of bread; and under favourable circumstances, he would doubtless exemplify his conviction; but if there are none of "like precious faith" with himself in the village of Rothes, he has no alternative but walk with God in the solitude of an isolated faith in the testimony of God.

The third point in the clerical indictment against Dr. Coutts is a compliment to him; "he has been the means of circulating in this place a book, &c." This shows that Dr. Coutts, having accepted the truth himself, is prepared to do his duty to others, by giving them an opportunity of possessing the precious boon as well, instead of hiding the counsel of God, either from fear of the parish minister, or dislike of the trouble and expense which the discharge of such a duty entails. Dr. Coutts is neither a coward nor a traitor, Mr.—"the Rev."—Mr. Gray being witness. But the crime is in the nature of the article circulated. The book, in Mr. Gray's opinion, "contains a denial of many of the most important and fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion." Understanding by "the Christian religion," the religion of the clergy, the allegation is true. It has come to pass that in order to preach the truth, one has now-a-days to deny "many of the most important and fundamental doctrines of the (orthodox) Christian religion." But of course, Mr. Gray, being on the side of the "fundamental doctrines," protests against the denial as "fitted to produce pernicious effects upon the minds of many," &c. Thanks be to God, he can go no farther than protest. He cannot intercept the circulation of the hated book, nor prevent the conviction which it is calculated to form in "the minds of many" that the system of which he is an upholder and a preacher, is a grand imposition from the lowest stone at the bottom to the cock of the highest steeple.

May God hasten the development of this conviction on all hands, that honest God-fearing people may be emancipated from the iron thralldom of orthodox superstition, and admitted to that glorious fraternity of free men, which stretch from Abel to the last saint elected before the advent of the Lord.

It is to be presumed that "the triumphant

party," who gave processional and band playing vent to their glee, was not the Christadelphian party, but that section of the parochial powers that be that had defeated Satan's manoeuvres to retain "his power, and his seat, and his great authority." The time has not come for Christadelphian "demonstrations." We must wait the Master

of the Ceremonies. When Christ comes, the saints will "shout aloud for joy," and, seizing the sword of power, drive the last supporter of superstition into the abyss. Till then they wait with unobtrusive patience, fellowshipping the sufferings of Christ, working out their own salvation with fear and trembling.  
EDITOR.

## ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

**BELIEVING DEVILS.**—(E.L.C.)—James ii, 19: "*The devils also believe and tremble.*" Men possessed of unclean spirits were themselves spoken of as unclean spirits (or demons)—(Mark iii, 11.) These lunatics were believers in God and in Christ, as is proved by their ejaculations on meeting Christ; but their faith was not a saving faith, because it did not work rational results in their lives. James points to this as a proof that "faith without works is dead."

**MARRIAGE.**—(E.L.)—There is nothing to prevent marriage with a Chinese woman or any other female of the *genus homo*, provided she be a believer. It is all a matter of taste. It is not usual for brethren to officiate in marriage, except in Scotland. It is unnecessary, however, to submit to clerical manipulation, as the law in Britain allows the registrar of the district to perform the ceremony. How it is in China, you will know best.

**THE CHANGE FROM FLESH TO SPIRIT.**—(J.W.C.)—"Flesh and blood" in 1 Cor. xv, 50, can only be understood of living mortals; and the statement that as such, they cannot inherit the kingdom of God, proves they must undergo the change specified at a later part of the chapter (1 Cor. xv, 51)—viz., their mortal constitution must be changed by the quickening action of the spirit upon their mortal bodies (Rom. viii, 11), resulting in incorruptibility of substance, and, consequent immortality of life. The transition from one state to the other is instantaneous (verse 52), and does not admit of an intermediate condition.

**JESUS NOT A DESCENDANT OF AARON.**—(J.B.)—Jesus was not of Aaronic descent. Paul expressly settles this in Heb. vii, 11-16. He describes Jesus as "another priest . . . after the order of Melchizedec, and *not called after the order of Aaron,*" and says "It is evident that our Lord sprang out of Juda, of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood." The fact that Elizabeth, the mother of John the

Baptist (of the daughters of Aaron) is styled "cousin" to Mary, the mother of Jesus, does not prove an Aaronic connection for Mary. "Cousin" (*sungenees* in the Greek) has not the strict and limited meaning attached to it in English. It expresses the idea of kindred generally. The tribes intermarried (Numb. xxxvi, 3), and in this way relationships were created between persons belonging to different tribes. Mary was of the tribe of Juda, and had no blood connection with the house of Aaron, but may, by the intermarriage of her relations, have become related in law to Elizabeth.

**RE-IMMERSION.**—(W. J. B.)—Baptismal immersion in water produces no result of itself: its efficacy arises from divine recognition. But, this divine recognition can only be secured by a compliance with the divine appointment in the matter. God has not required, and we may safely conclude, will not recognise, the baptism of an unbeliever or an ignorant person. The only parties whom he has commanded to be baptised are those who believe the gospel. Now, as an orthodox Baptist, you did not believe the gospel, because you were ignorant of it. Hence, your immersion in those days was not the baptism required. If you would be in harmony with the divine will, you must be baptised again on coming to a knowledge of the truth. It is true there is only one baptism, but that is the baptism of an intelligent believer of "the things concerning the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ." You were not such a believer, and therefore your immersion was a valueless ceremony performed in well-intentioned ignorance.

**THE BIDDEN AND UNBIDDEN GUESTS, JEWS AND GENTILES.**—(T.M.)—The bidden guests of the parable (Luke xiv, 16-24) were the Jews, "to whom pertaineth the adoption and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises."—(Rom. ix. 4.) The unbidden guests, who were pressed into attendance, were the Gentiles, who did not come within the original scope of the gospel. Jesus said,

"I am not come but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel."—(Matt. xv, 24.) For this reason, he prohibited his apostles from evangelizing among strangers, commanding them to limit their operations to the Jews, (Matt. x, 5), a charge which the Christians kept for some time after the ascension of Christ.—(Acts xi, 19). But the Jews rejected the advances that were made to them, and then the apostles were commanded to extend the offered favour to the Gentiles.—(Acts xiii, 46, 47; xxii, 21; xxviii, 25-28). The Gentiles accepting the invitation, are spoken of by Paul under the simile of branches cut from wild stock, and grafted on a good olive tree; and they are warned against presumption, on that account.—Rom. xi, 17-24.)

**THE BIRTH OF CHRIST.**—(CHARLES DEALTRY.)—The second part of your letter, of which a portion appeared some months ago, raises the question of authenticity on grounds which open up interminable controversy. We have therefore decided not to publish it. The *Ambassador* is devoted to the work of upholding what the word teaches, and cannot afford to be diverted from its work by the discussion of the merely speculative suggestions of those whose theories create the necessity for getting rid of the gospel of John, and integral portions of Matthew and Luke. The suggestions in question are purely speculative. What one may conclude from given premisses, ought to have been or ought not to have been, as regards the facts or literary features of any historical document, is at all times of doubtful weight. A knowledge of the facts as they were at the time, would doubtless, in most cases, dispel the most ingenious theory. Ingenuity on the other side is quite as fruitful of plausible suggestion. Every one of your objections can be turned round. 1.—The improbability of the miraculous conception was a sufficient reason why angelic confirmation of Mary's word to Joseph was necessary. It was morally impossible Joseph could otherwise have believed it. 2.—Joseph's intention to put Mary away "privily" on discovering her to be with child, is in keeping with his character as "a just man," because it evinced a desire to spare Mary the disgrace of open exposure. He wished to save her unnecessary shame. Loving mercy and peace, he contemplated the quiet performance of a painful duty. The term "just" (*dikaïos*) as applied to Joseph, comprehends the idea of kindness and uprightness. His uprightness was not compromised by his purpose to have a private separation. Had his kindness taken the form of an intended continuance of the conjugal relation, in the face of her apparent criminality, there might have been some reflection on his justice. 3.—Dreams have not been so uncommon as you seem to think in the history of divine communications. "If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will speak to him in a dream."—

(Num. xii, 6.) "Your young men shall see visions; your old men shall dream dreams."—(Joel ii, 28.) Your suspicion of "miracles in dreams" is a little obscure as applied to Matt. i and ii. If you consider the appearance of an angel in a dream, a miracle, then you are intelligible, but be consistent, for your complaint tells with equal force against Daniel. "Daniel had a dream," and in the dream, the miracle of revelation was performed in its highest form, for in his dream, Daniel had communicated to him by angels (Dan. vii, 16) a complete disclosure of the world's future history. So also, with Nebuchadnezzar's secret: "The secret was revealed to Daniel in a night vision." Paul is an example of the same thing. Information in dreams was frequent in his experience. "A vision appeared to Paul in the night. There stood a man of Macedonia, &c."—(Acts xvi, 9). "Then spake the Lord to Paul in the night by a vision, Be not afraid but speak, &c."—(Acts xviii, 9). "The night following, the Lord stood by him and said, Be of good cheer, Paul, &c."—(Acts xxiii, 2). "There stood by me this night the angel of God, &c."—(Acts xxvii, 23.) The case of Joseph is therefore no exception, but on all fours with those you are bound to admit. 4.—"Jesus" and "Emmanuel" are coincident terms, one of Greek and the other of Hebrew origin; the one means *God shall be the saviour*, and the other, *God with us*. To be the saviour, he had to be "with us" in the manifestation of himself, in a son of man; and therefore being Jesus, he was necessarily Emmanuel. You are prevented from seeing this harmony by your mistake on the origin and nature of Christ; albeit the prediction that he should be called the one, is not given as the reason why he was called the other. 5.—The appearance of the wise men, or magi, on the scene, was no doubt a little wonderful, but it does not follow that it did not take place. Our ignorance of the nature and the reason of their advent from the East, is not to be allowed any weight against the recorded fact that they did journey to the birth place of the Messiah. It was rather fitting than not, that the birth of so great a personage, should, in the providence of God, be signalized by the homage of the wise men divinely guided to his cradle. Who these wise men were, we are not informed. It is not necessary to speculate; they had heard of the Jews and their Messiah; and were possibly themselves of Jewish descent, and whoever they were, God who went before the tabernacle in the wilderness, in a pillar of cloud by day, and of fire by night, evidently guided their path by meteoric sign, to the locality of the great wonder predicted by Isaiah.—(Isaiah ix, 4.) You can only deny this; your dogmatic expletives prove nothing. 6.—Jesus, though born in Bethlehem, is called Jesus of Nazareth, because he was brought up at Nazareth. This is natural. If there is anything

as against Matthew's narrative (of his birth at *Bethlehem*), in your argument on the fact that he is invariably styled "Jesus of Nazareth," you are bound to discredit Micah, who predicted his birth at Bethlehem. 7.—Chronological difficulties (especially such as involve a discrepancy of only a year or two), can have no weight against the facts you assail, considering that chronology itself is so obscure (for various cogent reasons), that nothing definite to a year can be predicated on it. The knowledge of parties living at the time the disputed chapters were written (even granting for a moment they are interpolations), is infinitely more valuable than the most carefully worked deduction of a nineteenth century critic; and surely the writer of Matthew is as much to be trusted as the profane writers of the same period. The Augustine enrolment which took Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem, and fulfilled a prophecy, was naturally an important event from the evangelist's point of view, while to the ordinary historian, it might be a matter of executive routine calling for no special record. It has to be remembered at the same time, that the veriest fragment of Roman writings have come down to our time, and that if any considerable portion had been preserved, we might have had confirmatory testimony to the occurrence of the taxing. 8.—Hosea xi, 1, doubtless referred to the exodus of Israel, but there is such a thing in prophecy as a double (or twice repeated) application of the same words. When Jesus came from Egypt at the death of Herod, the words were certainly fulfilled, "Out of Egypt have I called my son," and it is not for us to say that this application did not come within the intended scope of the words when delivered. 9.—The slaughter of the babyhood of Bethlehem may have occurred, notwithstanding the omission of all mention of it from the writings of contemporary historians. Many things happened of which history has preserved no record. In every history, things are omitted which are mentioned in other histories; but their credibility is not necessarily invalidated. The historian Matthew mentions this incident, because it had an intimate relation

to the central theme of his narrative, in which other writers had no interest; and this is sufficient to commend it to belief. 10.—The fact that none of the prophetic writings extant contain the prediction, "He shall be called a Nazarene," does not exclude the possibility of its having been contained in some of those which have not come down to our time. The occurrence of a mythical citation would be inconsistent with even your view of Matt. i and ii, for had the writer of these chapters been the clever forger you allege, he would have taken care to avoid such a direct evidence of the fraud. 11.—The difference of Luke's narrative from that of Matthew, in the particulars of the birth of Christ, is certainly no argument to be used by an individual who rejects Luke. The difference is an argument in favour of both. Luke's narrative was written long after Matthew's. It was prompted by the inferior attempts of "many" to "set forth in order" "the things" believed by the Christians; and coming after them, would necessarily be more complete than the other. The details of Matthew he omits, as of a gospel already well known and long established, and supplies others ascertained by himself by enquiry. If both had been the work of the forger, they would have been marked by those features and resemblances, the absence of which you use against them; or if one had been true and the other false, the false narrative would have been run in the mould cast by the genuine, for the sake of credulity. If both are false, it is singular they are dissimilar, and strange the forgers did not finish their work by accomplishing a similar fraud with Mark and John. But the truthfulness of both is confirmed by the circumstance that dissimilarity of incident is united with substantial identity of narrative—a peculiarity that always characterises two truthful accounts of the same thing. After all that can be said in a kind of controversy so elastic and interminable, it remains to be repeated what has already been said, viz., that the divine sonship of Jesus rests on grounds too broad and deep, to be overturned by even a successful attack on the records of the miraculous conception.

---

## INTELLIGENCE.

---

**BIRMINGHAM.**—There have been three immersions during the month. The first case was of special interest, as that of a judicious mind that had long struggled against the inevitable conclusion, putting it to crucial test, lest, notwithstanding appearances, the truth might, after all, be one of the many plausible fallacies which he knew to be plentiful in the religious world. The case is that of "W.O.," *alias* "FRIEND"—Mr. WILLIAM OSBORNE, of Tewkesbury, who responded to the last

reply in the following letter:—

Tewkesbury, Sep. 13, 1868.

My dear Sir—I cannot but feel under great obligation to you for your repeated attentions to my various difficulties from time to time. If every convert were as slow and tedious in coming, you might not be long in getting weary in the work, if not of it. True you have, perhaps, been animated by the "size of the ship," in thus helping to get it "out of dock"—distance having lent enchantment

to the view; the view being perhaps telescopic and magnified. Should it sail into "your port," I doubt its "size" proving above "mediocrity," very likely *below* it.

I quite think twenty years' residence in the precincts of "Doubting Castle" has engendered a state of mind which makes it difficult to get "free;" but I hope the bracing nature of the fresh air of Truth will complete the liberation of the captive.

His present position is not enviable: one foot on the old superstitions, and one on "the faith" of scripture—the former in the act of being raised, and the latter bearing the body's weight, but still giving the appearance of divided attachment. It is a position I am ill satisfied with. Worship with "orthodoxy" (so called) is got out of the question. "Prayers" and "sermons" are alike instigators of antagonism and thorough dissatisfaction; and singing "There is a happy land," and such like, does not prove anything more congenial. And then "about the children," as I once asked. It seems like leading them into the lion's residence every time they are taken to listen to *sounds* that the word of God condemns. I would, then, get out of this ambiguous position; and if I did nothing else, I could thus render a *silent* testimony to the truth. I now see nothing in your explanations of faith and doctrine but what is in accordance with the "Word," and am only stopped by the "Examination" difficulty. I have well turned over your representation of the matter in the August *Ambassador*, and feel much indebted to you, being at least silenced, if not convinced. All the reason and "philosophy" appear on your side, and scripture not against it. Need I "confess" more? I should be only too happy to be identified with the sect that is "everywhere spoken against;" being quite satisfied that they only are in the "narrow way" that leads to life everlasting. Thus I am ready to comply with your invitation to "arise and be baptised, and wash away my sins."

Reading September *Ambassador*, I have been quite envious of the happiness of friend Boshier, who, in one short six months, could surmount all his difficulties, and leave friends and doctrines, and all behind for his "new love," while for two and a half years have I been slowly wading in the same direction, and not yet arrived in port.

I remain, &c.,

W. OSBORNE.

As "examination" in a case like this was as much a superfluity as in apostolic days, (there being an ample guarantee without it, that the faith was received in its entirety), there was no "difficulty" so far as Mr. Osborne's obedience was concerned, and arrangements were accordingly made for his immersion, which took place at Birmingham, on Sunday, October 4, at the close of the evening meeting, in the presence of a large

company of the brethren and friends.—The second case was that of CHARLES HUMPHREYS, railway clerk, Cheltenham, a young man who, having come to a knowledge of the truth through brother Otter of the same place (in the same calling), was accompanied by him to Birmingham, to be immersed. The immersion took place on Saturday, October 17, and the two brethren broke bread with the ecclesia, on the following day, when brother Boshier, of London, happened also to be present.—The third case was that of CHARLES RICKUS (33), purse manufacturer, who has been in attendance at the meetings for a length of time.—The annual meeting of the ecclesia was held on Monday, October 5. Business was preceded by the usual cup of tea, which affords the means and occasion of familiar and agreeable intercourse. After tea (brother Bailey occupying the chair), the usual reports were read, showing the following facts:—During the year, the ecclesia had raised £140. Of this, there has gone in current expenditure, £18 in the construction of a bath for immersions; £27 towards the expenses of Dr. Thomas's approaching visit; and miscellaneous, £95. The additions during the year have amounted to 30. The weekly attendance at the table has averaged 65, and the collection, £1 18s. The total number of brethren and sisters now on the roll available for attendance at Birmingham, is 113. A harmonium has been introduced into the hall, in aid of the singing.—A resolution has been adopted, by which 2,000 of each issue of the *Christadelphian Tracts* will be placed at the disposal of the ecclesia for distribution. That number will be purchased out of the funds of the ecclesia, and placed in the hands of a brother for gratis supply to brethren and sisters who may have zeal, or time (or both), for the work of distribution. By a door-to-door delivery in divers parts of the town, on Sundays or other days, the light will be kept in continual view of the town. The tracts contain an advertisement of the place of meeting, and of the books expository of the truth: so that, so far as they could be so in so small a compass, they are finger-posts and guides to the way of life. What if ninety-nine out of one hundred fall like snow-flakes on the water (which is probable), the hundredth may be the means of bringing a son of God to the truth; and, whether or no, the ecclesia does its duty as the pillar, ground, and beacon-light of the truth, and contributes to solve the question how best and most effectively the truth can be testified in these dark days, when there is no vision, messenger from God, or spirit attestation of the truth proclaimed. It is to be hoped the hearts of many will be smitten with this work, and carry forward a saving testimony for the truth of God in these closing days of the Gentile dispensation.

CHELTENHAM.—See Birmingham Intelligence. There are good hopes of the formation

of an ecclesia in this place. Brethren Otter and Humphreys are zealous towards this end. May the pleasure of the Lord prosper in their hands.

GALSTON.—Brother Dr. Ramsay writes, October 5th, as follows: "I am happy to inform you that I have now a brother in Christ in Galston, Robert Bennet, a middle-aged man: he is an old collier, troubled with asthma, consequently could not go under water here without risk. He went to Glasgow, and I gave him a note of introduction to the brethren there: he being also personally acquainted with Brother O'Neil, of Glasgow, formerly of Galston; and he was united to the only name under heaven, among men, whereby we can be saved. We meet to break the loaf every first day, and occasionally during the week."

GLASGOW.—Brother Clark states that an effort has been made by the Dowieites in Edinburgh to amalgamate the various discordant bodies in Glasgow, who make more or less a profession of the truth. This took the form of addresses on "Union," by one of their number, delivered at the various meeting places where permission to speak was obtained. The application for permission to use the meeting-place of the Christadelphians was responded to in the following letter:

"DEAR SIR.—I received your letter and laid your proposal before the brethren with whom I associated, and we unanimously decline having to do with the proposed scheme of unity. The truth rightly understood and affectionately believed, is the only basis from which edification and comfort can be developed. We cannot recognize and fellowship individuals, who are either ignorant or perverters of some of the first principles of the oracles of God, for, in so doing, we should be acting a cruel and wicked part to them in propping them up in a false position, which, in all likelihood they would only come to know when it was *too late*. Our desire is to be found faithful and true witnesses for God's truth. There are many in Glasgow professing to believe the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Anointed; and if there be disunion among them, it arises from the fact that they either do not know the truth, or that it has no hold upon the affections: in either case, the result is death. Taking your letter in connexion with a short article which appeared in this month's *Ambassador*, it appears to us that you are one of those whose toleration goes the length of fellowshiping one who denies the only hope of Christ's brethren, viz., the resurrection of the dead. If so, then it is our duty to warn our brethren everywhere against this modern Oregonism, lest it beguile the unwary.

Were it even possible to patch up a union of all who profess to know the truth, they would have no affinity, like the legs and feet

of Nebuchadnezzar's image. We are not against union among the remnant of the woman's seed now scattered in the wilderness, but shall be right glad to welcome among us any who have taken the promises of God to their heart, as their only hope and portion for ever. But we have no idea of constituting ourselves churches, after the pattern of the apostacy. You will perceive at once that there is no affinity between us upon this subject; and two cannot walk together unless they be agreed.

I am yours, on behalf of the Christadelphians, meeting at 280, George Street, Glasgow,  
WILLIAM CLARK, Sec."

Brother Ellis, of Edinburgh, commenting on the subject, says: "Your friend, Alexander Black, is at present visiting in Glasgow, on the Sundays, with the view of bringing all the parties there into one meeting. His foundation is similar to that propounded by Alexander Campbell some twenty years ago, viz: a confession that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. The grand mistake that he, and other well-meaning people fall into, is the supposition that unity can be attained at pleasure. Unity is the result of certain affinities coming to the knowledge of each other, and wherever these certain affinities exist, and a mutual knowledge of them is attained, unity must be the inevitable result. But the attempt to cultivate unity by ignoring the truth, understandingly loved, will always result in more division."

HALIFAX.—Bro. R. Whitworth, under date Oct. 22, reports the following immersions: Sunday, Sep. 13, MRS. BAIRSTOW, wife of brother D. Bairstow, formerly Wesleyan Methodist; Sunday, Sep. 20, WILLIAM UNSWORTH, tin plate worker, Hull, formerly Church of England; JAMES PHILLIPS, shoe maker, Hull; Sunday, Oct. 11, ZECHARIAH DRAKE, ironmonger, Elland, near Halifax, formerly Independent; Sunday, Oct. 18, THOMAS SWINDEL, grocer, Halifax, formerly Baptist; JOHN BIRKENHEAD, of Sale, near Manchester, (brother to bro. W. Birkenhead, of the same place,) formerly Church of England; WILLIAM CARR, saddler, of Sale, near Manchester, formerly Church of England. These immersions (only three of which are additions to the Halifax ecclesia,) involve, as it will be perceived, the embryotic formation of ecclesias at Manchester and Hull, two principal towns of the kingdom. May they take deep root and grow largely in numbers, knowledge and love. The brethren at Halifax wish it to be understood that there are no "vain janglings and strivings about the law" rife in their midst, but only "expositions of the law of Moses from one of their brethren, which have been on many occasions most edifying, and have opened up in some measure a source of instruction, as far as they know, hitherto untouched, except by our beloved brother, John Thomas, of America."

**HULL.**—See Halifax intelligence. May the new brethren recognise their position and realise their responsibilities.

**LEICESTER.**—Brethren Buckler and Lester, compelled by the unfriendly attitude of friends, have begun to break bread in a summer house two miles out of the town. They have succeeded in arresting the attention of a number, and are hopeful that some will receive the truth, and join them in upholding a pure testimony. They are turning their opportunity to the best advantage, by a liberal resort to the use of book-lending.

**LONDON.**—Brother Hayes, who has been in the metropolis several weeks, writes on September 28th, that the prospects of the truth in London are good at the present time; "certainly far better," he says, "than I have ever known them before. There are several interested inquirers, and an agitation going on in the previously long-stagnant waters of orthodoxy, which can hardly fail to result in some good eventually. During brother Andrew's absence, I have delivered a lecture each Sunday evening to attentive and increasing audiences. Last night there were forty-five persons present, being the largest number I have yet seen assembled in Crowndale Hall, and certainly some of them appear to be of the right stamp." Brother A. Andrew writes that "interest in the truth is steadily progressing in London. The circle of enquirers is increasing in number. A Bible class of twenty young men assembles in the brethren's meeting-place, Crowndale Hall, on Sunday afternoon, under the tutorage of a Mr. Watts, who was formerly connected with Vernon chapel (Spurgeonite), where he taught a much larger class, of which the twenty young men mentioned are the remnant. On getting hold of the truth, he began to teach it, and this was so offensive to the authorities of the chapel that he had to leave. Twenty young men followed him, desiring him to continue the class, and to let them have more of the 'new doctrine.' Arrangements having been made with the brethren for the use of their room on Sunday afternoon, he acceded to their wishes, and is himself progressing rapidly to a full comprehension of the things of the kingdom and name, while leading others in the same direction.—The brethren have commenced the issue of monthly handbills, announcing subjects of lecture for the Sunday evenings of the month. The subjects for September were as follow:—(Dr. Hayes being the lecturer.)

1.—The preaching of the Lord Jesus and his apostles in the first century, and the preaching of the 'ministers of the gospel' in this nineteenth century, compared and contrasted.

2.—The Kingdom of God, as it existed in the days of Solomon, and as it is hereafter to exist under Jehovali's anointed king.

3.—'Nebuchadnezzar's image explained.'

4.—'The origin and nature of the Lord Jesus, the Christ of God.'

The subjects for October, were as follow: (Brother Andrew being the lecturer, except on the first subject):

1.—The origin and nature of the Lord Jesus (concluded from the previous week by Dr. Hayes.)

2.—'The kingdom of God as taught in the New Testament shown to be neither church on earth, nor a kingdom in the skies.'

3.—'Moses against immortal-soulism, or the nature of man as taught in the Pentateuch.'

4.—'The restoration of the Jews to Palestine, necessary to the establishment of the kingdom of God.'

The following items are from brother J. J. Andrew: "On the 29th of August, I had the pleasure of immersing at Burgh Castle, Great Yarmouth, ANNIE JANE TWELVE-TREES, aged 18, as the result of above eighteen months' examination of the scriptures. She postponed rendering obedience to the truth for some time, at the urgent request of relations, who thought it was only a temporary whim. But, subsequent examination of the things of the kingdom and name only confirmed her convictions; so she felt compelled to give effect to them without further delay." He also says: "On Sunday morning, the 18th inst., we had two immersions, consisting of ALFRED DAVID THOMAS, age 26, in the employ of the New River Company, and his wife, JANE THOMAS, both of whom were formerly Congregationalists. On Sunday, the 25th instant, we further immersed (Mrs.) ELIZABETH LOWE, (45), and (Miss) LYDIA PRISCILLA LOWE, (23), 'until recently members with the Plymouth Brethren. All of these are relations of brother Lowe, of Swansea, by whom the truth was first introduced to them."

**MANCHESTER.**—See Halifax intelligence. May the standard of the truth be successfully planted in this great centre of population.

**TEWKESBURY.**—See Birmingham Intelligence. The truth has now made a living commencement in this place, in the obedience of Mr. Osborne.

**WHITBY.**—Brother Shuttleworth, writing October 19th, announces the following immersions and addresses to the ecclesia:—HENRY WETHERILL, (28), jet worker; ELIZABETH FOWLER, (25), widow; HENRY HARRISON, (20), compositor. The Rector of Whitby, having recently advocated the union of Church and State, in an address reported in the papers, the brethren (on the principle of turning every opportunity to good account), issued a handbill, worded as follows, in announcement of a reply by brother Shuttleworth: "THE RECTOR OF WHITBY ANSWERED. Prayer meeting at the Iron Church! Mr. Keane's

Bible arguments for a State Church (as reported in the *Whitby Gazette*) examined; the 'Rector's Pastoral Address' analysed, on Wednesday evening, October 7th, at Seven o'clock, in the Commercial Rooms, Flowergate, when Mr. Keane and the clergy, and all who are interested in THE PRESENT CRISIS, are respectfully invited to attend." Brother Shuttleworth reports as follows on the result: "The room was crowded on the occasion. Reports in both papers (of proceedings at the Iron Church,) I see notice what they call our blasphemous assertion that the alliance of the church with the state is an adulterous and unholy union. The address reported (at the Iron Church) purports to prove that that alliance is scriptural. I have already got a reply in the *Whitby Times*, and have another one ready for the *Whitby Gazette*; and I have also taken up the matter in some measure in No. 3 of the *Biblical Newspaper*, which will be ready in a day or two. Two reporters were present at our lecture, but the report was squeezed out by electioneering addresses."

#### UNITED STATES.

WINONA CITY, MINN.—"In far off Minnesota, United States, in this little corner of our Father's green earth called Winona, my husband and self have been alone two years, waiting and anxiously watching the receding Gentile night, and the steadily advancing beams of the glorious morning of Israel's deliverance. And while waiting, we reach out and around, and gather into our hearts new love for the faithful, whenever and wherever we read and hear of them. I thought it might cheer your heart, with others of the dear brethren and sisters across the Atlantic to hear from us, of whom, I think you have heretofore not learned. Nearly three years since, through the anxious kindness and true Christadelphian love of John D. Benedict, and Angelina his wife, of Wisconsin, we received presents of *Elpis Israel*, and first and second vols. of *Eureka*. Shrouded in settled midnight, as were our minds at the time: yet thanks—for ever thanks to the Father Deity—the glorious light of the gospel of His dear Son did shine into our hearts by the aid of these agencies. Hungry, weary, and faint, I had almost, if not entirely resigned the expectation of finding an intelligent and scriptural faith on earth,—sensible it was not to be found among those now called 'christians'—and myself too weak, too ignorant and blind, to discover the Way, the Truth, and the Life even with it in my hands. I think while memory remains with me, I shall never forget what wondering joy I followed that dear brother, and faithful labourer for Christ, Dr. John Thomas, as he lifted thick veil after veil from the word of the Deity—and I for the first time could in some degree comprehend its

import, and contemplate its, to me hitherto, hidden glories, and the living designs of the Father Deity through it, to a death-doomed world. Oh how sincerely we thanked Him—and do still—for existence continued unto us until we might thus learn the "things of the kingdom and name of Jesus Anointed. There were five members of our own family at that time, and one daughter by marriage. Since then my husband, T. R. Gage, son, Chapman C. Gage, with Sarah his wife, our daughter—now married—Nettie A. Brown, and myself have been baptized into the saving name, and with much faith we are hoping that our remaining daughter and husband, both may yet—and before long—be wise, and heed the call before the Master of the house shall rise and shut the door. Last Sunday week my husband led a believer into the Mississippi river, and assisted him to put on Christ in the appointed way; and now although our three children are away from us, we have one brother with us; his name is Caspar Monroe, an educated and highly intelligent Swede. He was educated to the Episcopal 'ministry' at home, but was too intelligent to believe in it, and too honest to preach what he could not believe. He came to America, and was fast growing into infidelity—as well he might—but a humbler or more joyfully thankful believer than he is now, I think I have not seen. About forty miles from us, in a town called Eyota, Olmsted Co., in this State, is an ecclesia of twelve Christadelphian brethren. I believe they are *live* ones too. Brother J. Lyman Wright, and brother John Harrow, of that ecclesia, baptised us here."—CAROLINE L. GAGE.

#### CANADA WEST.

Brother J. Evans, of Waterloo, writes Sept. 22nd, as follows: "You will doubtless be gratified to learn that your efforts to turn men from darkness to light, are not confined to your side of the Atlantic. In many an obscure corner of the province of Ontario, the *Twelve Lectures* find their way, and bring light and instruction to many a dark mind. Your writings are doing quite a missionary work here, real evangelists, and little cost. The *Lectures* are getting pretty well known in several localities. The truth as it is in Jesus is making some progress, and the brethren are growing in knowledge. In some places they are untrusting in their efforts to enlighten their neighbours, and such brethren are the foremost in the knowledge and practice of the truth. In other places, no efforts are made to spread the light, and the professors of the truth are making little or no progress themselves. Thus we find that an advancement in the knowledge of the things of God is inseparably connected with efforts to enlighten others.

We have had several immersions this



summer, eleven in Guelph, several in Zorra, besides eleven immersions of individuals who at the time of their previous immersion, were not sufficiently instructed in the truth concerning the name of Jesus. They did not understand the object of his death, their relation to the judgment; and on being better instructed in these first principles of the doctrine of Christ, they intelligently put on the covering name of Jehovah's Anointed. It is really surprising in what ignorance of the name of Jesus many have been immersed.

The no-judgment adversary is strong on this side of the Atlantic, (so far as the States are concerned) but I am happy to inform you that in this province his strength is small. We are happy to hear of the success of the Truth in the mother country, and hope that the number of the elect is about complete, so that we may soon be summoned into the great King's presence."

#### NEW SOUTH WALES.

SYDNEY.—Brother W. Rooke transmits on behalf of the Sydney ecclesia, £10, to be remitted to Dr. Thomas as "a small token of respect" and gratitude to him, for the benefit received from the perusal of his writings—a benefit which they describe as deliverance from Egyptian darkness, and introduction to the glorious light of the gospel. He adds that the truth is making some progress in Sydney. Since his last communication, there have been three additions to the ecclesia by immersion: JOHN STONEBOROUGH, formerly an Episcopalian, immersed May 3; PETER and ARCHIBALD GREGHOM, formerly Congregationalists, immersed July 12.—Brother Rooke, writing at an earlier date, announces the death of his wife, a sister in the faith, MARGARET ROOKE, aged 47. He says, "My dear wife fell asleep on February 22, after a severe illness of three months. We are but few, and could ill spare her from our midst. What a blessing to know that she died in the faith, and that our sorrow is not without hope; for she looked for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour, Jesus Christ."

#### "TOUCH ME NOT."

DEAR BROTHER ROBERTS.—I perceive a suggestive question at the end of the article under this heading, in the *Ambassador* for October. As it appeared to me that the solution cannot be obtained from the law, I suggest the following, which you can make any use of you think proper.

In the corresponding narrative, given by Matthew, it is evident that the two (Mary Magdalene and the other Mary,) did more than touch Jesus. "And as they went to tell his disciples, behold, Jesus met them,

saying 'Allhail,' and they came and held him by the feet, and worshipped him." The only difference between the narratives being that the one mentions the two, and the other only one. Mark also refers to more than one being at the sepulchre, chap. xvi, 1, and in the 9th verse makes mention simply of Mary Magdalene.

It appears to me that John mentions Mary Magdalene, because she only was spoken to, for both narratives must refer to the same event. If this be so, then Mary was actually holding Jesus by the feet at the time he uttered the words recorded by John, "Touch me not;" and that if any defilement could have come from the touch of Mary, that defilement had taken place before Jesus had interdicted her. The meaning of Jesus could not, therefore, be "Touch me not," but rather "detain me not, for I (have) am not yet ascended to my Father." The passive verb "am" in the C.V., suggests the idea that he was not then changed in nature, but the equivalent verb in the Greek is in the perfect tense active, *anabebeka*, and rather implies that Jesus had not yet done something which it behoved him to do. And this thing I take to be the presenting of himself before his Father, after being made alive.

When Jesus hung upon the cross, the Father withdrew His power, and the temple he had prepared for himself was destroyed by the Jews, and remained destroyed until the third day, when the Father raised him up again. Now it appears from the narratives that this act of raising from the tomb had immediately preceded the interview with Mary, and that after recovering consciousness, he had not yet presented himself as the first fruit, with his hands filled with a faith perfected by obedience, and alive after having suffered the death due to transgressors of the law of Deity. I take the full meaning of Jesus to be, therefore— "Detain me not, for I have not yet presented myself before my Father, for His acceptance of me; but go unto my brethren, and say unto them I ascend to my Father, and your Father, to my Deity and your Deity. On the same day at even, Jesus shewed his disciples his hands and his feet, and breathed on them, and said "Receive ye the Holy Spirit; whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." This circumstance proves that the temple which had been destroyed was not only raised up again, but that the Deity was now dwelling in him in a manner similar to what he did before he died, with this difference, that he was now alive for evermore, and in possession of the keys of the unseen and of death, the first-begotten from the dead; the Son of God by the power of the Holy Spirit, as testified in the Psalm "Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee."—W. ELLIS.

# THE AMBASSADOR

## Of the Coming Age.

---

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

---

No. 54.

DECEMBER, 1868.

Vol. V.

---

### THE NEW JERUSALEM EXPLAINED.

---

*(Concluded from page 302.)*

---

### THE TREE OF THE KINGDOM.

WHAT the Tree of Life represents, may be learned from the following texts: “Wisdom is a tree of life to them that lay hold upon her.” “Blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord, and whose hope the Lord is. For he shall be *as a tree planted by the waters* which spreadeth out *her roots by the river*, and shall not see when heat cometh, but *her leaf* shall be green, and shall not be careful in the year of drought, *neither shall cease from yielding fruit.*” “What is *the vine tree* more than any tree?” This text from Ezekiel shows that in the scripture style, the vine is regarded as a tree. “I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit, He taketh away; and every branch that beareth fruit, He purgeth it that it may bring forth more fruit. I am the Vine,” continued Jesus to his apostles, “ye are the branches. He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for, severed from me, ye can do nothing.”

“In the Word was life; and the life was the light of men.” That Word was made flesh, and named Jesus, who proclaimed himself the resurrection and the life. Hence, as the true vine, he is the Tree of Life, watered by the Spirit, which he received without measure. He is “a tree of life to them who lay hold upon him;” for he is “the power and *wisdom* of God unto them which are called.” In the book of symbols, Christ on the throne of his kingdom, and encompassed by the 144,000, is represented as “the Tree of life in the midst of the

Paradise of God." "I am," said Jesus, "the bread of life which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live *eis ton aiona eis ton aiona*, in the age." Hence, one of the inducements set before the faithful to overcome, is, in the words of Jesus, "I will give him to eat of the Tree of Life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of God;" and "Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the Tree of Life, and may enter in through the gates into the city."

To eat of this tree is to become one of the leaves of it, and to partake consequently, of that nourishment which rises from the root through the stem and branches thereof. This life-sustaining and invigorating principle, is that "pure water of life" which issues forth from the throne, and maintains the tree in everlasting freshness and beauty. It is the Tree of the Kingdom to which Jesus referred when he said, "The kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and sowed in his field, which indeed is the least of all, but when it is grown it is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof." The birds of the air are the chiefs of the nations, which saved-nations seek the tree's fruit from one new moon to another, ministered to them by its healing leaves.

### THE HEALING LEAVES.

*The Leaves of the Tree for the healing of the nations.* That is, the water of life is health-imparting to the saved nations through the Leaves of the Tree of Life. The apostles being the *branches* of the true vine tree, those who are ingrafted into that vine by the obedience of faith through their testimony, are the *leaves*, or breathing organs of the tree. The Spirit that issues from the throne of God and the lamb will breathe upon the conquered nations through the saints who then "possess the kingdom, and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven." He breathed upon the 3,000 Pentecostians through the apostles; and the result was their acceptance of Jesus as the king of the Jews, raised up from the dead to sit on David's throne; and obedience to the kingdom's gospel in his name. "He breathes where he pleases." He breathed in Jerusalem of old; he will breathe thence anew; not upon a few thousand Jews only, and through twelve men of Israel, but through "a great multitude which no man can number:" upon all the millennial nations of the earth; so that, as a consequence, "the knowledge of the glory of Jehovah shall fill the earth, as the waters cover the sea." Then "shall the Gentiles come unto Him from the ends of the earth, and shall say 'Surely our fathers have inherited lies, vanity, and things wherein there is no profit.'"

That a "leaf" or leaves when used metaphorically in scripture signifies a person, will appear from the following texts. Job, in his reasoning with God concerning his hapless condition, says, "Wherefore holdest Thou me for Thine enemy? Wilt Thou break a leaf driven to and

fro?" That is "I am a leaf, as it were, driven to and fro, wilt thou break me?" *as it were*, that is metaphorically. Isaiah addressing the transgressors in Israel, who practised idolatrous rites in gardens and under oak trees there, says to them, *collectively*, "Ye shall be ashamed of the oaks ye have desired, and ye shall be confounded for the gardens ye have chosen. For ye shall be *as an oak whose leaf fadeth, and as a garden that hath no water.*" In this, apostate Israel in church and state is likened to a withered oak, and a parched-up garden, the very opposite similitude to that in the Apocalypse, where the government of their nation is likened to a tree of life; that is to one whose leaf shall not fade, and to a well-watered garden, "the Paradise of God." The dried leaves of Israel's withered oak have done nothing for the nations, which are unhealed to this day; and will so remain for ever, unless their olive tree do "blossom and bud, and fill the place of the world with fruit." But, let the reader mark the figure, how that trees are used in scripture sometimes as representative of *polities*, good or bad, according to the condition of the trees.

There is a notable instance of this in Daniel. Nebuchadnezzar, in a dream that he had, describes a tree he saw, saying, "I saw, and behold, a tree in the midst of the earth, and the altitude thereof was great. The tree grew, and was strong, and the height thereof reached unto the heaven, and the sight thereof to the end of all the earth: the leaves thereof were fair, and the fruit thereof much, and on it meat for all: the beasts of the field had shadow under it, and the fowls of the heaven dwelt in the boughs thereof, and all flesh was fed of it." This tree was representative of "the kingdom of men," on whose Chaldean throne Nebuchadnezzar reigned as king. Hence, Daniel said, in showing the significancy of the tree, "It is thou (or thy kingdom), O king, that art grown and become strong: for *thy greatness* is grown, and reacheth unto heaven, and *thy dominion* to the end of the earth." The stump of the tree when felled, banded with brass and iron, was the kingdom of Babylon during the seven years of its king's dethronement, made sure to him on the recovery of his reason. The fair leaves of this tree shaken off, were the nobles and dignitaries of the king'dom detached from all connection with Nebuchadnezzar during the days of his calamity.

The passage already quoted from Jeremiah shows that a person is likened to a tree as well as a kingdom; and that his excellency is manifested in the condition of its leaf and fruit-bearing quality. When a tree represents a body corporate, its foliage is generally expressed by the plural "leaves," but when only one person is meant, the singular is used as "leaf." Thus, it is written in David, speaking of the man who is blessed, "He *shall* be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season; *his leaf* also shall not fade, and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper." This is predicable of the blessed man when he is a *leaf* among the leaves of the tree of life—whatsoever he doeth then shall prosper. By synecdoche, a leaf for a tree represents a man; as *an eye* in the apocalyptic living

creatures, symbolizes an individual; the rule being *a part for the whole for the decorum of the symbol*. A multitude of eyes, and a multitude of leaves, are a multitude of people, constituting a community, incorporated into a divine polity in that represented by the tree-stock, and the cherubic creatures—fire, light, and spirit, the symbols of the Godhead in manifestation through body, styled “God manifest in the flesh.”

I trust that the reader will now be able to answer the question scripturally and rationally, “What is represented by the apocalyptic city of gold and precious stones? and what by the throne, the river, and the tree of life? They are all things representative of Christ and his breast-plate saints,\* in their governmental relations to the millennial nations. There is one point, however, I have only hinted at in my exposition, which I will briefly notice here. The common version reads, “the tree of life which bare twelve *manner* of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month.” The words italicized were inserted by the translators to make out what they conceived to be the sense. Their rendering, however, is not satisfactory. The words are ξύλον ζωης, ποιῶν καρπὸν δώδεκα κατὰ μῆνα ἓνα ἑκάστου ἀποδιδοῦν τὸν καρπὸν αὐτοῦ, *a tree of life, producing twelve fruits, through one month yielding its separate fruit*. In this rendering no supplemental words are introduced. But what is the meaning of it? I believe it is symbolical of something already declared by the prophets; for the whole book of the apocalypse is a symbolical representation of the “mystery of God as He hath declared to His servants the prophets.” In these writings, He had promised blessedness and saving health to all nations; and we read of them saying in their convalescence, “Come and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and He will teach us of His ways.” Who will teach them? He who is the tree of life in the Paradise, or Garden of God. He will then produce, or reveal knowledge, pertaining to “His ways,” which knowledge is contained in “the Law” and in “the Word,” which are to go forth from Zion and Jerusalem. The law and the word of God will issue from His throne, through His king, *through stated times*, or, “from one new moon to another.” The “twelve fruits of the tree of life” are the knowledge of good tending to life, being made known in all the year. *Fruit* is anything produced. It is not produced to all the world at once; that is in a single month, but at every new moon of the year’s twelve shall strangers present themselves in Jerusalem for instruction, “and from one Sabbath to another.” The tree *produces* the knowledge, the leaves *yield* it to the nations, according to the administrative institutions of the new constitution and order of things, which I understand to be represented in the text before us.

It will hardly be necessary, I think, after this exposition, to say much about the “dogs and sorcerers without,” the Gentiles and teachers which

\* Aaron under his four-square breastplate of judgment, the Urim and Thummim, the ephod, gold, blue, purple, scarlet, and fine twined linen, in the most holy place, was a type of the New Jerusalem; that is, of Christ and his Saints in glory. Compare Aaron’s four-square with the four-square of the Apocalypse, Exod. xxviii. Concerning Christ as the precious seven-eyed stone \* like a jasper and sardina to look upon,” Jehovah says, “I will engrave the graving thereof,” which graving is represented in the workmanship and names engraved on the gates and foundations of the city.

they have heaped up to themselves after their own lusts. It must be obvious to every one that there can be none such within; but that the words are strictly true in the very nature of things, that "there can in no wise enter in anything that defileth; but only those written in the book of the Lamb's life." The Lamb's life-community is the world's unchangeable government for a thousand years. Flesh and blood cannot be a constituent of that government. It is "without;" and until that government is triumphantly established, it is in open rebellion, cursing and wailing, and gnashing its teeth.—*Herald of the Kingdom and Age to come*, (DR. THOMAS,) June, 1853.

---

### SCRIPTURAL KNOWLEDGE CONCERNING JESUS CHRIST.

---

*"These words spake Jesus . . . and this is eternal life, that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent."*—John xvii, 1, 2.

IT is very easy to see from this text, that to obtain "eternal life," a knowledge of two things, or rather persons, is indispensable. A correct idea of one insures a proper understanding of the other. This is proved by the statement Jesus made to the Jews, as recorded in the 8th of John and 19th verse. "Then said they unto him, where is thy Father? Jesus answered, Ye neither know me, nor my Father: *if ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also.*" Now if the Jews—who had many advantages over the Gentiles—did not know "the Father and the Son," it need astonish nobody if it should be found that an incorrect understanding is gone abroad among the Gentiles concerning them. We hardly need remark that the *knowledge* referred to is not a personal knowledge, for as regards the Father, that were impossible. He is "the invisible God,"—Col. i, 15—"dwelling in the light which *no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see.*"—(1 Tim. vi, 16.) And as touching Jesus Christ, the Jews addressed were familiar with his outward appearance. To know the Father and the Son, therefore, implies an acquaintance with something else pertaining to them. And this is the mind or will, purposes and *nature*. The Jews doubtless, knew a good deal concerning the Eternal by experience, that is, by judgments and mercies upon their nation. Still, they were ignorant of the divine purpose in the Messiah, or else they must have known Jesus to be he. Being deficient in this, they are said not to have known the Father. Hence it follows that a knowledge of the Father comes through a knowledge of the Son. As Jesus said to Philip, "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known *me*, Philip?" "He that hath *seen me hath seen the Father.*"—(Jno. viii, 9) Up to that time, the disciples had not the eyes of their understanding opened, so they had neither "*seen*" Jesus nor the Father: but soon afterwards, their eyes were opened. The Jews, however, are blind to this day. How important it is that we should seek to know Jesus Christ, for upon that depends the gain or loss of eternal life.

Our future existence or non-existence rests upon this. If "the understanding be darkened" in this matter, "alienation from the life of God" is the inevitable consequence.—(Eph. iv, 18.) This being so, all tradition relating thereto should be thoroughly tested by the word of the Eternal.

Very early in the christian era, notions respecting the Christ were put forward which were not approved by the apostles; and these notions are strongly depreciated in various parts of their writings. But, notwithstanding this, the notions alluded to find many adherents by so-called christians to the present time. In the end of the first century, John made it a kind of shibboleth to those pretending to have the "Spirit of God," whether "Jesus Christ had come in *the flesh*."—(1 Jno. iv, 2-3.) Any "spirit" or person who could not properly say that Jesus Christ was come in the flesh, was regarded as an enemy and an antichrist. Now, the persons whom this thing concerned, were all the followers and professed friends and disciples of the Lord: it was not an affair that affected the pagan heathen. Such is exactly the case now. It matters nothing to the sceptical crowd, nor the indifferent masses, whether Jesus were a flesh and blood man or of another composition; but to every one professing to believe on him as the Son of God, and the author of their salvation, the question is of the utmost moment. Whatever tradition may have set up, and "divinity" continued to maintain, goes, or rather will go, for nothing at all at the settling day, inasmuch as what should be known upon the subject has been very decidedly set forth for the benefit of all seekers after eternal life, in the New Testament writings, which upon this, as upon all other things, are in perfect harmony with the Old.

Nobody, perhaps, who admits that Jesus Christ has come, denies that he has come in *flesh*, but it is a very old disputed point as to what "kind of flesh" he possessed. The great majority of disputants hold that it was not the same sort of flesh as that in which our blood courses from head to foot. And still they allow that it was flesh containing blood, and make no small do about the shedding of that blood upon the cross. Paul observes that there are divers kinds of flesh—flesh of beasts, flesh of birds, and flesh of fishes; all flesh is not the same. Nevertheless, there is one particular in which all the various kinds agree, and that is, they are all *corruptible*; *the blood of every one is the life thereof*. That is the divine teaching concerning all flesh under the heavens.—(Lev. xvii, 14.) The term generally used to point out the nature of Jesus' flesh, is "*immaculate*." The meaning of this is "spotless, pure, undefiled." If this were the kind of flesh Jesus had, of course it was not corruptible, for all corruptible flesh of man is defiled by sin in its members, working death. Neither was the blood the life thereof. Now, if the blood of Jesus was not the vitalizing principle, of what use was it to the flesh? Those who contend that Jesus was immaculate, will, perhaps, meet this question with the reply that his blood was immaculate also. In that case, his flesh and blood would, of course, be sinless. This would be the flesh of angels, who are immortal, and, consequently, cannot die any more. The testimony

of Jesus and of Paul goes to show that blood is not present in an undefiled body. In Jesus' conversation with the rich young man, "the kingdom of God" and "eternal life" are used interchangeably.—(Matt. xix, 16, 23.) So that to have eternal life is to go into the kingdom of heaven. And Paul, in 1 Cor. xv, 50, writes "Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and *blood* cannot inherit the kingdom of God;" in other words, they cannot inherit eternal life. How then can flesh and blood be undefiled? It is very easy to answer this by the admission that the flesh and blood of men in general to which Paul referred, is not undefiled, but those which constituted the body of Jesus were an exception, and not alluded to in Paul's statement. But stop; is this so? Where is the proof that they were an exception? Assertion sometimes sounds plausible, but, howsoever much so, assertion is no proof. We ask again, therefore, where is the proof that the flesh and blood of Jesus Christ was not the same in nature as the flesh and blood of all other men? While the reader is trying to find something like a sound answer, let him not shut his eyes to New Testament statements on the question. Paul, in Phil. ii, 6, says "Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon himself the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of man; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." "Who for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God.—(Heb. xii, 2.) "But now once in the end of the world (age), hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, so Christ was once offered to bear the sin of many."—(Heb. ix, 26-27-28.) "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, . . . being put to death in THE FLESH."—(1 Pet. iii, 18.) "Who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not."—(2 chap., 23 v.) "Who can have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way; for that he himself also is compassed with infirmity."—(Heb. v, 2.) "Who in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up strong crying and tears, unto Him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared."—(verse 7.) "Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate."—(He. xiii, 12.)—"Searching what manner of time the Spirit which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ."—(1 Pet. i, 11.) "Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered for us in THE FLESH, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind; for he that hath suffered in the flesh, hath ceased from sin."—(chap. iv, 1.) "But rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings."—(13th verse.) "Jesus Christ who is the faithful witness, and the first begotten of the dead."—(Rev. i, 5.) "And I beheld, and lo, in the midst of the throne and of the beasts, . . . stood a Lamb, as it had been slain."—(chap. v, 6.) "And I heard the voice of many angels, saying, worthy is the Lamb that was slain."—(verse 11-12.) "And the saints sang a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to



take the book, and to open the seals thereof; *for thou wast slain.*—(verse 9.) “And their dead bodies shall lie in the street of the great city . . . where ALSO *our Lord was crucified.*”—(chap. xiii, 8.) “Remember that Jesus Christ, of THE SEED OF DAVID, *was raised from the dead* according to my gospel.”—(2 Tim. ii, 8.) “For there is one God, and one mediator between God and man, *the man Christ Jesus*, who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time.”—(1 Tim. ii, 5-6.) “*For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him.*” “And to wait for His Son from heaven, *whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus.*”—(1 Thes. i, 10.)

The suffering and death, so conspicuous in the foregoing passages, are most obviously to be received in the literal sense. There is not the slightest tinge of figure in them. They harmonize strictly with the texts of the *narrative* of the birth, life, and death of Jesus. The burning words of Jesus, when under the full sense of his approaching end, are enough, at this distance of time, to move the strong to pity and sorrow. As for those who were witnesses, they were at times overwhelmed with grief: all this strikingly indicates the reality of the thing. The emotion is the very same in mankind to-day under kindred circumstances. Let us now scan some of the narratives. “Then said he unto them, my soul is *exceeding sorrowful, even unto death* . . . and he fell on his face, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me!”—(Matt. xxvi, 38, 39.) The conversation at the supper, the hymn afterwards, and the interview in the garden, make a scene of very touching character. “And about the ninth hour, Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying ‘Eli, Eli, lama sabacthani?’ that is to say ‘My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?’ . . . when he had cried again with a loud voice, *he gave up the ghost.*”—(Matt. xxvii, 46, 50.)

What contemporary enemies and others thought of the nature of these things, is well deserving our notice. “Now, the next day that followed the day of the preparation, the chief priests and Pharisees came to Pilate, saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while *he was yet alive*, after three days I will rise again. Command therefore, that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come by night and *steal him away*; and say unto the people, he is risen from the dead.”—(63-64.) “Then answered all the people, and said, his blood be on us, and on our children.” Pilate washed his hands, and said “I am innocent of the blood of this just person.”—(24, 25.) “Herod will seek the young child to destroy him. Then Joseph arose and took the young child and his mother *by night* and departed into Egypt, and was there until the death of Herod.”—(Acts xxv, 18, 19.)

A Trinitarian may imagine his faith invulnerable, even to such a formidable power as is presented in the above testimony. He cannot see the force of these quotations against his position, inasmuch as his articles of faith have made ample provision for all therein set forth in what they call the “*Two natures in one person.*” The second article of the celebrated “*Thirty-nine*” affirms that there are two whole and

perfect natures; the Godhead and Manhood were joined together in one person." So that we are to believe that it was the "Manhood," which suffered and died and rose again. We need not be surprised at such a statement, after finding so unscriptural an account of the Deity in the first article of faith. The God of the system propounded by Act of Parliament for salvation is declared to be "*without body, parts, or passions.*" He may well be said to be without "parts" seeing that he is "without body," and, being without both, we are not surprised to find that he is without "passions" or feelings. This is a "strange God." It can never be the God of the Bible, the grand archetype of human and divine intelligences. Alas for christendom! for it is their God. Some absurd and incomprehensible thing befits the begotten of such a Deity, and lo! we are prescribed with it in the "two whole and perfect natures." This utterly unintelligible child of the "strange God" is described, after a fashion, in article XV thus: "Christ in the truth of our nature was made like unto us in all things, sin excepted, from which he was clearly void, *both in his flesh, and in his spirit.*" How different to this is the New Testament account of Jehovah's "holy child Jesus;" still not altogether different. For to be impartial and candid, it must be acknowledged that the "holy child Jesus" was, as the article states, void of sin in his spirit. It is a pity to see truth and falsehood hand in hand like twin sisters. But it is so here as often as elsewhere. A mixture is well calculated to gull the public. Sugar and varnish over any poison which does not kill at once, and they will swallow it greedily, at a high price. All the misery, from the murder of Abel to now, originated in a mixture of good and evil. The evil was introduced—whether intentionally or not, does not matter in regard to consequences—under cover of the good "Ye shall not *surely* die; for God doth know that in the day ye eat the fruit, ye shall become as Gods, knowing good from evil." This was the first transaction in soul-quackery; and the seed of the serpent has driven a roaring and profitable (?) trade ever since. True indeed was it that our first parents should, in eating the forbidden fruit, "know good and evil," but that they in nature should be as gods or angels, was falsehood. This may seem a too remote beginning of the tradition, and the event too insignificant to found the delusion of all after generations upon. Nevertheless the tradition is to-day substantially the same as that set up by the exceeding subtle beast in Eden's paradise. It was not too small a beginning. All the great curses which have from time to time over-run the world, have been at the commencement very trifling affairs in appearance. This will also be true of the blessings yet ungiven. When accomplished, men's memories will take them to very remote times, and call back a few sentences uttered by the angels to some poor and despised persons in an out of the way region. But it will be unmistakable that this was the beginning of good things to come. The kingdom of God under the figure of a tiny mustard seed, confirms and illustrates this idea.

If the fleshly mind had misconstrued the word of the Eternal as a

"word," it is no wonder that it should not have comprehended the same when it was "made flesh." In its desire for mystery, Jesus was transformed into something as absurd and contradictory as its own reasonings. There was no difficulty in seeing that the burden of the old book required a faultless man in some sense, but it pleases the flesh to conceive a man faultless altogether, "both in his flesh and in his spirit." It must have his *body* perfect as well as his mind. This surely was not "the same Christ Jesus" of whom Paul speaks, but "another Jesus" evolved from "another spirit."—(2 Cor. xi, 14.)

Z.

(To be continued.)

### LION-ROARINGS OF THE DEVIL.

THE truth is getting more and more into view, for the devil (the adversary of the truth) is roaring, and if it were not getting large and important enough to be an object in the circle of his vision, he would hold his tongue. But it has caught his eye as it slowly emerges above the horizon of the night; and it disturbs him. It is a strange sign in his heavens overhead which causes him to be tumbled up and down a little, and to be at a loss whether to pray (for the devil prays much) or revile. He is doing a little at both. The lugubrious sounds that issue from his throat are heard from various points of the compass. Speaking with a feigned "voice upon the mountains," his bellowings takes the following shape:—

"We ask the prayers of the Lord's people, that He may, if it be His will, stay the progress of this fearful evil. Some of our readers may know little or nothing of its rapid spread. We hear much—have talked with its victims, and seen something of its terrible results. The peace and well-being of families are being broken up. Wives and children are being sacrificed. Men are being ruined both for time and eternity. It is one of the most fearful signs of these evil days, and in reference to it, many seem to be given up to strong delusion to believe a lie. We trust that the fearful lengths to which these Christadelphians are going, will cause many to pause who are so busy questioning some of the *old foundations*.

Upon this, we have a few observations to offer. First, those whom Dr. Bell, (editor of the magazine from which the foregoing is extracted) invokes as the Lord's people, are not the Lord's people. The only way of knowing the Lord's people, is by comparing the doings of people with what the Lord has

commanded to be done. The Lord himself gives us this rule: "Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you."—(Jno. xv, 14.) "HE THAT HATH MY COMMANDMENTS, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me."—(Jno. xiv, 21.) "Believe in the light THAT YE MAY BE THE CHILDREN OF THE LIGHT."—(Jno. xii, 36). Now the parties addressed by Dr. Bell as "the Lord's people" believe not in the light, have not his commandments, and consequently do them not, and are therefore not the Lord's people. They believe not in the kingdom of God which Jesus preached. (Mark i, 14; Matt. iv, 17-23; Luke iv, 43; Luke viii, 1; ix, 1-2-11; xiii, 28) which is the kingdom of David (Isaiah ix, 6-7; Luke i, 30-33; Acts ii, 30) to be re-established at his coming.—(Amos ix, 11; Acts iii, 21; Matt. xix, 28.) They believe not on Jesus as the author of immortality, to be conferred only on those who believe on him (2 Tim. i, 10; Jno. xi, 25; Rom. vi, 23), but exalt as one of the first elements of divine truth, the pagan falsehood of natural immortality. They proclaim the fiction of the disembodied glorification of human ghosts in "kingdoms beyond skies," as the salvation offered to mankind, thus overthrowing the scripture, which declares that dead men are dead, and know nothing at all; (Ps. vi, 5; Eccl. ix, 5-6; Ps. cxlvi, 3-4) and reducing to the utmost insignificance the doctrine of the RESURRECTION FROM THE DEAD, which is the great essence of the salvation that has come through Christ.—(Jno. xi, 25; vi, 39-40-44; Acts xxiv, 15; iv, 2; Philip. iii, 11.) In many other particulars which might be

enumerated, they, instead of "believing in the light," reject the light,—spurning it as darkness; while on the other hand, they glorify the darkness of pagan and Papal superstition as the light of God. Therefore, instead of being "the children of light," they are of that generation of darkness which calls good, evil; and evil, good: darkness light, and light, darkness."—(Isaiah v, 20.)

They reject the gospel of the Christ, and preach a false spirit—the magnetism of their own pious brains; like the false prophets of old, they "prophesy out of their own hearts, and follow their own spirit, and have seen nothing."—(Ezek. xiii, 2-3.) It might well be said to Dr. Bell's constituency, and the followers of the clergy generally, "Hearken not unto the words of the prophets that prophesy unto you; *they make you vain; they speak a vision out of their own heart, and not out of the mouth of the Lord.*"—(Jer. xxiii, 16.) Professing to be the disciples of Christ, they revile his gospel, and despise his ordinance of baptism. They call him, "Lord, Lord;" so did many while Christ was on earth; and he said to them, "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say."—(Luke vi, 46.) They say "the people of the Lord, the people of the Lord, the people of the Lord, are we!" So said the thousands of Israel, who had more claim to utter the words, and were much more likely to be right: and yet they were all rejected, and Jesus said of them, "In vain do ye worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."—(Matt. xv, 9.)

Now, the people that Dr. Bell calls "the Lord's people," may pray long, piously, and even frantically. The Pharisees were a praying race. They made "long prayers," (Mark xii, 38,) and made a very public business of it, for which they received "greater damnation,"—(Matt. xxiii, 14); and if the prayers of God's own national people were rejected, does Dr. Bell imagine that a race of dark-minded British Gentiles (who are "pious" but unbelieving and disobedient) will be heard when they pray the God of Israel to put a stop to His own truth? Nay, verily, the heavens will be brass over their heads, and God will listen with displeasure to their blasphemous petitions. "The prayers

of the wicked are an abomination to him"—(Prov. xxviii, 2; xv, 8); and no greater act of wickedness can be perpetrated than to obstruct and try to destroy God's own works. Many of them will sin this great sin, doubtless, like Paul, "ignorantly in unbelief," and God may, to such of them as are of "a good and honest heart" grant unto them repentance and an opportunity of undoing their evil work; but so long as they occupy their present attitude towards the truth, they are the devil and Satan, whose end is to be destroyed for ever from under the heavens of Jehovah.

"This fearful evil"—as the truth is considered by the untutored world, to which Dr. Bell belongs, with all his piety and charity-schemes and soft complimentary speeches, which many of them smell rankly of the spirit of the flesh—is, thanks be to God, "spreading" and making "progress," though we fear not to the extent of Dr. Bell's apprehensions. God's will may be that it spread much, comparatively speaking, before the advent of His Son. Whether or no, let everyone who receives it, see to it that he do his utmost to impart it to others. All who receive the truth are by its reception constituted "fishers of men." Let the Master at his return, find every man at his work. "The most we can, and the best we can" must be the motto of all Christadelphians in reference to the measure of this service; that hundreds, and if it be God's will, thousands, of God-fearing men may lay hold of the forgotten hope of the gospel, and become heirs of eternal life in the glorious epoch when Christ, re-appearing on the earth, will solve all the difficulties of this groaning world, and bring to pass all the promises.

The "victims" have been talked to by Dr. Bell. Who these were, we do not know, but we know that the "victims" generally can stand some talking to. They are rooted and grounded in the faith. They can give to every man a reason for the hope that is within them. Their faith stands not in the traditions of the cradle, the Sunday school and the pulpit; but in what they have learned and read for themselves in the oracles of God. They do not, as a rule, throw aside the revered foolishness of orthodoxy, without

testing the matter well, and when they decide, we be to the orthodox doctor who ventures upon a "talk with them."

The spread of "this fearful evil" doubtless leads to some of the things which Dr. Bell describes as "terrible results." It breeds family discord where the truth does not conquer both sides of the house. Dr. Bell has seen something of this, and holds his hands aghast at the sight, as an omen that the truth is an emanation from "the horrible (devil) pit" of his Paganised theology. He seems to consider that the truth of Christ ought to cause union, concord, agreement, love, tranquillity, and every other condition savouring of that glorious state which will undoubtedly come forth as the grand result of Christ's work; and he regards the opposite results as an evidence of the truth being a lie. One can only wonder whether he is a reader of even the New Testament. It would scarcely seem that he is; notwithstanding that he takes the position of a teacher, leader, and champion. For what has Christ said of the present phase of his mission? That it would produce precisely those results which in many cases are arising from the truth being received. His words are "THINK NOT THAT I CAME TO SEND PEACE ON EARTH: I came not to send peace but a sword: for *I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law; and a man's foes shall be they of his own household.*"—(Matt. x, 34, 36.) So far, therefore, from the "terrible results" referred to by Dr. Bell, being evidence against the truth, they are in its favour. They show that the truth in its operations answers to the prediction of Christ, in relation to the effect of his truth. We do not rely upon them as favourable evidences, *per se*, but so far as they go, they tell a hopeful story for those who have been conquered by the terrible pestilence of Christadelphianism.

The "terrible lengths to which these Christadelphians are going," will, we hope, become more and more terrible. We hope they will make themselves felt throughout the length and breadth of the land, to the disquiet of those sleek, well-fed gentlemen who fatten on the prejudices of the people—

and the salvation of many honest souls who are, many of them, struggling in horror with the clouds and darkness raised around the Bible by the dogmas of Paganised christendom. Their "terrible lengths" is doubtless "one of the signs of these evil days," for if the truth had not been a revived thing in the earth at the present moment, there would have been ground for doubting that we are so near the close of the times of the Gentiles, as we have every reason for believing we are. It is a sign, but not as Dr. Bell reckons it a sign; it is one of God's signs which he mistakes for one of his devil's. It belongs to the side that he is not on. It belongs to that cycle of events which will include the advent of Jesus, the downfall of the kingdoms of men, and the perdition of christendom, all of which will equally astonish, perplex and confound him and his misguided fellows, as the advent of the truth itself has done.

The "terrible lengths" of the Christadelphians, instead of "causing many to pause who are so busy, questioning some of the old foundations," are just having the contrary effect. An increasing number are startled into enquiry, and (remarkable fact!) when a clear, thoughtful mind once enters on the path of investigation, he infallibly comes out at the other end with the conviction that the "old foundations" are but the slab stones of the Mother of Harlots' house, who has lorded it over the earth for dreary centuries of darkness.

So much for Dr. Bell and his counterfeited "Voice upon the Mountains." But the devil roars from other quarters; he makes his voice heard in the pages of Mr. Spurgeon's magazine, *The Sword and the Trowel*. One of Mr. Spurgeon's hell-fire missionaries, has been doing (so-called) "Christian work among the lowly," and in the course of his travels, he says he "unearthed the other day" "an obscure sect that is gaining a certain share of success, which boasts of the title 'Christadelphians.'" He attributes the existence and success of this "obscure sect" to causes which in view of all things, must be pronounced remarkable. He says, "the more thoughtful and intelligent mechanics are most apt to nurse heresy!" From this it follows, that in order to be free from "heresy," a man must be "thoughtless and ignorant;" or rather that the more of an utter noodle a man is, the greater are his chances of salvation! Truly, "where ignorance is bliss, 'tis

folly to be wise."

Ought it not to suggest suspicion to the upholders of orthodoxy that when "thoughtfulness" and "intelligence" are brought to bear upon their doctrines, there is a strong disposition created to become disbelieving? If those doctrines were true, such a result could never arise; for it is the nature of all truth to become brighter and more evident, the more rigorously it is put to the test. To what a sorry pass are orthodox teachers come! You examine their teaching with "thoughtfulness and intelligence:" you cannot square this and that in them: you cannot see them to be true: and you are to be told that it is your misfortune to be possessed of that type of mind which is "most apt to nourish heresy." What are you to do? Receive what the clergy teach, and the more ignorance and thoughtlessness you bring to your aid, the better. "Shut your eyes and open your mouth," is the rule of the clergy in the teaching of the people! And who are ye, Messrs. Clergy? Has God spoken to you that we are thus to lay ourselves at your feet, and accept all you say to us? Went ye not, when puling boys, to school, and got your empty heads crammed with the lore of the dark times that have gone by? And did ye not take it all in without a murmur or a thought that it might be wrong? And came ye not out with the purpose before you, of clothing your bare legs and filling your craving stomachs by preaching all this to the people: and are we to take you as disinterested judges, independent thinkers, infallible guides? Are ye inspired? Nay, verily. Ye are a race of ecclesiastical dummies. Ye have been blocked out and clad in the clerical manufactories. Ye are all of a pattern: ye are all what ye have been made in the ecclesiastical shop. If ye have any life in you, it is the life of moving images. Ye have been made to work in one way, and in that way ye work, and miserable slaves and paltroons should we be, were we to listen to you, when we have God's own words written down by his own prophets and apostles, in the book which ye profess to teach from, but which ye contradict and deny in all your speeches.

Mr. Spurgeon's missionary finds an explanation of the marvellous freaks of "thoughtfulness and intelligence" in "the lack of the education or culture which enables a man to throw away his mental blinkers!" It is

perfectly natural for Mr. Spurgeon's missionary to entertain this view, but we should be inclined to turn the whole matter round so as to get it into a true position. Thus: "noodles have a great faculty for holding on to nonsense taught them by the clergy as the truth, because they have no ability to detect the imposition: the 'more intellectual and thoughtful' are most apt to nurse disaffection towards the clergy, because they are more able to see through the professional glosses by which it is attempted to make darkness appear light; and the only explanation of otherwise intellectual men being found among the abettors of orthodoxy, is the fact that they have acquired that education and culture (in clerical institutions) which lead them to put on mental blinkers, by which they are for ever prevented from perceiving the true state of affairs."

Another devil's growl comes to hand in the shape of a letter from a gentleman who has been looking into the truth for some considerable time, and who, in ordering the discontinuance of the *Ambassador*, expresses himself in the following words:—

After three years' careful reading of the truth (so called) by yourself and other authors, I have arrived at a very different conclusion to that of Mr. Boshier and Mr. Osborne. While I deem it right to inform you of my judgment. I judge the less I say about it the better, further than to utterly dissent from your teaching as a whole. I may add it is a religion operating principally on the head rather than on the heart, and is only another proof "that the world by wisdom knows not God."

The writer of the letter from which the foregoing is an extract, is one of those who are not "able to receive" the truth. He apparently lacks the mental capability to see his way out of the thick mists in which he has been born and bred. The mis-spelling of his letter, which we have suppressed, gives some indication of this. It may be shocking that a man requires some brains to perceive the truth; but it is nevertheless true that only human beings are capable of doing so, and those of them only who have something of the original type of the *genus homo*. An idiot or a baby unhappily, but truly, cannot believe the gospel. This principle applies in varying degree according to intelligence. There be many who are "ever learning and are never able to come to the knowledge of the truth." Jesus illustrates this by employing different kinds of soil to represent the indivi-

duals having the truth.—(Matt. xiii; Mark iv.) Some, he says, "had no root in themselves."—(Mark iv, 17.) and after enduring a while, wither away. Others might bring fruit from the seed if well nurtured, but they get into the hands of the devil (sometimes religious and sometimes secular) who steal it away, and nothing comes of the seed-sowing. Their case is thus described:—"When anyone heareth the word of the kingdom and *understandeth it not*; then cometh the wicked one and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart. This is he that received seed by the wayside."—(Matt. xvii, 19.) This is our friend's case. He understood not what was presented to him, else the calamity which has befallen him would never have happened. He does not observe that the word is presented to a man's *understanding* first, as a means of getting into his "heart," and that it can never get into the heart (or affections), without being known to his "head" or mind; and he also fails to see that owing to the universal denial of the truth, Christadelphians are compelled to present the appearance of catering more for the judgment than the affections; that they are forced into Paul's attitude of "much contention,"—(1 Thess. ii, 2; Acts xix, 8)—striving to "cast down imaginations and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God."—(2 Cor. x, 5.) He also fails to see that Christadelphians do not profess to know God by "wisdom" (philosophy) but by revelation. God has given us a revelation of himself, and in *this*, we try to be wise; is this wrong? Mr. Moss, of Doncaster, thinks so, because he has not the ability to see otherwise, or else because he has been steeping his brains all the while in the intoxicating fumes of pious outpourings at orthodox meetings which have acted the part of the devil, and taken away the seed out of his heart. We can only commiserate his fate, and thank God that he is an exception among those who bring the truth under their examination.

The devil has roared upon us from other quarters. We give two more specimens, which may be left without comment, further than to say that when the devil shows the hoof and screeches infernally, as he does below, without any attempt to feign the voice of the Beloved, his attacks are perfectly harmless displays;—

SIR,—Your books affect me in this way,—that you are a man void of genuine humility—the greatest of all graces—ornament of the christian life and character—going about to establish your own righteousness, writing to display your learning and to get money to live idle. And as regards your profane idea of the total destruction of children, since Christ himself said, "of such is the kingdom of Heaven;" how can that be, what can be the meaning of the 6th verse of the 9th chapter of Rev.; also the 19th verse of the 20th chapter? Sir, can you suppose that the world would be spacious enough for all the elect of God? Sir, can you say that all these good men, Wesley, Whitfield, Calvin, Luther, and others are all gone to hell, or as you say, never will rise again only to receive their stripes? Can you suppose the world is now the worse for these men having lived in it? They all taught orthodox faith. Very few do teach hell-fire punishment. Few ever did; only used the figure. Suppose your doctrine should be true, your doctrine makes the scripture as ugly or ghastly as what we believe, and probably from looking into it, and from attending the places of worship as much, is as much a hell as we believe the wicked or guilty will have. Can you suppose that all those that have died in the faith and were not immersed (or baptized) only with the Holy Ghost, are now, or will be punished as unbelievers? I have been immersed myself with water and the Holy Ghost. The things I once loved, I now hate. All things are become new. Am I not a new creature in Christ Jesus? Shall I perish in this state? If you will explain this to my mind in your *Ambassador*, I will be a Christadelphian.

J. SILMAN.

"I have tried in vain to induce either you or your brethren to engage in a written conversation on the subjects composing your *Twelve Lectures*. I know nothing of the Rev. Barnett, nor have I seen one word of his reply. I do know that the "subject matter of your *Lectures*" is diametrically opposed to the word of God, and could only have been written by one whose understanding is deranged, and who requires more of our sympathy, than our censure or ridicule. But it is not an easy matter for one who *loves* the Bible to be silent when he finds *anyone* pretending to reason and superior knowledge, actually striving to turn the truth of God into a lie; and this is what you have done in your *Lectures*. You have insulted the God of heaven, denied the divinity of Jesus Christ, laughed at the idea of a personal devil, and done despite to the Eternal Spirit. I am ready, able, and willing to meet you in any proper way to substantiate my charge. A great portion of your book of *Lectures* contains mere truisms. A great portion of your *Lectures* is a wholesale slander on the churches of British Israel, and you keep

talking, and talking, and talking about the kingdom of God; and only prove that you are as blind as a bat in this matter. 1st, Truism.—“It is evident that the judgment will be no *dumb show!*” Who ever said it would be? but it is nonsense to talk about “those who are alive at his coming, and those who emerge from the grave will all be on an equal footing.” Where is conscience? Ah, where! Will the abominably wicked and the truly righteous be influenced by one and the same feeling? subjects of the same hopes and fears! to say so, is to talk madness—the thing is impossible. Even Job could say “*I know that my Redeemer liveth.*” I cannot in one letter say all I wish to say, but what am I to think of an author, who, in the nineteenth century, styles Plato the “father of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul.”—page 76. The immortality of the soul is brought before us in the first book of Genesis, in words never quoted by the author of these lectures. Let God be true and every man a liar! I learn in Genesis, that God *created* man “in his own image,” but that he “formed his body out of the dust of the ground.” The body was “formed” a *tenement* of clay; but, into it, God *breathed a living tenant*, and man became a *living soul*. Let all Mr. Roberts’ *natural facts* hide their presumptive appearances, and let him prostrate himself in dust and ashes before his insulted Maker! How much of Lecture 3 is taken up to prove that “destroy” does *not* mean what it *does mean* in reference to future punishment. That the soul, yea, and the body too *cannot* be annihilated the scriptures everywhere teach; but that they can be punished with *everlasting destruction* is a New Testament doctrine. Mr. Roberts may turn the most solemn language of the Saviour into ridicule, but the fact is clear. If our blessed Saviour did not teach the immortal nature and work of the *soul*, when he asked “or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?” then he taught nothing. I have not room to insert my remarks about a *living dead*, but if there be no death and no

hell torments, explain to me *I beseech you*, the 41st verse of the 25th of Matt., a verse which Mr. Roberts has found it very convenient not to quote in these *Lectures*, at least I have not met with it. If I am wrong, you ought to write to me and put me right. I verily believe you are wrong, and therefore I write; may God give you his grace to enter *now* into that kingdom of God which *is open now* in existence, and is the portion here of all true believers.”

Yours truly, Wm. WOOD.

P.S.—You will hear no more from me, unless you write me something worth reading. And yet I long to try to remove the scales from your eyes, for of all the bungling, jumbling, mumbling stuff that ever came out of a printer’s machine, your *Twelve Lectures* bear away the palm. You seem to lay no little stress on baptism. Can baptism regenerate the soul? Plunging, dipping, or sprinkling, can in *reality* do no more to save you from sin and its awful consequences than exchanging a soiled shirt for a clean one. There is one passage I would solemnly recommend to your most serious consideration. It has never been honoured with even a notice in your book of *Errors*. “Except a man be *born* again”—not merely washed,—but born again, “he cannot see the *kingdom of God.*” If Plato and Socrates believed in the immortality of the soul, I think it is a GREAT DISGRACE for a man with the Bible in his hand to *deny it as you have done*. But it is too late in the ages that are passing away, to dispute either the immortality of the soul, or the Godhead of our Lord and Saviour, the *great God*, our Jesus Christ. None but a fool would attempt it. You may if you *choose*, go on laughing at the devil and he will surely laugh at you. But a christian writer has said to all such: “the keen vibration of bright truth is Gehenna.” God in mercy save you and your deluded brethren from discovering this truth.”

W. WOOD.

*Sale, near Manchester.*

---

## SUNDAY MORNING AT THE CHRISTADELPHIAN SYNAGOGUE, BIRMINGHAM, No. 11.

---

### RESURRECTION.

THE idea commonly entertained by religious people respecting the resurrection of the dead is, as you well know, that when that event takes place, the righteous will rise from their graves with glorified bodies. This doctrine is derived from the

words of Paul in 1 Cor. xv, where he says that the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and that they will be changed in the twinkling of an eye; which would seem to countenance the popular view, and which we might accept without dispute, were it



not that the judgment is here left out of view, and we know from portions of scripture that the judgment forms an important part of God's future programme. For we are told that believers must all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, to be there rewarded according to the deeds they have done.—(2 Cor. v, 10.) And as such a fact is inconsistent with the notion that they have received their reward before, Christadelphians have generally come to regard 1 Cor. xv, as dealing only with the broad results arising out of the resurrection, leaving out the details as entirely superfluous for the present purpose of the apostle, and inasmuch as he, as well as others, has given those details elsewhere.

The controversy between the upholders of the two views—between the mortal and the immortal resurrectionists—has been and is still very warm. It is not my intention, on this occasion, to travel over the ground which has been so well trodden by the various brethren who have defended what I consider the only rational and logical, as well as scriptural, view of this subject, nor indeed do I propose to enter upon the question so broadly as it would be necessary to do were I speaking to an audience divided in opinion concerning it. I purpose dwelling a little upon some portions of the chapter of Corinthians in question, with the object (1st) of shewing how beautiful is the comparison that Paul institutes between the resurrection of man and the rising from the ground of the deposited seed, and (2ndly) of endeavouring to extract the Christadelphian doctrine of the resurrection from the very passages so much relied upon as supporting the opposite one.

Turning to the chapter mentioned, we find that after demonstrating the necessity of resurrection in opposition to some (and those professing Christians), who evidently did not consider it necessary, Paul proceeds to the consideration of the nature of the body to which the righteous resurrected will ultimately attain; and in answer to the question "How are the dead raised up, and with what body," or to what body—for that is said to be a rendering more consistent with the original—"to what body do they come?" he exclaims, "Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die, and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body which shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat or of some other grain; but God giveth it a body, as it hath

pleased him, and to every seed his own body."

Now, as Paul here illustrates the resurrection of the dead, by a comparison with the mode of the growth of grain, it necessarily follows that if we would the better understand the details in connection with the rising of the one, we must examine the known facts of the other. A grain of wheat is composed of two parts—the outer, or the body, and the inner, or the germ, which is the vital principle of the grain; and without which it would be impossible for germination, and consequent reproduction, to take place. When placed in the ground, the body of the grain corrupts, but the germ remains, and from that germ springs up the future body. Now, what is there in man that corresponds to the germ of the seed? An orthodox believer would no doubt reply "the immortal soul," which in his opinion, is the active and vitalising principle within us. But a most superficial examination will show that there is no correspondence between the so-called immortal soul and the germ of the wheat; for instead of remaining when the mortal body has corrupted and been reduced to dust, its departure from the body is said to be the very cause of that corruption; and at the resurrection, allowing the immortal soul theory to be true, instead of being the revivifying principle—that which forms the resurrected body, as in the case of the wheat germ, it would not return until the reconstruction of the body had wholly taken place—until, indeed the receptacle which it left, had been again prepared by other means for it. Adam, according to popular notions, was wholly organised before the immortal soul was placed within him. So we see the absurdity of saying that that principle corresponds to the germ of the wheat.

What, then, is it that possesses this correspondence? I answer, the truth, as it indwells in those who receive it. Of this I think we have abundant scripture proof; but I need only refer to a few passages. In John v, 24, Jesus says "Verily, verily, I say unto you, *he that heareth my word and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life.*" Again, (John vi, 63,) "It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, *they are spirit and they are life.*" (viii, 31.)—If ye continue in *my word*, then are ye my disciples indeed, and ye shall know the truth, *and the truth shall make you free.*" (xi, 25.)—"He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet

shall he live; whosoever believeth and liveth in me, shall never die." The truth, then, is the vital principle corresponding to the germ; and on examination, we find that this correspondence is a most complete and striking one. As with the grain, so with the body of the believer: placed in the ground, the body decays and is destroyed; but is the truth, however weakly possessed by that body, destroyed also? Apparently so, as in the case of the germ; but in reality it is not. The connection between the dead body and the truth that inhabited it, is written in the eternal memory of God, and in the eye of God remains, and hallows as it were, the very dust of the believers, which, when the proper time arrives, will by the power of God, revivify the dust, and bring back the life possessed before. And when will that time be? We are aware that in order to cause the seed to germinate, the heat of the sun and the fertilizing influence of the showers are absolutely necessary. And in this respect the analogy is maintained. Christ is the sun and the fertilizing shower, who will quicken the germinating power of the truth into action, and restore the dead and perished body once more to life. Even the prophets, as if they themselves, by the Spirit of God, apprehending the comparison that Paul subsequently institutes, speak of these beneficent characteristics of the Saviour. Malachi says, "Unto you that fear my name, shall the sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings;" and the Psalmist, speaking of this sun of righteousness, exclaims, "He shall come down like rain upon the mown grass, like showers that water the earth."

If this be a true reading of the lesson Paul wishes to teach by his analogy, it is evident that there are persons who never will be raised at all; and is not this in harmony with the plain teaching of the divine word—that by nature we are hastening to death, having no hope whatever beyond the grave? "Man that is in honour and understandeth not," says the Psalmist (xlix, 20), "is like the beasts that perish." "That which befalleth the sons of men," says Solomon (Eccles. iii, 19) "befalleth beasts, even one thing befalleth them; as the one dieth, so dieth the other: yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast, for all is vanity." "O Lord our God," we read in Isaiah (xxvi, 13), "other lords beside Thee have had dominion over us; but by Thee only will we make mention of Thy name. They are dead; they shall not

live; they are deceased, they shall not rise; therefore hast Thou visited and destroyed them, and made their memory to perish." These passages confirm the truth of my analysis, and taken with it, we have a demonstration that, as in the natural, so in the spiritual—without a germ there can be no re-production.

Having now arrived at that aspect of Paul's comparison when the body revives from the perished state in which it lies in the ground, and has sprung up, let us bring to bear the case of the seed in the further elucidation of the subject. I think the natural lesson or doctrine to be deduced from this, can be no other than the Christadelphian doctrine of "mortal resurrection." In the case of the wheat, at the proper time, the reaper appears, and cuts it down, gathers it together, and then separates the good ears from the chaff. He stores the wheat in his garner, but the chaff he burns or throws away. Now to my mind, this is a most faithful picture in figure of the circumstances attending the judgment, as we are taught to understand it by Christ and his apostles; indeed it is a picture of the judgment that the Saviour himself paints for us in one of his parables. Christ having effected his work as the fertilizer of the dormant seeds, now becomes the reaper, and proceeds, in exact analogy with the reaper of the grain, to separate the produce gathered before him: the good he admits into his garner—the kingdom of God; but the bad he rejects and destroys; and just as the grain of the farmer is not properly raised till it is placed in the storehouse, all clean and separated from the impurity which necessarily accompanied it in its growing state, so the believers in Jesus Christ do not arrive at the proper resurrected state—to that state spoken of by Christ as "in the resurrection"—until they have been winnowed by the winnowing fan of the judgment, and freed from all the imperfection that they necessarily possessed before that judgment process had been undergone.

In the chapter before us, Paul declares that God giveth to every seed its own body: that is, according to the nature of the germ, "so will be the nature of the body springing from it. Now, the germ I have been speaking of, the truth germ, is of divine origin, and, therefore, its germination should result, ultimately, in the production of that which is divine; it is a spiritual germ, and should produce spiritual bodies. This indeed, I need hardly say, is the object that God intends it to accomplish, as exemplified in the case of

Jesus, who is the first fruits of the deposition of that germ. But how is it that this germ results in raising above the ground many who will never attain to the full resurrection-state? Why, for the very same reason that a good many wheat germs do not succeed in forcing their produce to the full ripe ear, because in some cases it is weak. We must remember that this divine germ has to be deposited in our hearts before the body dies and is placed in the ground, and it depends entirely upon the vigour of that germ at the time of death, as to how far it will afterwards succeed in carrying on the body toward that state represented by the grain fully ripe. If it be weak, it will only just succeed in forcing up a sickly plant, that will die as soon as it appears; if it be strong, it will carry forward the body to full resurrected life. It depends wholly upon how we, who have the germ nature, foster it now; and, therefore, let us take care that we nurture it well.

After this analysis of Paul's comparison, how clearly we can understand and how keenly we can appreciate his further statement respecting the body: "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"—Paul, of course, is speaking of that body which possesses the germ in full vigour; and the meaning, raised, as I have endeavoured in this examination to show, being the attainment of the spiritual position that the sowing of the truth is intended to accomplish, and not the mere rising from the ground.

I will proceed now to the consideration of the text which is generally thought to inculcate the opposite view of the character of the resurrection which I have endeavoured to support from Paul's comparison. In the 51st verse, the apostle says, "Behold I show you a mystery: we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed."

Now, in considering this passage, I do not think sufficient attention is given to the statement that it is at the sounding of the last trumpet that the dead (and the living also) are to be *instantaneously* changed. I think this is the key to the meaning of the whole verse. The men-

tion of the trumpet is evidently an allusion to, or a figure drawn from, the custom of the Jews to sound the trumpet on certain important occasions. The form of the Jewish trumpet, says Josephus, was invented by Moses, and in length the instrument was a little less than a cubit. Two of them were employed. When the first sounded, the heads of the tribes were to assemble for consultation, but when they both sounded, it was a call to the multitude to come together. The children of Israel whilst journeying in the wilderness also moved their tabernacle and their tents at the sound of the trumpet, all the people being in motion at the end of the fourth blast. In the book of Revelations, certain important epochs are represented as being marked by the sounding of this instrument; and, taking all these facts together, we must conclude that the mention of the *last trump* by Paul indicates the close of a series of events, each symbolically marked, as in Revelations, by the trumpet's blast. What the details of such events so marked are, Paul has not told us, but from the analysis I have made of Paul's comparison, and from the words of Jesus himself in Matt. xxiv, 30, 31, where he says that the Son of Man shall send his angels *with a great sound of a trumpet*, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other—from these we gather that the blasts referred to must embrace the whole period from the rising of the dead from the ground to the conclusion of the judgment. The dead rise from the ground, the dead and the living are then summoned before the judgment-seat of Christ; judgment is pronounced; the words "Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world," are uttered; then the last trump resounds, and "*instantaneously, in the twinkling of an eye,*" the accepted are "raised" to the perfect state of spiritual life to which the good seed gradually leads. Then, to use the simile of the wheat once more, the divine germ has produced the results it was intended to accomplish—the fruit is ripe and pure, and it is placed in the storehouse of the Son of God.

This exposition of the passage, you will see, is quite in harmony with Paul's analogy and indeed with all the other statements that we find in scripture respecting this great and awful event; and in conclusion, in view of the glorious prospect opening out

before the finally-accepted believer, I need only urge upon each and all of us, in the words of Paul, to be "steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as we know that our labour is not in vain in the Lord."

J. BUTLER.

SUNDAY MORNING, OCT. 11, 1868.

### THE LIGHT OF TRUTH.

"Truly the light is sweet, and 'tis a pleasant thing for the eyes to behold the sun."—These words, which are to be found in the 11th chapter of Ecclesiastes, 7th verse, are very beautiful in a natural sense; but what Christadelphian is there who has not felt how applicable they are to that Word which is truly a light to his feet and a lamp to his path? By the intelligence and honest courage of brethren, to whom we are deeply indebted, the mysteriousness of orthodoxy has been dispelled, the multitude of errors which darkened the horizon of truth have been cast away, and our eyes which were obscured by false doctrines, now see in the oracles of God the way to that inheritance which Peter declared to be incorruptible, undefiled, and which will never fade away. And what makes the light, in which we rejoice as Christadelphians, so sweet to the mental eye? It is because in it there is no contradiction; in it there is nothing contrary to our reason. As to a beautiful object, smoothness and regularity are essential features; so perfect harmony distinguishes Christadelphian principles—harmony not only with a man's reason, but with his spiritual aspirations. It is perfectly clear that we can only be religious by being reasonable, for religion is reasonable in the highest degree. This will be seen to be quite true, even as regards those mysteries which are above our comprehension, such as the nature of God and His procedure towards mankind. Both nature and revelation teach us that He is, and must ever remain to finite minds, incomprehensible. In Job we read, "Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty to perfection?" And again, "Behold, God is great, and we know Him not, neither can the number of His years be searched out." Anyone believing that God is, must also believe that He is incomprehensible; and that we should not understand this great mystery, is in perfect harmony with our reason, though it is so far above it: for, having got rid of that pride-inspiring dogma of being in

ourselves immortal, we know we are really finite creatures, and as such we can never, while in this state, fathom the infinite: "My thoughts are not your thoughts, saith the Lord; for as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thought." And so the mysteries which He has been pleased to reveal to us in the scriptures are quite in conformity with our nature. God, by His almighty word, created the heavens and the earth, and by His will there sprang into existence creatures fearful and wonderful in their structure. Man—the highest in order—being made in His own image, and we are told, but a little lower than the angels—was disobedient. By that disobedience sin entered into the world, and death by sin; but promises were at once given—hope-inspiring promises—in which having faith, the patriarchs and prophets obtained a good report, but we not having received the promises, God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect—(Heb. i, 30). Those promises were like so many rays of light revealing the approaching glory. And as the first rays of the morning sun touches first the highest objects, so these promises alighted first upon the grand old men who lived in the morning twilight of the world as we live in the evening-shades of this dispensation.

By the light of these promises, these men walked with God, and endured—the world not being worthy of them. They did not accept deliverance that they might obtain a better resurrection. Time went on, and the light still shone in darkness; but the darkness comprehended it not. There was a man sent from God, whose name was John. The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the light, that all men through him might believe. He was not that light; but was sent to bear witness of that light. That was the true light which lighteth every man who cometh into the world. Of this man, Jesus said, he was "a burning and a shining light," and his active operations in preparing the way of the Lord, and kindling a gleam which must have illuminated the countries blessed with his presence, fully agrees with what Christ said of him. But the light which was to lighten the Gentiles, and he who was to be the glory of Israel, and he who declared himself to be the light of the world, rose and eclipsed the light of John; and though eighteen centuries have passed away since he spake on earth, his

words, before which darkness fled, apply to us as much as to the people who heard his voice; and these are his words: "Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me." The gospel which contains his words, in conjunction with the prophets and apostles, is the light which is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, and we will add, from Timothy, "are able to make us wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus." Such are the words of Paul, and they are echoed by Peter, when he calls upon us to show forth the praises of him who hath called us out of darkness into his marvellous light. These words are repeatedly thrust on our attention by what transpires around us: for what do we find outside? Why, the gross darkness which was predicted should cover the people, and the thick veil which no artificial light can ever penetrate; the darkness out of which we have been called; and as in the days of Jesus, the blind leading the blind.

Let us then daily repair to that word

which contains the will of Him who alone hath immortality, who dwelling in light unapproachable, has so far revealed himself to us by the gospel that his intentions towards us are there to be found without obscurity. Casting off the works of darkness, may we walk as children of light, animated by one sentiment and inspired by one principle, putting on that armour of light which Paul mentions in his epistle to the Romans, which will not only preserve us from the assaults of the enemy, but will enable us to contend for the truths once delivered to His saints, and to overcome the many temptations which surround us; looking forward to that time when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, and when that city shall be set up which will have no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it; for the glory of God will lighten it, and the Lamb will be the light thereof. Those divine truths which have found an echo in our consciences, being sustained by the word of God, will be made manifest when the righteous shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.

WILLIAM WHITCOMB.

---

### CLERICAL HELPS TO A SEEKER AFTER THE TRUTH.

---

THE subjoined correspondence is a fair illustration of the helplessness of the clergy when brought face to face with the truth, in the anxious enquiries of one of their own adherents who meets with it, but is willing to be persuaded it is all delusion. It is easy to launch general condemnations from the professional chair, and natural for the multitude to accept clerical dogmatism and clerical numbers as presumptive evidence in favour of what they preach: but the true merits of the case are brought to something like a test when, as in this case, (the case of brother Boshier, of London,) a prominent sympathiser with their craft catches a glimpse of the truth, is stunned by its strength, and goes with eager docility to the shepherds of the flock to get the illusion (as he at first supposed it to be) dispelled. Brother Boshier was willing—nay, anxious—and his anxiety for weeks amounted to torture—to have the new views overturned. It was a subject of

earnest prayer and exertion with him to bring this about, if the truth were not the truth. He was in a mood in which he would have rejoiced with great joy if the teachers of the people to whom he applied had been able to let even a ray of sterling doubt into his mind as to the genuineness of what he had found. At the same time, he was a man that could not be satisfied with anything short of solid evidence and argument. He was not to be intimidated or wheedled. His mind once fairly roused to the very foundation by the exhibition of scripture testimony against the pretensions of orthodox religion, which he had been in the habit from infancy of regarding as divine truth, could not be re-settled by anything but a demonstration of the scriptural basis of the old doctrines. He was therefore not greatly "helped" by the assistance he got from clerical quarters, that is so far as getting re-settled in orthodoxy was concerned. He made application where he had most right

to expect assistance in the matter; but the "assistance" helped in an opposite direction from that intended. He was helped into the truth by their incompetent endeavours, and for this we must be thankful, without feeling any special gratitude to them.

The following are the letters in which brother Boshier, on the one hand, (not having yet made up his mind), tries to elicit evidence on behalf of orthodoxy; and his correspondents on the other (whose names are suppressed out of courtesy to the writers), with one exception, seek to burk the task assigned to them under cover of mere denunciation. The first is to a rev. gentleman who is considerably ahead of his craft on the doctrine of immortality, for publishing his views on which, he was at one time nearly isolated: but having ceased his agitation on the subject, and dosed into a snug conformity to clerical manners, he is now once more "respectable," and at the head of a large metropolitan congregation, many of whom are ignorant that their pastor differs from his brethren.

—  
TO THE REV. E. W.

MY DEAR SIR,—As you were the means of first drawing me away from the errors of orthodoxy, by your valuable work, I now take the liberty of sending you a small pamphlet (*Declaration*) by this post, containing an outline of some works I have been reading, going further in the same direction, by Dr. Thomas, of America, and Mr. R. Roberts of Birmingham. Will you please look over the pamphlet, and let me know what you think of it. I should very much like you to see the larger works, which I have marked on the back. I have read them, and think they take the most reasonable and scriptural view of theology I have ever met with, and I have confidence in you that if I get your opinion, it will not be mere dogmatic assertion without proof, and you may again help me to obtain a further knowledge of the truth concerning these great matters, which I most seriously desire to attain. When I say this I am sure you will pardon me thus troubling you. I remain, dear Sir, yours very truly, T. B.

REPLY OF THE REV. E. W.

MY DEAR FRIEND,—Thanking you for your tract, I have seen and read somewhat carefully the larger work, I must confess, with much disappointment, especially in the critical department, which seems to me another example of the small evidence which satisfies some sort of minds in the matter of

interpretations. Of course I agree with some things stated by the author; but the main drift of the *larger* volume is to teach the Unitarianism—not of our times, which is a little spiritual—but the low, coarse Unitarianism, or materialism of Priestley; and you already know that I do not think this is the right interpretation of the writing of St. John or St. Paul. If you *do*, you have much altered since I last saw you, and in nothing more than in the easiness with which you are satisfied by audacious assertion. In fact, I will not believe it till I have seen you. Of course I cannot give time to write on the question of criticism; but I should be very delighted to see you, and to observe how you look in the character of an easy recipient of American Unitarianism. You used to be a tough one for them. Nothing will make us love you less in the way of opinion. But frankly, I think the books detestable.—Yours ever, E. W.

—  
REPLY OF T. B. TO REV. E. W.

MY DEAR SIR,—I received yours in reply to mine of the 13th, and am obliged for your promptness, but must confess I am not a little disappointed in receiving such a note from you. I asked for bread, and you have given me a stone. It would have been much more valuable to me if you had taken only as much time in giving some clue to the fallacy which is so evident to you in the book to which I ventured to call your attention, and ask your opinion. I suppose if only a little evidence is required to incline some minds to come toward an opinion, an entire absence of evidence on the other side is not likely to turn the scale again. Now I am beset on all sides with mere dogmatic denouncement, and have been for the last fifteen years, ever since I met with your work. I am certainly very sorry to find you stoop to use the same weapons that orthodoxy has been wont to use against you—even the same pattern. I have been told times out of number that these doctrines were American notions; something that had been kicked out from there, and would only be a nine days' wonder anywhere; and when asked for scripture proof for the condemnation, the opponent has always no other response, or has flagrantly misquoted texts of scripture to answer his purpose. Now it is a very easy thing to call certain opinions ugly names, and to say such and such books are detestable. Such remarks from ministers as, unfortunately, we have too much evidence, are enough to deter most of their people from looking into them, but it has just the contrary effect on me; and, I conclude, if there is no good reason given for the condemnation, it is because they have none to give, and this has caused me to hold fast to the doctrine of life in Christ. I am obliged for your kind intimation of affec-

tionate regard, and if I cannot get anyone to shew me the fallacy of what you call American notions—but which, I think, look very much like Bible truth—I shall take the opportunity, some day, of letting you see how I look—not as an easy, but a very hard recipient of doctrines, which will have the effect of separating me from long-cherished hopes and much-loved friends, for the truth's sake. But, really, you would do myself and others great service, if you would bring your powerful teaching to bear on what you seem to think such a flimsy structure, which Mr. Roberts has set up. I should very much like to see you make the attempt, in a good fair public discussion. I have no doubt Mr. R. could be brought to London to meet you; at any rate I should be proud of being the means of bringing such a combat about, and, with your permission, I will try. What do you say? Please let me know. I remain, dear Sir, yours truly, T. B.

[No reply to this.]

TO THE REV. S. H. B.

DEAR SIR,—By this post I send you a small pamphlet (*Declaration*) containing an outline of the theory taught in some new works I have been reading of late, chiefly the *Twelve Lectures*, by Mr. R. Roberts, of Birmingham; and though not able to say I as yet fully concur in all contained therein, I am bound to say, generally, I think the views there given seem to me to be more in harmony with the teaching of the Bible than those called "orthodoxy;" and as I and my family have of late been in attendance on your ministry, and thought of joining the church about to be formed at your chapel, I thought it right you should know why I hesitate; and permit me to say, my dear sir, I shall be glad to receive from you any communication on this important matter, by letter or otherwise, that you think would help me to a right conclusion. I think I can say, as before God, my sincere desire for myself and family is to know the truth, that by it we may be made free.—I am, dear Sir, yours truly, T. B.

REPLY OF REV. T. H. B.

MY DEAR SIR.—After carefully examining the *brochure* you sent me per post, I quite agree in the propriety of your hesitation as to joining the church about to be formed by us. Without discussing the question as to where the truth lies, it is undoubted, that even if you have only a disposition to adopt the opinions advocated in that pamphlet, you would be regarded by the members and myself as not being in accordance with the teaching of the scriptures. That pamphlet distinctly denies the divinity of our Lord, on page 21. Rightly or wrongly, we shall maintain that he was *very God*, and more than that, that this

is the keystone of all redemption and grace. Believe me, yours very truly, T. H. B.

T. B.'s RESPONSE.

MY DEAR SIR.—I received yours of the 14th in reply to mine. I find you have only noticed one point of doctrinal differences of which the pamphlet I send you treats, viz: the divinity of our Lord. I shall, therefore, only refer to that by saying that this is the one point at which I most stumble, amongst the number of things in which Mr. Roberts and Dr. Thomas differ from orthodox christians. Still the views held by them on this point are very different from those of Unitarian christians, as you would see if you read their works, and, in some respects, seem to me to be self-evident as well as scriptural, and somewhat the same as I see admitted in the writings of one of the living fathers of another denomination.—I remain, dear Sir, yours truly, T. B.

REV. W. D. TO T. B.

MY DEAR MR. B.—While staying at your house this week, I took the opportunity of reading much of the work called *Elpis Israel*. I should like to ask one question concerning it. The author claims a knowledge of the truth discovered and promulgated by himself. He is the founder of the Christadelphian system. This is a *new system*; that is to say it professes, according to the title page of Mr. Roberts's *Twelve Lectures*, to prove that the preaching of every other sect is wrong; and *Elpis Israel*, in many pages throughout the book, declares that all preaching since apostolic days has been wrong. Now my question is founded on what would be to me an insuperable perplexity, supposing that every word and thought in *Elpis Israel* appeared right in other respects. How is it to be explained that, although Christ said to his apostles "Lo I am with you always, even until the end of the world," nevertheless he has made no provision for the proclamation of the Gospel, and has raised up no true preachers from the apostles until the appearance of the Christadelphians? When Christ said that he would be with his apostles until the end of the world, he must have included all who should follow them successively in their work; for, according to Dr. Thomas's own theory, they are asleep, and it would be unmeaning non-sense to say that he would be with them while asleep till the end of the world; for all that would be needed would be that he should wake them again at the end of the world. Now Paul was not one of the twelve, yet Christ was with him, although the parting words had not been addressed personally to him. And I believe that in the darkest ages many true and accepted believers have existed, and also preachers, whether history records them or not. So that although Dr. Thomas, among many others in each generation, may be able to throw new light

on scripture, as every real student may find fresh treasures for himself in an inexhaustible mine, yet I cannot conceive the possibility that God has reserved the di-discovery of the truth for him. I have many other faults of an irreparable nature to find, of which I may trouble you with the mention of two or three. Having been a teacher of Greek, I am at liberty to state, without fear of contradiction from qualified scholars, that the Greek version is most recklessly and shufflingly garbled at the foot note of page 4, *Declaration*, evidently because everything must be so strained as to dovetail into the system.

Concerning the *intermediate state* and the theory of the sleep of the departed, I can only say that the scriptures seem to prove by their mysterious language that God keeps His secret concerning this intermediate state. I saw instantly that Mr. Andrew, on Sunday, did not know how to dispose of the words "absent from the body, *present* with the Lord," and he certainly declined to attempt any plain explanation. Now the texts which speak of *sleep* are evidently those in which the subject is spoken of *mysteriously*; but to be *present with the Lord* is a plain and emphatic saying which deserves a more candid admission. Again; what of the parable of Dives and Lazarus, where Abraham is mentioned as *talking* to the rich man? Evidently this parable either disposes altogether of the theory of *sleep*, and shows that the expression is a figurative allusion every time it occurs, to a mystery which revelation avoids disclosing, or else the *parable* is founded on a downright *misrepresentation* of heaven and hell by our Lord. Now is there any parable founded on incidents of earthly life which are not real incidents? I cannot find any. So if our Lord for one refers to incidents of spiritual spheres, these incidents must have *some* relation to reality; not, of course in every particular, for every parable has its drapery; but an exact and positive misrepresentation, calculated to mislead all believers, is what I cannot believe, and what you ought not to believe, without some satisfactory explanation, more than is to be found in *Elpis Israel*, where I do not think you will find the subject gone into to help you much. It is all very well to say "*Only* a parable," but such an expression implies disregard of a subject of awful significance. Again, Peter speaks of preaching to "*spirits in prison*." This passage is so mysterious that I believe only God understands it; but as Dr. Thomas professes to elucidate mysteries, or presumes to establish a system in defiance of these dark sentences; a system too which consigns to perdition all the earnest lovers of Christ who do not embrace it,—I consider that his followers are bound to explain to you and me what such phrases mean, worded as they are in antagonism to the other phrases of "*sleep*."

Now, my dear Mr. Boshier, I have as you

know, been willing from fear of God, and for the sake of the knowledge of Christ, to sacrifice *anything* in order to be found acceptable at Christ's coming. On the subject of baptism I found the scriptures clear and transparent as the day. If an equally clear light of knowledge shone out on any other subject, God helping me, I would walk in that light. But I will not, and you ought not, to follow any who pretend to shed the light of their *own* reasoning and argument on the most ab-truse of all subjects. The most powerful and convincing books are to me the least pretentious; but *Elpis Israel* is as bombastic as it is inconclusive. I may say that prone as you are to be fascinated with what is specious, I should be sorry to throw in your way certain books of remarkable power, which without a close course of special study, you would find to be unanswerable *against* the scriptures, to an apparently over-ruling degree. Now what if someone should throw you into another path of enquiry, (which your professed and real anxiety for the truth would impose upon you a moral obligation to follow,) by sending you a book or two which would involve you by an intellectual necessity in a more harrassing task to *prove* that the scriptures are inspired, that they harmonise with the discoveries of the age, &c., than your present task of learning the truth according to the scriptures? Do you not see with what difficulties we are endlessly surrounded? Where will you stop? Not where Dr. Thomas will lead you; for you will (unless you beware, and God guard you,) push on beyond a creed essentially founded on the Unitarian dogma, to the cold and sceptical region, where the chaos of all faith will surround you—which may God forbid. And now, will you consent to be an independent student of the Bible, without being shackled by Dr. Thomas's method of reasoning—but doing as he does, coming at your own conclusions with prayer. If so, I should like, as a student, to study with you, in regular correspondence.

Yours in the love of Jesus, W. D.

REPLY TO REV. W. D.

DEAR MR. D.—In reply to your kind letter of the 9th, permit me to say, I don't think Dr. Thomas in *Elpis Israel* professes to have discovered any new truth, or has a wish to found any new system; but because it is the old truth, as he thinks, revealed by God to the ancient patriarchs and prophets, and preached by Jesus and his apostles, but covered up by the errors and superstitions of ages and generations; that he (Dr. Thomas) wishes again to bring it to the light, for the benefit of earnest truth-seekers. Your objection to the work on the ground of Christ's promise (Matt. xxviii, 20) to the apostles, seems to me to lose a great deal of its force, when we know as a *fact*, that for about nine centuries after the time of the apostles, the



truth was not to be found, and error and superstition of the grossest kind, had over-spread christendom; and even when the light dawned again, it was so mixed with these thick clouds of darkness, that some of the worst errors and unscriptural ceremonies, were retained by the Reformers themselves; and now at this period of the history of the church, we find only about the tenth of those who have the scriptures, have separated themselves from these grave errors—and even many of that few believing and practising a ceremony which is the very witness of Popery,\* and as you and I believe, quite contrary to the teaching of the New Testament; and neglecting those very things on which the promise of the Saviour were founded. In reference to that promise, I suppose it must have reference to the Holy Spirit, which was to guide them into all truth, and we have confidence in reference to them and to their time—to the end of the age (see Greek)—this promise was fulfilled. But of whom can we say this has been the case since the apostles' times? Most christians *think* they have the presence of the Holy Spirit now; but we know that they go in an opposite direction as to the truth, and more often go out of it than into it. I am not able to follow you into the question of the right rendering of the Greek passage in foot-note of page 4 of the *Declaration*; but if in a future letter, you will point out the reckless shuffling and garbling, I don't doubt but I could take it to a scholar or two, in whom I have confidence, who would help me to a right decision. I can only say a friend of mine, a Baptist minister, who is a Greek scholar, took down his books the other day, in my presence, and in reference to the question of the death state, he said Mr. R. was quite fair in his rendering of Phil. i, 23. I quite feel the difficulties we have in our search after truth, and the danger sometimes of doubting the inspiration of the scriptures. I have not been without such doubt; and indeed, I think if I had believed of late all the fables of the pulpit were to be found in the scriptures, I should have been confirmed in my doubts as to their divine origin: but the harmony and wisdom of the scriptures according to Dr. Thomas's interpretation seems to me to be the very best barrier against such doubts. However, I am still wishing to know what is truth, and shall be very glad to have a correspondence with you to that end, and certainly wish to be an independent student of the Bible, untrammelled by the views of Dr. Thomas or any other man, only so far as they are helps to the natural interpretation.—I remain, dear Sir, yours truly, T. B.

THE REV. W. D. TO T. B.—No. 2.

DEAR MR. B.—I send you back by this post the Christadelphian pamphlets you have kindly lent me. I am sure you will feel that if none others of your orthodox friends have given the system you have embraced a fair examination, yet I at least have done so. As I have been fair and candid, and have personally sympathized much with you, I feel that I shall not be faithful to my ministry if I do not state plainly to you my opinion that your new creed is really and radically erroneous. I cannot see that one of the leading doctrines of the Christadelphians is right. I trust that we shall still be able to esteem each other sincerely: but your new creed I cannot esteem, and cannot acknowledge any sympathy with it whatever.

I had hoped that by friendly argument I might have induced you to hold back from a fresh baptism; but as you have really been re-baptized, of course any further arguments are useless and unnecessary.—Most faithfully yours, W. D.

T. B.'S REPLY TO REV. W. D.

DEAR MR. D.—On reaching home last Saturday evening, I got the note from you and the Christadelphian pamphlets you returned. I was glad when you asked me for the loan of them, and offered to read them, as I knew you would get some light from them; but I must say, I think your fairness, candour, and faithfulness to your ministry would have been more apparent, if you had not only given me *your opinion* of my new creed as being really and radically erroneous, but also adduced the reasons for your condemnation, with the scripture proofs; I should then have been able to look them over and see what they were worth, and if there had been any force in them, it might have converted me from the error of my ways—if I am in error. It surely does not follow because a man has been baptized into any faith, therefore, it is useless and unnecessary to give him any friendly argument, and certainly not so in my case, else how is it I have repudiated my baptism in your denomination, and fallen under the friendly scriptural argument of the Christadelphians? And it seemed to me when I was at your house last, you felt the force of them too. However, in this I may have been mistaken; but I am not surprised, as it is just the kind of help I have received from all my orthodox friends, in seeking to know the truth, both before and since my baptism. I would endorse your wish, that we may still esteem each other sincerely, and remain, yours truly, T. B.

\* Infant-sprinkling.

## INTELLIGENCE.

**BIRMINGHAM.**—There have been two immersions during the month, the obedient believers being JOHN HUGH BREADY (28), shoemaker, formerly Baptist, and his wife, ISABELL BREADY (26), also formerly Baptist. Both were cases of re-immersion. Others are giving earnest heed to the word, and about yielding the required obedience. Six advertised lectures have been arranged for—subjects as follow:

*Sunday, Nov. 22.*—The Bible as the only rule of faith.

*Sunday, Nov. 29.*—The Salvation of the world bound up by the destiny of the Jewish nation.

*Sunday, Dec. 6.*—The Kingdom of God, a future administration of divine authority among men, by the personal presence of Christ.

*Sunday, Dec. 13.*—The second appearing of Christ the epoch of salvation, and the object of every true Christian's hope.

*Sunday, Dec. 20.*—Immortality the gift of God, to come, and not the present attribute of human nature.

*Sunday, Dec. 27.*—The birth of Christ in relation to the world's history.

**DEVONPORT.**—Bro. J. W. Moore writes, Oct. 26, to report the immersion of JAMES PEBLINE, hatter, who came to a knowledge of the truth by rather a roundabout process. Originally interested in the doctrine of Christ's personal reign, through the preaching of a Cornwall clergyman, he joined a Methodist Free Church, in the same neighbourhood, to the members of which he endeavoured to introduce this doctrine. The Methodists did not like it, and rejected both it and him. He then removed from Cornwall to Plymouth, where, after being in vain applied to by the Methodists for his fellowship, he united himself with the Adventists in connection with Mr. Micklewood. He was immersed by that gentleman without a question as to his belief—an individual of an entirely opposite view being immersed at the same time. Finally, he heard of the Christadelphians, and coming to see the truth, he rectified his position in re-immersion and cast in his lot with the sect that is everywhere spoken against. Brother Dr. S. G. Hayes having taken up his stay in Devonport for a short time, has been delivering a series of Sunday evening lectures, in the "Christadelphian Meeting Place, Lower Stoke." The audiences have been good, in some cases above the capacity of the room to accommodate them. The subjects (commencing Sunday, Oct. 25), so far as announced, have been as follow:

1.—The Reign of Christ upon the earth as foretold by the prophets and apostles.

2.—The Restoration of the Jews to their

own land necessary to the establishment of the kingdom of God.

3.—Immortality a conditional gift.

4.—Resurrection and Judgment.

5.—Everlasting Punishment NOT everlasting Torment.—"These shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal."—Matt. xxv, 46.

6.—The Promises made to the Fathers.—"To Abraham and his seed were the promises made."—Gal. iii, 16.

7.—The One Baptism—"They that gladly received His word were baptized."—Acts ii, 41.

8.—The Signs of the Times.—"Then shall appear the Sign of the Son of Man in Heaven."—Matt. xxiv, 30.

**EDINBURGH.**—Bro. Ellis, writing November 17, says: "I am happy to inform you that MARY STEELE, daughter of our brother James Steele, was immersed and added to our ecclesia on the 26th of October; and in July last, FREDERICK NELSON, whose immersion was omitted to be mentioned in the last issue of the *Ambassador*."

**LONDON, (NORTH).**—"On the 22nd of October and following days, we had the pleasure of listening to a course of five lectures, by bro. Ellis, of Edinbro', the subjects being:—

1.—"The second coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, its objects and results."

2.—"The past, present, and future of the Adamic race in the light of scripture, contrasted with clerical traditions and scientific speculation."

3.—"The scripture doctrine of the devil and Satan, contrasted with modern fables, lay and clerical."

4.—"Judgment to come, or the Bible doctrine of rewards and punishments."

5.—"The restoration of Jews to Palestine, necessary to the establishment of the kingdom of God."

The audiences were not large, a result partly from the unfavourable state of the weather, which prevailed the whole time; but although the audiences were small, they contained within them the elements of both approbation and opposition. On "the devil" especially, there was considerable discussion between brother Ellis and several persons supporting the popular side.

The subjects announced for November (lecturer, brother J. J. Andrew), were as follow:—

1.—"The Spirit of God in its various manifestations subversive of the Trinitarian teaching respecting the "Holy Ghost." "*Whither shall I go from thy spirit?*"—Ps. 139, 7.

2.—"The judgment seat of Christ, its objects and results. "*We must all appear*

before the judgment seat of Christ."—2 Cor. 5, 10.

3.—"The parable of the rich man and Lazarus shown to afford no support to popular views of man's nature and destiny. *"There was a certain rich man."*—Luke 16, 19.

4.—"Jerusalem, its past history and future prospects in connection with the redemption of mankind." *"Swear not by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the Great King."*—Matt. 5, 35.

5.—"Dust and ashes, or the essential mortality of man, as taught in the book of Job." *"Wilt thou bring me into dust again?"*—Job 10, 9.

MUMBLES.—Brother D. Clement, writing October 28, says:—"Our Sunday school goes on remarkably well, and quite exceeds our expectation; the boys in particular display quite a deep interest in the truth, and I believe much good will result. I had to give notice of a meeting to be called for the purpose of getting money to get Bibles as rewards for the boys who display energy in the truth; and I am happy to say we have had a favourable response. Brother Behenna is our superintendent, and he displays great interest and energy.

NOTTINGHAM.—Brother Phelps, writing October 20th (a day too late for last month's Ambassador), reports the immersion of Mrs. ANN DABELL, of Landham, Notts., formerly General Baptist. Sister Dabell had been acquainted with the truth for some years, but lacking the advantages of those living in the town where there is an opportunity of hearing the truth expounded, she has been thus late in yielding the obedience which the truth requires. She was immersed and added to the Nottingham ecclesia, on September 27th. The annual course of lectures by brother E. Turney has been commenced, and so far they have been well attended. The subjects are as follow:—

1.—"THE GOSPEL PREACHED TO ABRAHAM." *Proof*.—"If any man preach any other gospel unto you, let him be accursed."—PAUL, Gal. i, 9.

2.—"THE KINGDOM OF GOD TO BE ESTABLISHED UPON THIS EARTH, WITH JERUSALEM RE-BUILT FOR THE METROPOLIS THEREOF." *Proof*.—"Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth."—JESUS. Matt. vi, 10.

3.—"JESUS CHRIST, KING OF ISRAEL, AND RULER OF ALL GENTILE NATIONS, UPON DAVID'S THRONE, TO BE RE-BUILT." *Proof*.—"God raised up Christ, to sit on his (David's) throne."—PETER. Acts ii, 9.

4.—"THE RESTORATION OF THE JEWS SHEWN TO BE A LEADING FEATURE IN THE DIVINE SCHEME FOR THE SALVATION OF MANKIND." *Proof*.—"If the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be but life from the dead."—PAUL. Rom. xi, 15.

5.—"THE GREAT SALVATION, OR THE

DESTINY OF THE RULERS AND THE RULED. TO PROVE THAT THE GENERATIONS WILL COME AND GO AS NOW, BUT LIFE WILL BE GREATLY PROLONGED: THAT CHRIST'S BRETHREN WILL POSSESS IMMORTALITY IN BODY, AND RULE THE WORLD WITH HIM FOR 1000 years. *Proof*:—"How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?"—Heb. ii, 3. "To him that overcometh, I will give power over the nations."—Rev. ii, 26.

6.—"THE ENTIRE MORTALITY OF MAN, OR THE DOCTRINE OF PLATO AND THE CLERGY SHOWN TO BE IN CONTRADICTION TO THE WORD OF THE LIVING GOD." *Proof*:—"The soul that sinneth, it shall die."—Ezek. xviii, 4.

7.—"THE HOPE OF THE GOSPEL, OR ETERNAL LIFE TO BE MANIFESTED IN THE BODY." *Proof*:—"This is the promise that he hath promised us, even eternal life."—1 John ii, 25.

8.—"THE ORIGIN OF SIN AND THE PUNISHMENT OF THE WICKED; OR THE VULGAR DOCTRINES OF THE DEVIL AND HELL UNSCRIPTURAL." *Proof*:—"The sting of death is sin."—1 Cor. xv, 56. "Where no law is, there is no transgression."—Rom. iv, 15.

9.—"THE COMING OF JESUS CHRIST IN PERSON, TO REIGN AS UNIVERSAL KING, ARDENTLY DESIRED BY THE APOSTLES AND THE CHRISTIANS MADE BY THEIR PREACHING." *Proof*:—"For what is our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing? Are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ, at his coming?"—2 Thes. ii, 19.

10.—"THE BLOOD OF CHRIST CLEANSETH FROM SIN. REPENTANCE. BAPTISM." *Proof*:—"The blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from all sin."—1 John i, 7. "Repent and be baptised, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins."—Acts ii, 38.

11.—"THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD. NO REWARD OR PUNISHMENT TILL THEN. THE JUDGMENT OF THE SAINTS, AND THE SUBSEQUENT JUDGMENT OF THE WORLD BY THEM." *Proof*:—"There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust."—Acts xxiv, 15. "Know ye not that the saints shall judge the world?"—1 Cor. vi, 2.

12.—"THE POLITICS OF THE BIBLE, OR THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES: SHEWING THE NEARNESS OF CHRIST'S ADVENT. GLANCES AT THE GREAT POWERS OF EUROPE; THEIR ARMIES; STATE OF TURKEY; THE EASTERN QUESTION; THE ETERNAL CITY; THE POSITION OF BRITAIN. HOW TO PREPARE FOR THE FINAL CHANGE."

#### NEW SOUTH WALES.

SYDNEY.—In a letter to the Editor, dated, Nov. 2, Dr. Thomas thus writes of the gift transmitted to him from the Sydney ecclesia:—"I am greatly obliged to the brethren in New South Wales for their remembrance of me. While it proves their gratitude, it is to me

an agreeable offset to the maliciousness of the enemy which would devour me elsewhere."

#### CANADA WEST.

GUELPH, ONT.—Brother H. L. Drake, writing of the operations of the brethren in and around the neighbourhood for the truth's sake, says:—Our lectures at Eden Villa resulted in the obedience of our "infidel" friend, Mr. HENRY LLES, his wife, and two young men (farm servants), in his employ. We find him earnestly and zealously affected in every good work, and the centre of a radiating influence to others in that vicinity, which we hope will result in more becoming obedient. Since you last published intelligence from Guelph, we have had twelve immersions and three re-immersions. We now number 22. Twenty additions in one year is a pretty fair increase. Others are interested and (apparently) earnestly seeking to know the truth as it is in Jesus."

#### UNITED STATES.

ASHTABULA, Ohio.—Z. D. Bugbee writes, Oct. 20, that there are six Christadelphians in Ashtabula, who meet together every Sunday evening, to break bread and read the scriptures, for mutual edification and comfort. They are not doing so much for the truth as they would like to do, there being only two males amongst them, neither of whom are able to "rightly divide the word of truth in public: but they mean at least to hold their own till the coming of the Lord." They get the *Ambassador* regularly, and are comforted thereby. Some outside are willing to read, but there has hitherto been a difficulty in getting books to distribute. [This difficulty need no longer be felt, in view of the facts stated in reply to sister Bucklin of Osh Kosh, two months ago.—EDITOR.] There are a few Dowieites and one Josophite, but with these, the brethren are not in fellowship.

DETROIT, Ill.—Brother Donaldson announces the immersion of ROBERT POWELL (36), late of Hamilton, C.W., who had never before been connected with any religious denomination.

#### LETTER FROM DR. THOMAS'S DAUGHTER.

Sister Lassius, writing to sister Roberts, November 5, says:—

"My time has been fully occupied this last summer in travelling with father to different places, and attending to domestic affairs in the intervals, and since our final settlement in winter quarters, at home. My health being very feeble the most of the time, and father desiring a travelling companion, he invited me to accompany him in his journeyings to and fro. This I, of course, very readily accepted, and have been quite

cheered and refreshed in spirit, from the pleasant intercourse we had with brethren and sisters of the genuine stamp. When *truth* has once set her indelible seal on the minds and hearts of those who profess to love her, it forms the strongest and most enduring cement or bond of union, that can be found to exist. It unites our aims, and hopes, and desires; "we share each other's sorrows, and weep each other's tears," and partake each other's joys. This thought reminds me of an article in the *New York Herald*, which was read before the brethren about two years ago, commencing with these words:—"The day is coming, even near at hand, when *all that is not asbestos will burn*." Politicians are sometimes seized with a fit of inspiration and feel bound to utter a prophecy; at the same time not understanding the true import of the sayings they record. But they, the hidden ones, for whose benefit those things appear can readily interpret the meaning thereof. We know, of a surety, that the only substance which will answer to "*asbestos*," in the day of God's wrath, so soon to be revealed, will be "the spirits (and bodies) of just men made perfect." The spirits of just men, imbued with the word and principles of Deity, are "*asbestos*" now, against the fire of the enemy and the wiles of the adversary. We see abundant illustration of this in the pages of the *Ambassador*, which comes a regular, welcome visitor to our home circle. I should think Mr. Govett's *Voice* will have become dry and husky before this, from his vehement efforts to sound aloud his warning notes, against the truth and its advocates. It is really comforting and encouraging to us here, to see an account of so many additions to your numbers in Birmingham and elsewhere: as brother Roberts truly remarked in a letter to father lately, "the tide is rising in Britain." This is great encouragement to us here, who have been holding a steady course against wind and tide for some time. Every sun must have his season; and every dog his day, as the phrase is. Daylight, in reference to the gospel, was just beginning to dawn upon the British isles, while America was approaching her meridian. We are not increasing much in numbers on this side the water; but I think we are growing in "grace and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ." We seem to possess a characteristic of all mature and experienced bodies—that of quietude and rest: this especially applies to us in Hoboken, also in Baltimore: but in some other

places there seems to be more *outward* activity.

We have recently started a Sunday school in connection with our ecclesia in Hoboken. I saw a report of one having been added to your ecclesia, from the Sunday school. I think it very important to have the children of believers well instructed in the scriptures. It greatly facilitates their progress in the truth, when they become mature enough to think for themselves, and investigate on their own behalf. Some have objected to it, because it is a sectarian custom; but I cannot see that this is a valid objection. It is true, sectarians know very well how to build up their systems and propagate their principles; and why may we not act as wisely? Indeed it is a duty to do so. We are commanded to use the wisdom of the serpent, together with the harmlessness of the dove. When we consider, too, what numbers of children would grow up in ignorance of the word of God, if some such means were not adopted, on account of the pressure of adverse circumstances upon the parents, the duty of attending to them is more manifest.

\* \* Father feels to be quite relieved now that the third and last volume of *Eureka* is published. He feels prepared to take a voyage across the ocean in the spring, if the Lord permits. He and mother propose that I should accompany him, as her inability to travel renders it impossible for her to accompany him. So it is probable that I may have the pleasure of seeing your face in the flesh, D. V., and of talking with you about the near glorious future, which is "all our salvation and all our desire."

#### MORTAL AND SPIRITUAL LIFE.

##### MORTAL LIFE.

What is Mortal Life?—a flower  
Of early grass; first a morning dream,  
Full of sweet visions; future yet, and never  
realised;  
Visions of life and happiness, seen in the far  
distance.

As the heavenward vapours of a rose-pink morn.

And as that morn expands to day,  
The tinted clouds assume prosaic gray.  
That morning dream—where is it now?  
Youth's smiling face and cloudless brow?

The young man stands in pride erect:  
Bitter sorrow has he felt, and found the dream  
of life

A phantom, ever flying as pursued.  
De-pair would seize him for her own, but Hope  
Stands with uplifted hand still pointing forward.

Meridian's past, the setting sun descending,  
'Mid darkening clouds, thick gathering in the  
west;  
The old man on his dying couch reclining,  
With pain and weakness sorely pressed.

Where now the dreams of early youth?  
Where now the young man's pride and hope?  
Following shadows these long years, he still  
must follow,  
The mind's received a cast he cannot alter now;  
And therefore, in his second childhood,  
He lives the first again, until that weak,  
The mortal spark expires, and he  
To earth returns, as withered autumn grass in  
rain.

##### SPIRITUAL LIFE.

What is Spiritual Life?—A perennial spring of  
living water:  
First the clear conception of the promise given,  
Seen afar off, yet sure, made sure, and ratified;  
Ratified by blood—the precious blood of his own  
Loved One  
The reception of that promise—like the first rays  
of light  
That part the clouds at early dawn,  
Dividing light and darkness, arraying  
Field and wood in softest shades of loveliness—  
The mind illumines, of the humble and the  
contrite one.

And as the Truth its power maintains,  
The humble heart, responding gains  
The answer of a conscience good,  
By washing in the watery flood.

Now Faith and Hope take each a hand  
To lead him forth; but first array him all in  
armour bright.

Faith hands the shield, Hope puts the helmet on,  
Faith girds his loins, and Hope his feet in sandals  
puts.

Faith bids him take the sword, while Hope thus  
whispers:

"Fear no shame, for Faith and I are ever near."  
'Tis now he feels he has a power, a strength  
In that rich light of Truth he yields:  
He feels that in himself there's nought;  
And therefore to the Giver of all good  
Pours forth his soul in gushing gratitude.

Age brings to him no lamentation,  
For Faith and Hope, still standing near,  
Point forward to the glad salvation,  
Which shall with Christ his Lord appear.

His early faith is now matured, for he  
In riper years has followed on to know the Lord.  
The vision of the glorious land is now  
More clearly seen, and nearly viewed.

Death and the grim tyrant's prison he fears not;  
His name in heaven is written, whose sun shall  
soon arise

With healing beams, to loose his chains and set  
him free,

As eagle live—an everlasting youth.  
He dies, but is not lost; his record lives;  
His life is hid, laid up with Christ, in God.

CHARLES SMITH.

Edinburgh, July, 1868.

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.

Neatly got-up, glazed cover (gold-lettered), 34 pages, price, fourpence,

### RECORD OF THE BIRMINGHAM CHRISTADELPHIAN ECCLESIA,

Containing, amongst other things, a verified Statement of the One Faith, on which they are built; together with a scripturally-sustained Specification of the current fables of the Religious World, of which they require a rejection on the part of all seeking their fellowship.

#### LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE DECEMBER NUMBER.

December 2. E. G. Fry, R. Paterson, J. S. Aplin; 3. W. Newport; 4. E. Turney, D. Clement, W. Bain; 5. F. R. Shuttleworth, R. Goldie, T. Fuller, A. Pearson; 6. W. H. Hacking, J. Robertson, S. Fletcher, T. Bosher, J. Phelps; 7. W. B. Otter, W. King, F. R. Shuttleworth; 9. E. Turney; W. D. Jardine, T. Williams, A. Pitt, A. P. Willie, J. Phelps, J. McIntosh; 10. J. Mowatt, H. Goodman; 11. T. Williams, W. Dew, J. Durrie; 13. W. Brown, S. and T. Gilber; 14. B. Ellis, Mrs. Hage; 16. T. Williams, J. Grant, W. J. Turney, H. Clarkson, J. Barrow, W. Fowler, R. Goldie; 17. W. Ellis, W. Osborne, J. J. Andrew; J. Whitehead, R. Whitworth; 18. T. Kidd, J. Coombe, T. Bissett, J. Phelps, J. McIntosh, J. Ritchie, R. Goldie; 19. C. Dealtry, Mrs. Acton, W. Osborne, J. J. Andrew; 20. Miss Hayes, J. Gibbies; 21. F. R. Shuttleworth; 23. W. Newport, J. Wootton, J. Mulholland, T. Haming, G. H. Kidd, J. J. Andrew, W. Graham; R. Paterson, S. G. Hayes, J. K. Ramsey; 25. W. Osborne, W. Clark, J. Mulholland, W. Gill, J. Turney, J. Knight; 26. J. Kirkwood, Geo. Inwood, J. Whitehead, J. Pettigrew, R. Goldie, J. Riley; 27. W. Ellis, F. Lofthouse; 30. McMillan & Co.; 31. W. Dent, C. B. Hume, Thomas Fuller, W. King, Thomas Bosher.

#### RECEIPTS FROM 2ND TO 31ST OF DECEMBER, 1867, INCLUSIVE.

*Ambassador*.—D. Clement, Mumbles, 24 copies (12 months), also bound vol. and back numbers, and postage; A. Pearson, London, 1 copy (12 months); J. Robertson, Turriff, 1 copy (6 months), and postage; S. Fletcher, Nottingham, 6 copies (6 months) and postage; W. R. Otter, Cheltenham, 1 copy (one month), and back numbers, from Dec., 1865, to Aug., 1866; W. J. Turney, Stourbridge, (in *Declarations*) 2s.; J. Phelps, Nottingham, balance for postage; J. Durrie, Newtonshaw, 1 copy (12 months); W. Fowler, Whidby, 4 copies (1 month) and postage; H. Clarkson, Chesterfield, 1 copy (one month) and postage; R. Whitworth, Halifax, 19 copies (1 month) and postage; J. Coombe, Toronto, for W. Guan, 8s6d.; T. Kinn, Dundee, 3 copies (3 months); J. Ritchie, Banff, 1 copy (6 months) and postage; T. Bissett, London, 3 copies (12 months) and postage; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 31 copies (1 month); J. Wootton, Grantham, 2 copies (6 months); J. Mulholland, Glasgow, postage, 2s6d.; J. K. Ramsey, Galston, 3 copies (3 months), postage from Jan. to June; W. Graham, Leeds, balance of account; W. Clark, Glasg., 10 copies (6 months) and postage; J. Kirkwood, Wishaw, 3 back numbers; J. Pettigrew, Dalry, 3 copies (3 months); W. Ellis, Edinburgh, miscellaneous numbers; T. Davis, Birmingham, 63 copies (1 month); F. Lofthouse, Leeds, 1 copy (6 months) and postage; J. Mitchell, Mintlaw, 2 copies [6 months] and postage; T. Bosher, London, 1 copy [3 months]; George Armitage, Heckmondwike, 3 copies [6 months] and postage; T. Fuller, Leeds, 1 copy [12 months] and postage; W. King, Littlebury, 1 copy [3 months] and postage; W. Dent, Nottingham, 6 copies [6 months]; J. Grant, Cambridge, 10s. to credit.

*Twelve Lectures (4th Edition)*.—E. G. Fry, Southport, 1 copy; J. S. Aplin, Yeovil, three copies; D. Clement, Mumbles, 24 copies and 3 bound copies; Mrs. Hage, Newark, 1 bound copy; Thomas Bosher, London, 2 copies; W. R. Otter, Cheltenham, 1 copy; J. Durrie, Newtonshaw, 1 copy; J. Ritchie, Banff, 1 copy; W. Mitchell, Edinburgh, 1 copy; Mrs. Acton, Bath, 1 copy; T. Bissett, London, 12 copies; J. K. Ramsey, Galston, 1 copy; J. Mulholland, Glasgow, 6 copies; W. Clark, Glasgow, 4 copies; W. Ellis, Leith, 11 copies; T. Bosher, London, 3 copies; W. Dent, Nottingham, 1 copy; T. Bosher, London, 1 copy.

*Declarations*.—D. Clement, Mumbles, 50 copies; J. Robertson, Turriff, 12 copies; W. Brown, Powel by Douglas, 2 copies; J. Barrow, Barrow-in-Furness, 24 copies [only 6 sent]; T. Bissett, London, 30 copies; W. Ellis, Leith, 200 copies.

*Miscellaneous*.—J. S. Aplin, Yeovil, 2 copies *Destiny of British Empire*, 2 copies *Contrast*, 2 copies *Devil and Hell*; D. Clement, Mumbles, 2 copies *Eureka*, vol. II, 6 copies *Anastasis*, 3 copies *Elpis Israel*, 6 copies *What is the Truth*; W. Bain, Dundee, balance for *Elpis Israel*; Mrs. Hage, Newark, 1 copy *Anastasis*; J. Robertson, Turriff, 2 copies each, *Anastasis* and *Soul and Kingdom*, 1 copy *Discussion*; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 1 copy *Discussion*, 3 copies *Hymn Book*; W. King, Littlebury, 1 copy *Destiny of British Empire*, 1 copy *Contrast*, 2 copies *Bible Companion*, 1 copy *Eureka* II, 1 copy *Hymn Book*, 1 copy *Diaglott*; W. Brown, Powel-by-Douglas, 1 copy *Devil and Hell*; T. Bissett, London, 2 copies *Anastasis*, 2 copies *Soul and Kingdom* and postage; W. Clark, Glasgow, 1 copy *Elpis Israel*, 3 copies *Discussion*, 6 copies *Way of Life*; W. R. Otter, Cheltenham, 1 copy *Yahweh Elohim*; J. Kirkwood, Wishaw, 2 copies *Devil and Hell*; W. Ellis, Leith, 1 copy *Anastasis*, 2 copies *Elpis Israel*; T. Fuller, Leeds, 6 copies *Way of Life*; W. Dent, Nottingham, 5 copies *Destiny of British Empire*.

*Neatly got-up, glazed cover (gold-letted), 34 pages, price fourpence,*

## RECORD OF THE BIRMINGHAM CHRISTADELPHIAN ECOLESIA,

Containing, amongst other things, a verified Statement of the One Faith on which they are built; together with a scripturally-sustained Specification of the current fables of the Religious World, of which they require a rejection on the part of all seeking their fellowship.

### CANADIAN SUBSCRIBERS.

At Bro. Coombes repeated request, we publish the state of account with individual subscribers in Canada, extending the debit to December, 1868; W. G. Kollmyer, dr., 13-51: cr., 6; D. P. Ross, dr., 13-11d.: cr., 5s6d.; H. Richards, dr., 14-9-11: cr., 5s; W. T. Cleverton, dr., 13-5-1: cr., 5s.; J. Renshaw, dr., 13-5-1: cr., 5s.; J. Wilson, Dr., 13-5-1: cr., 9-7d.; W. Fish, Dayton, dr., 8-5-1: cr., 0s; J. H. Thomas, dr., 12-11d.: cr., 4s.7d.; Mrs. Connel, dr., 12-5-1: cr., 10s.; Geo. Deighton, dr., 13-5-1: cr., 10s2d.; Thomas Cronkrite, dr., 14-5-1: cr., 9-2d.; Robert Colvin, dr., £1 0s 5d.: cr., 19-5-1; Samuel Briggs, dr., 14-5-1: cr., 0s.; Dr. Hipkins, dr., 14-5-1: cr., 9-5-1; John Rains, dr., 4-11d.: cr., 5s.; Dr. Emery, dr., 13-5-1: cr., 13-5-1; George Seaborn, dr., 14-5-1: cr., 5s; George Iarnell, dr., 10s.: cr., 5s.; A. Milne, dr., £1 0s. 6d.: cr., 5s; John Grady, dr., 10s.: cr., 5s.; John Teece, dr., 14-5-1: cr., 8-3-1; John Cove, dr., 14-5-1: cr., 5s; John Harrison, dr., 10s.: cr., 5s.; W. Pengilly, dr., 10s.: cr., 5s.; Edwin Holmes, dr., 10s.: cr., 5s.; C. Howell, dr., 10s.: cr., 5s.; Peter Degeer, dr., 10s.: cr., 7s.; J. S. Harris, dr., 10s.: cr., 5s.; John Wanless, dr., 10s.: cr., 4s.; Sarah Edwards, dr., 10s.: cr., 5s.; C. Packham, dr., 10s.: cr., 5-8-1; A. P. Williamson, dr., 10s.: cr., 11s.; C. M. Taylor, dr., 10s.: cr., 5s.; F. Malcolm, dr., 10s.: cr., 5s.; John Chart, dr., 10s.: cr., 5s.; P. Sims, dr., 10s.: cr., 5s.; I. C. Thomas, dr., 10s.: cr., 5s.; C. Smith, dr., 10s.: cr., 5s.; W. Blashie, dr., 5s.: cr., 5s.; Mrs. Millar, dr., 5s.: cr., 0s.; John Ford, dr., 5s.: cr., 0s.; T. Cornish, dr., 5s.: cr., 0s.; K. Dixon, dr., 5s.: cr., 5s.; J. Marshall, dr., 5s.: cr., 5s.

### LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE LAST NUMBER.

January 1, J. Slack, Mrs. Cumming, Fuller, W. Dew; 2, R. Whitworth; 4, G. Davidson, W. H. Hacking; 6, W. Dew, J. Donaldson, Dr. Thomas, J. Phelps, W. Gill, A. L. Sweet; 8, T. Haining, T. Boshier; 9, R. Black, D. Brown, Marlborough and Co; 13, C. B. Hume, Mrs. Hage, F. R. Shuttleworth, J. Beevor, W. Vernon; 14, J. Robertson, J. Kirkwood, J. Riley; 15, W. Dent, J. Gillies, R. Goldie, R. Hodgson, M. A. Colnell; 16, W. Newport, P. Robertson, J. Coombe, J. J. Andrew, C. Walker, J. Beevor, R. Black, D. Atkins, T. Randles, J. Douglas; 17, McMillan & Co., Mrs. Randles, C. Dealry; 18, J. B. Newlands, R. Paterson, W. Rooke, T. Randles; 20, J. Wootton, T. C. Hodgson, W. Newport, John Stanley, H. Esworth, F. R. Shuttleworth, A. Mason, T. Randles, J. Phelps; 21, R. Paterson, Mrs. Randles, W. S. Allen; 22, W. Gill, Gavin Cree, J. Phelps; 23, R. Paterson, G. Andrew, W. Dew, J. Halgrod, F. R. Shuttleworth, J. J. Andrew, Miss Hayes, Mrs. Randles, W. E. Eaton; 24, R. Whitworth, 25, J. Coombe, J. Beevor, K. Bennett, T. Haining, T. Randles, D. Clement; 27, P. Goldie, J. Swinton, J. Brown; R. Paterson, T. Haining, J. Phelps, J. Everett, C. Bennett, B. Ellis; 29, T. Haining, T. Fuller, C. A. Bishop, J. Beevor, W. Clark; 30, H. L. Drake, J. Coombe, R. Woods, W. Gunn, T. Randles.

### RECEIPTS FROM JANUARY 1ST TO FEBRUARY 1ST, 1868, INCLUSIVE.

AMBASSADOR.—Mrs. Cumming, London, postage; W. Dent, Kaber, 1 copy (16 months) and postage; Geo Davidson, Jarrow-on-Tyne, 1 copy (18 months); W. H. Hacking, Listowel, 7 copies (12 months) and postage; Henry Clarkson, Chesterfield, 1 copy (12 months) and postage; W. Dew, Innerleithen, 4 copies (6 months) and postage; J. Bevan, Sandford Park, 1 copy (12 months) and postage; Geo. Dell, Llanely, 1 copy (12 months) and postage; J. Gillies, Beith, 6 copies (six months) and postage; R. Hodgson, Wishaw, 12 copies (six months); Geo. Inwood, San Francisco, to account, 10s.; J. Coomb, Toronto, 1 copy (12 months); D. Atkins, Barnstable, 2 copies (3 months); R. Black, Glasgow, 5 copies (6 months); W. Rooke, Sydney, 4 copies (12 months) and postage; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 35 copies (1 month) and postage; F. R. Shuttleworth, Whitby, 7 copies (1 month) and postage, Miss Hayes, Bridlington, 5 copies (six months) and postage; R. Whitworth, Halifax, 19 copies (one month) and postage; J. Coombe, Toronto, for Mrs. Miller, G. Kollmyer, A. P. Williamson, and Geo. Deighton, 4 copies (12 months) and postage; R. Goldie, Swansea, £1 for self and £1 from T. Randles, to account; J. Brown, Green Island, Otago, 4 copies (12 months) and postage; T. Meakin, Derby, (per G. Meakin,) balance to date, 5 copies monthly; C. Bennett, Mumbles, odd nos.; T. Haining, Auchinleck, 11 copies (6 months) and postage; C. A. Bishop, odd nos. and postage; J. Beevor, Scarborough, 1 copy (1 month); J. Coombe, Toronto, 5 copies, for J. Wilson, R. Dixon, J. M. S. Harris, J. Marshall, W. Gilnour, (12 months) and postage; J. Southill, Harvard, U.S., for C. Beebe, 1 copy (12 months) and postage; T. G. Newma, Teignmouth, 1 copy (12 months) and balance; T. Davis, Birmingham, 63 copies 1 month; W. Gill, Aberdeen, 14 copies 6 months and postage; Gavin Cree, Bigger, 1 copy, 12 months and postage.

*Twelve Lectures*—W. H. Hacking, Listowel, C.W., balance on 50 copies; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 3 copies; Thos. Boshier, London, 2 copies and postage; W. Ternon, Dorchester, 1 copy and postage; M. A. Colnell, Gravesend, 1 copy and postage; J. Beevor, Scarborough, 3 copies and postage; H. Bannister, Derby, 2 copies; F. R. Shuttleworth, Whitby, 3 copies, and postage; Miss Hayes, Bridlington, 8 copies; W. E. Eaton, Sheffield, 1 copy.

*Miscellaneous*.—J. Gillies, Beith, 1 copy *Anastasis*, 3 copies *Elpis Israel*; Mrs. Hage, Newark, 1 copy *Record*; McMillan and Co., Cambridge, 1 copy *Elpis Israel*; H. Bannister, Derby, 1 copy *Record*; 3 copies *How to Search* and 30 copies *Declaration*; W. Newport, Weston-Super-Mare, 2 copies *Record*, 6 copies *Bible Companion*; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 5 copies *Hymn Book*; Geo. Andrew, Whitechapel, 1 copy *Discussion* and postage; Miss Hayes, Bridlington, 3 copies *Record*; 10s. *Advertising Scheme*, 20s. toward deficiency in publishing fourth edition *Lectures*; R. Whitworth, Halifax, 1 copy *Elpis Israel*; J. Everett, Weston, 1 copy *Discussion*; J. Beevor, Scarborough, 1 copy each, *Discussion*, *Destiny of the British Empire*, *Contrast*, *How to Search*, and *Declaration*

## NOTES.

The articles by brethren C. Walker ("The Resurrection of the dead") and C. Smith ("Christ the first fruits of them that sleep") will appear next month.

AMERICAN SUBSCRIBERS will please take notice that owing to the high rate of customs duties on imported books, in addition to the cost of shipment from Britain, the price of copies of *Twelve Lectures*, in the hands of brother Donaldson, Detroit, is one dollar, and of the *Declaration*, eleven cents.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.—For brother Robertson's labours in the north, the Editor acknowledges, with thanks, from a sister, £3; a brother, £1 5s.; a brother, £1; a brother, 10s.; a sister 5s.

For brother Smith, of Girvan, whose need was mentioned last month, the following liberal provision has been made:—A sister, £1; a sister, 15s.; a brother, 5s.; a brother, 10s.; a brother, 9s.; an ecclesia, 20s.; poor brethren in Birmingham, 6s.; a brother, 10s.; a brother, 2s.; an ecclesia, 10s.; a brother, 5s. These sums, with the exception of 7s. yet to be sent, have been remitted to Brother Haining, who is overwhelmed with gratitude at the hearty response to his appeal on behalf of brother Smith. He mentions having received other sums direct from the contributors, viz., a brother, 10s.; an ecclesia, 41; an ecclesia, £1. He says "The amount has far exceeded all expectation on our part, and has produced within us a feeling of profound gratitude to the Giver of every good and perfect gift, and towards the brethren, who have thus been instrumental in giving timely relief in pressing need to a fellow servant in Jesus anointed. It is a peculiar and signal triumph to the truth. Its enemies imagined that its only friend in the town where brother Smith lived, was vanquished and silenced, having to consign himself and his wife to the poor-house, but just as he thought he would have to surrender, and while seated with his wife at what

seemed likely to be their last scanty meal under their own roof, my letter was handed to him, enclosing the first instalment of the brethren's bounty."—Brother Smith himself also writes in terms of devout thanksgiving.

RESPONSE TO THE BOOK LOAN SUGGESTION.—Brother Shuttleworth, of Whitby, writes as follows: "Many thanks to the brethren and sisters who have so promptly responded to my application for books, pamphlets, &c., for loan purposes. Their recompense is recorded Eph. vi, 7, 8. The following have been received, viz., a BROTHER (London): 5 *Declarations*, 1 *Discussion*, 6 *Ways of Life*, 3 *Summaries*, 1 *Names of Blasphemy*, 2 *Rewards*, 2 *Gospel of Kingdom*; total, 20 pamphlets. A BROTHER, (Mumbles): 1 *Twelve Lectures*, 2 *Ambassadors*; total, 3 books and pamphlets. A BROTHER and SISTER, (Newark): 1 *Elpis Israel* (4th Ed.), 1 *Twelve Lectures*, 1 *Kingdom and Name*. P.O. expended in the following: 2 *Twelve Lectures*, 6 *Discussions*, 2 *Destiny*, 1 *Contrast*, 1 *Record*; total 15 books and pamphlets. A BROTHER, (Manchester) 7 *Testimonies*, 12 *Restitution Age*, 12 *God and Man's Word*, 12 *Can you Believe?* 12 *Age to Come*, 4 *What is Truth?* 20 *Is Christ Coming to Reign?* 3 *Covenants of Promise*; total, 82 pamphlets and leaflets. A BROTHER (Jersey, Channel Islands): 49 *Ambassadors*, (6 over complete set), 2 *Twelve Lectures*, 6 *Declarations*, 1 *Discussion*, 1 *Devil and Hell*, 1 *Contrast*, 2 *Synopsis*, 1 *The Bible*, &c., 1 *Eternal Life*, &c., 6 *Testimony*, 1 *What is Truth?* 1 *How to Search*, 3 *Elpis Israel*, (4th Ed.), 1 *Elements of Gospel*, 4 leaflets; total 78 books, pamphlets, and leaflets. A BROTHER, (Dublin), several sets of *Ambassadors*, (vols. I and II,) amounting to 225 copies. Bro. Shuttleworth exclaims "What a lot!" A BROTHER, (Edinburgh), 11 copies "Way of Life" A BROTHER, (Innerleithen), 17 *Ambassadors*.

---

### A GUIDE FOR TRAVELING BROTHERS AND FRIENDS OF THE TRUTH.

We have been repeatedly requested to publish, on the cover of the *Ambassador*, a list of addresses of brethren in various towns for the convenience of those who may travel, and who desire access to the friends of the truth in the various towns which they may visit. In future, our friends will find such a list on this part of the cover, corrected from month to month as alterations take place. This month there is no space for it. We shall make a commencement next month.



## CONTENTS.

	Page.
The New Testament Doctrine of Judgment ... ..	63
The Apocalypse Paraphrased ... ..	67
The Providence of God ... ..	70
Sunday Morning, (Christadelphian Synagogue, Birmingham)... ..	74
Who was the Father of Jesus Christ? ... ..	80
The Political Heavens and the Signs Thereof ... ..	85
Intelligence ... ..	93
Visit of Dr. Thomas ... ..	cover, page 2
Notes ... ..	,, ,, 3

*Neatly got-up, glazed cover (gold-lettered), 34 pages, price fourpence,*

## RECORD OF THE BIRMINGHAM CHRISTADELPHIAN ECOLESIA,

Containing, amongst other things, a verified Statement of the One Faith, on which they are built; together with a scripturally-sustained Specification of the current fables of the Religious World, of which they require a rejection on the part of all seeking their fellowship.

## LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE LAST NUMBER.

Feb. 3, T. Boshier, Geo. T. Simpson, J. Hawkins, W. Dew; 4, A. J. Tugwell, W. Thomas, J. W. Moore, W. R. D. Gascayne, Mrs. Sharp; 5, J. Coombe, J. Richards, J. Phelps, T. Fisher; 7, W. Ellis, "Rev." T. Davies, J. Habgood; 10, F. Willis, W. D. Jardine, Eusebia Lassius; 11, Mrs. Hage, A. Pitt, F. R. Shuttleworth, W. Dew, Miss Hayes; 12, E. Lilley, A. Hart; 13, J. Walsh, J. Wilson; 14, F. R. Shuttleworth, R. Hodgson, J. Coombe, J. Robertson, J. Grant, T. Boshier, J. Donaldson, S. G. Hayes; 15, T. Bantles, R. Whitworth; 17, J. J. Andrew, T. Haining, J. Hodgson, C. Smith, D. Evans, W. Birkenhead, W. D. Jardine; 18, E. Turney, H. Shires, J. Walker, H. Turner; 19, D. Clement, J. Deatry, A. Williams; 20, W. Gill, W. Newport, J. Rhodes, J. Coombe, J. Phelps; 21, A. Pitt, H. Turner, F. R. Shuttleworth, J. Walker, W. D. Jardine; 22, T. Bantles, J. C. Weyers, J. Richards, F. R. Shuttleworth, J. Robertson, C. Mc Donaldson; 24, R. Goldie, J. Soothill, R. Paterson, J. S. Aplin; 25, T. Haining, C. Smith.

## RECEIPTS FROM FEBRUARY 3RD TO FEBRUARY 25TH INCLUSIVE.

*Ambassador.*—J. Hawkins, Frome, 1 copy (12 months) and postage; G. T. Simpson, Philadelphia, U. S. for missing number; T. Fisher, Huddersfield, 1 copy (6 months) and postage; F. Willis (for Mrs. Willis), Huddersfield, 1 copy (12 months) and postage; E. Lilley, Hong Kong, China, 4 copies (12 months) and postage; A. Hart, Jarrow-on-Tyne, 1 copy (2 years) and postage; J. Coombe, Toronto, for J. H. Thomas, Dr. Hipkins, C. Packham, Sarah Edwards, J. T. Shapter and Self, 6 copies (12 months) and postage; J. Grant, Cambridge, Strathspey, 1 copy (12 months) and postage, with balance to credit; R. Whitworth, Halifax, 20 copies (one month) and postage, also number for January; J. Griffiths, Kingston, (per F. Jones) 2 copies (seven months) and postage; T. Davis, Birmingham, 55 copies, (one month); J. Rhodes, Huddersfield, 3 copies, (three months) and postage; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 33 copies (one month) and postage; F. R. Shuttleworth, Whitby, 10 copies (one month) and postage, also two extra copies; J. J. Andrew, London, 30s. to account; J. Robertson, Turiff, £1 to account of 10 copies monthly; J. Richards, Montgomery, 3 copies, (6 months) and postage.

*Twelve Lectures.*—T. Boshier, London, 2 copies; Mrs. Sharp, Brighton, 1 copy; E. Lilley, Hong Kong, China, 3 copies; F. R. Shuttleworth, Whitby, 2 copies; R. Whitworth, Halifax, 1 copy; H. Turner, Birmingham, (while on journey), 2 copies; W. Allen, Birmingham, 1 copy.

*Miscellaneous.*—W. Dew, Innerleithen, 3 copies *Record*; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 6 *Hymn Books*; E. Lilley, Hong Kong, China, 2 *Records*, 2 *Hymn Books*, 2 *Bible Companions*; 1 copy *Eureka*, vol. II, 1 *Declaration*, 6 *Discussions*, 2 *How to Search the Scriptures*, 2 *Destiny B. Empire*, 1 *Elpis Israel*, 1 *Anaolia*; F. R. Shuttleworth, Whitby, 1 *Record*, 1 *Contrast*, 6 *Discussions*, 2 *Destiny B. Empire*; T. Boshier, London, 6 *Declarations*; S. G. Hayes, 4 copies *Roman Question*; J. Griffith, Kingston, 1 *Elpis Israel*; T. Davis, Birmingham, 12 *Records*; H. Shires, Leeds, 1 *Record*; James Walker, Newcastle, 6 *Hymn Books*, 1 *How to Search the Scriptures* and 1 *Anastasis*; W. Newport, Weston-super-Mare, 1 *Roman Question*; S. Richards, Montgomery, 1 *Record*; W. Dew, Innerleithen, 10s. to Advertising Scheme; J. Rhodes, Huddersfield, 3s. to ditto.

The Ambassador of the  
Coming Age, Mar. 1, 1868.]

# 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.

---

MARCH.

---

BIRMINGHAM :

PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR,  
ROBERT ROBERTS, CARLTON PLACE, BELGRAVE ROAD.

PRINTED BY WILLIAM H. DAVIS,  
8, NEEDLESS ALLEY, TEMPLE ROW.

1868.

PRICE FOURPENCE.

---

 VISIT OF DR. THOMAS.
 

---

**SWANSEA.**—The brethren here guarantee five pounds towards the expenses of the proposed visit, speaking “most strong y” in its favour, and particularly desiring an early visit to the town on account of the wide-spread attention the truth is there receiving.

**BIRMINGHAM**—The weekly collection continues at an average of sixteen shillings, without at all impairing the usual contribution towards current expenses. A box has been placed in the hall, with the following printed notice over it: “*VISIT OF DR. THOMAS TO BRITAIN.*—Interested strangers having expressed a desire to contribute towards the cost of bringing Dr. Thomas on a lecturing tour to this country, this box is placed here to receive what they may be disposed to give from time to time during the next few months.”

**CUMNOCK.**—Bro. Haining writes:—We are very glad to know that our much and justly esteemed bro. Dr. Thomas, is about to be invited to pay another visit to this country. We sincerely trust that he may find it convenient to come. Among living men, he is certainly the ablest expounder of divine truth. We consider his services at this time (should the Lord delay His coming yet a short space) would be most valuable. The sphere of his labour is now much wider. Through the labours of yourself and others, under God, the knowledge of first principles has been diffused throughout a wider range, thus giving greater facilities to him, who is enabled through a long course of industrious study of the Holy Scriptures to bring out therefrom things new and old. We will be ready to contribute according to our ability towards the object of his visit and in accordance with the method which may be considered best to be adopted.

**MANCHESTER.**—Bro. Birkenhead writes:—Add my name to the list of those who are in favour of a visit of our worthy brother Dr. Thomas to this country, at the same

time promising to add my mite when required towards defraying his expenses and making his visit pleasant. I should be glad of an opportunity of seeing him and hearing from his lips words of wisdom.

**WHITBY**—Brother Shuttleworth writes: “The brethren here are much rejoiced at the possibility of a visit from our highly-esteemed brother John Thomas, and they would also be glad of the opportunity of taking some humble share in the pecuniary responsibilities involved.”

**WISHAW.**—Brother R. Hodgson (whose letter was omitted by an oversight last month), says: “With regard to an invitation to the Dr. to come again to this country, I think I only need say I should be very glad to see him, and shall be glad to join in the expense of the journey. I hope you are not overlooking the fact that the Dr. is getting an old man, and therefore less able for work than when here last; and even then, he was very near killed with hard work. Should the invitation be given for the Dr. to come alone? seeing this would again separate him from his family. If he could bring his wife and daughter along with him, some central place of residence might be chosen, where his labours might be utilised to the extent of his power, with due regard to their comfort.”

A number of others, in divers places, incidentally allude in favourable terms to the proposed visit. The collective invitation was transmitted to the Dr. two weeks ago. His answer will probably appear in next month's *Ambassador*. Meanwhile a letter has been received from his daughter, sister Lassius, in which she hints that the amount of work yet to be done in completion of the 3rd vol. of *Eureka*, which the Dr. desires to publish before visiting Britain, makes it impossible at present to fix a date.

---

The Ambassador of the  
Coming Age, April 1, 1868.]

# 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.

---

APRIL.

---

BIRMINGHAM:

PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR,  
ROBERT ROBERTS, CARLTON PLACE, 64, BELGRAVE ROAD.

PRINTED BY WILLIAM H. DAVIS,  
8, NEEDLESS ALLEY, TEMPLE ROW.

1868.

PRICE FOURPENCE.

## NOTES.

"THE ROMAN QUESTION."—This tract has not yet come to hand. We are in daily expectation of a supply. Orders will be despatched as soon as it arrives.

OMISSION FROM THE ACKNOWLEDGMENTS OF LAST MONTH.—By a mistake of the printer, who missed a line in setting from copy, three contributions to the need of brother Smith, of Girvan, were omitted from the acknowledgments of last month, viz., an ecclesia, £1 5s.; a brother, £1; a brother, 5s. The Editor acknowledges, in addition to the receipts of last month, 4s. from a brother and 5s. from a sister; also for the general expense of Christ's work in Birmingham: a sister, £1; a brother and sister, 15s. Brother Haining announces, for bro. Smith, the receipt of a further sum of 10s.

THE PROPOSED VISIT OF DR. THOMAS.—No reply has yet (March 25th.) been received to the collective invitation transmitted to the Dr about four weeks ago. If the Dr. is on one of his frequent journeys, a little more delay may take place. In a letter from brother Coombe, of Toronto, who is near the source of information, it is mentioned as the Dr.'s idea that he cannot accept the invitation just yet. The ecclesia at Mumbles guarantee £15 towards expenses, in the event of his visit. Brother E. Turney (NOTTINGHAM) writes March 23rd to say, that on the previous day, the brethren agreed upon a weekly contribution toward the expenses of the Dr.'s visit. He adds: "It may appear singular that the Notting-

ham brethren, who are so well known to be hearty friends of the Dr., should not have commenced sooner; but, as I said to you not long ago, 'There are things one cannot help,' and one is, the general poverty of the ecclesia here. On this account, I did not feel at liberty to push the matter, but preferred that it should be started by themselves. This, I am glad to say, has been done, and though the result may not be great, it will be looked at upon the principle of the widow's mite."—We have to acknowledge the receipt of 5s. from Mrs. Williams, Stratford, and 20s. from a brother, toward the general fund.

THE BOOK LENDING SCHEME.—Brother Shuttleworth of Whitby, writing March 20th, says "Please acknowledge in *Ambassador*, with thanks, the following further responses to the Book Loan suggestion:—A brother (HARBORNE) 22 *Ambassadors*; 3 *Twelve Lectures*, 4th edition; A brother (EDINBURGH), 35 *Testimony*; A brother (WALKERBURN), 10 *How to Search*, &c.; A sister (BRIDLINGTON), 1 *Twelve Lectures*, 4th edition; 1 *Outline of the Constitution of Man*; 1 *Forty Questions on Immortality*. A brother (WISHAW), 116 *Ambassadors*. The kindly and gratuitous contribution of books and pamphlets, by brethren and sisters at a distance, is doing good service. Eyes have been opened, interest created, and oral enunciations confirmed to enquiring minds by their perusal. There is much to battle with and much to encourage. A harvest at hand."

*Price 2s4d. post free,*

#### FOURTH EDITION OF TWELVE LECTURES.

*Price 10s8d., post free,*

#### FOURTH EDITION OF ELPIS ISRAEL.

(BY DR. THOMAS.)

This work should, by all means, be procured by those whose attention has been attracted to the truth, and who are anxious to be enlightened therein. It contains a clear and convincing exposition of the hope of Israel, from its commencement in antediluvian times to its culmination in the appearance of Jesus, shewing the purpose of God to have been one from the beginning, and the whole scripture to be in harmony, from Genesis to Revelation.

ORDERS TO THE EDITOR.

## THE AMBASSADOR

(A monthly periodical of 28 pages, devoted to the exposition and defence of divine truth,  
as apprehended from a CHRISTOPHERIAN point of view.)

Is published on the last Thursday of each month for the month following.

**TERMS—Five Shillings per annum, post free.**

To Subscribers in the UNITED STATES, at current rates of exchange, *Two Dollars per annum*, to be remitted in advance to *J. DONALDSON, 242, Jefferson Avenue, DETROIT, Mich.*

Canadian subscriptions, the same as English; Agents:—*J. COOMBE, 104, Yonge-st., Toronto*; and *W. H. HACKING, Banner Office, Listowel.*

Where there is no notice of discontinuance, *subscription is taken as renewed.*

**SUBSCRIPTION NOT ACCEPTED FOR LESS THAN A VOLUME.**

Sets of back numbers from the commencement can be supplied; also bound volumes at 6s.; two vols. bound in one, 9s; three in one, 12; four ditto, 15s.

*Letters & remittances to R. ROBERTS, Athenæum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham.*

## A GUIDE FOR TRAVELLING BRETHREN & FRIENDS OF THE TRUTH.

- BARNSTAPLE.**—D. Atkins, Bradford Villa  
**BATH,** (Scotland.)—J. Gillies, grocer  
**BIRMINGHAM.**—Robert Roberts, Athenæum  
Rooms, Temple row, or 64, Belgrave-rd.  
**CARRBRIDGE,** Strathspey, (Scotland.)—J.  
Grant  
**CUMNICK,** (Scotland.)—T. Haining, Auch-  
inlech  
**DERBY.**—T. Meakin, 1, Peel-street, Ash-  
bourn-road  
**DEVONPORT.**—J. W. Moore, 4, Seymour  
Crescent, near Millbridge  
**DUBLIN.**—W. D. Jardine, 91 Bride-street  
**DUNKELD,** (Scotland.)—J. Milne, Athol-st.  
**EDINBURGH.**—Charles Smith, 45, North  
Richmond-street, or W. Ellis, 3, Prim-  
rose-place, Lochend-road, Leith  
**GALASHIELS,** (Scotland.)—W. Milne, High  
Town  
**GALSTON,** (Scotland.)—J. K. Ramsay, M.D  
**GLASGOW.**—W. Clarke, 54, Harmony-row,  
Govan  
**HALIFAX.**—R. Whitworth, Moorside  
**HECKMONDWIKE.**—G. Armitage, Northgate  
**HUDDERSFIELD.**—J. Rhodes, 25, Albion-st.  
**INNERLEITHEN.**—W. Dew, Walkerburn  
**JERSEY.**—S. G. Hayes, 40, Belmont-road,  
St. Heliers  
**KINGTON.**—J. Griffiths, Headbrook  
**LONDON.**—J. J. Andrew, 376, Strand;  
T. Bisset, 92, Charrington-street,  
Oakley-square  
**LLANELLY,** (South Wales.)—George Dell  
**LEEDS.**—A. P. Willis, grocer, Armley  
**LIVERPOOL.**—James Lind, 72, Dale-street  
**MUMBLES,** (South Wales.)—W. Clement  
**MANCHESTER.**—W. Birkenhead, Sale  
**MONTGOMERY,** (Wales.)—J. Richards,  
Church Stoke  
**NEWARK.**—John Hage  
**NEWCASTLE.**—Cornelius Young, 24, Leazes  
street, Gateshead  
**NOTTINGHAM.**—E. Turney, Trent Bridge  
Works; J. Phelps, 6, John-st., Sneyton  
**OLLERTON.**—W. Hage, Bilsthorpe  
**RIPLEY.**—W. Blount, High-street  
**SWANSEA.**—R. Goldie, 2, Bellevue street  
**STOURBRIDGE.**—J. Turney, Cliff Works  
**TEIGNMOUTH.**—T. G. Newman, 10, Bank-st.  
**TURRIFF,** (Scotland.)—J. Robertson, 18,  
Chapel-street  
**WESTON-SUPER-MARE.**—W. Newport, 3,  
Claremont Buildings  
**WISHAW,** (Scotland.)—R. Hodgson, Inland  
Revenue Officer  
**WHITBY.**—F. R. Shuttleworth, 8, Gray-st.

CONTENTS.

The New Testament Doctrine of Judgment	...	...	...	...	95
The Gospel Quadrilateral	..	...	..	...	99
Sunday Morning, (Christadelphian Synagogue, Birmingham)	...	...	...	...	101
The Resurrection of the Dead	...	...	...	...	106
Christ the First Fruits of Them that Slept	..	...	..	...	109
Answers to Correspondents	...	..	..	...	113
Intelligence	...	...	...	...	118
Notes	...	...	...	...	cover, page 2

*Neatly got-up, glazed cover (gold-lettered), 34 pages, price fourpence,*

RECORD OF THE BIRMINGHAM CHRISTADELPHIAN ECOLESIA,

Containing, amongst other things, a verified Statement of the One Faith, on which they are built; together with a scripturally-sustained Specification of the current fables of the Religious World, of which they require a rejection on the part of all seeking their fellowship.

LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE LAST NUMBER.

Feb. 26. W. D. Jardine, H. Barber, J. Mulholland; 27. A. Hart, F. R. Shuttleworth, J. Soothill, W. Osborne, F. M. Atkinson; 28. D. Atkins, Susan King; 29. H. Barber, R. Murray; Mar. 2, W. W. Holmes, T. Moss, Elliot Stock, W. Johnstone, A. Sister, R. Goldie; 3. Mc. Intosh, W. Osborne, W. Cundall, Jane Robertson, "Rev." A Wolfe; 4. H. Dyer, John Gibbs; 5. W. Cundall, W. Osborne, J. Atkinson; 6. R. Whitworth, W. Daw, W. Wood, W. Dent, J. Donaldson; 7. W. Dent, W. Dew, "Rev." A Wolfe; 9. R. Hodgson, W. Johnstone; 10. George Adam, Young and Co.; 11. C. Smith, T. Kidd, J. Kirkwood, J. Robertson; George Adam Young and Co.; J. Coombs, R. C. Bingley, C. Smith, (Ontario); J. Evans, 13, T. Boshier, D. Brown, J. Robinson, jun.; 14. W. Newport, J. S. Apth, A. Williams, T. Fuller; 16. D. Brown, (Calcutta); J. Robinson; 18. D. Moran; 19. W. Ellis, An Enquirer, J. Mulholland; H. L. Drake, J. Robinson, A. Reader, D. Clement; J. W. Moore, J. Phelps; 21, F. R. Shuttleworth; 23, J. J. Andrews, A. Pitt, J. L. Hathaway, Miss Hayes, J. Phelps, T. Randies; 24, H. Haywood, E. Turney, F. R. Shuttleworth, A. Grant.

RECEIPTS FROM FEBRUARY 26TH TO MARCH 24TH, INCLUSIVE.

*Ambassador*.—J. Mulholland, Glasgow, 8 copies, (6 months); T. Moss, Easterdale, 1 copy, (6 months) and postage; J. Slack, Huddow, 1 copy, (3 months) and postage; W. Osborne, Tewkesbury, 1 copy, (7 months) and postage; R. Whitworth, Halifax, 20 copies, (1 month) and postage; T. Boshier, London, 1 copy, (12 months) and postage, and two additional numbers; T. C. Cleverdon, Burford, C. W., 1 copy, (12 months) "Rev." A. Wolfe, Bury St. Edmunds, 1 copy, (4 months) and postage; T. Davis, Birmingham, 55 copies, (1 month); T. Kidd, Dundee, 1 copy, (3 months) and postage; J. Kirkwood, Wishaw, 4 copies, (6 months) and postage; J. Coombs, Toronto, (for George Farnell) 1 copy, (12 months) and postage; C. Smith, Belle Ville, Ontario, C. W., 1 copy, (12 months) and postage; J. Evans, Waterloo, C. W., 2 copies, (12 months) and postage; A. Williams, Stratford, 1 copy (12 months) and postage; T. Fuller, Headingley, 1 copy, (12 months) and postage; W. Newport, Weston super-mare, 1 copy (12 months) and postage; W. Ellis, Edinburgh 24 copies (12 months) and postage, (with the exception of small balance); J. Phelps, Nottingham, 34 copies, (1 month) and odd numbers; F. R. Shuttleworth, 10 copies (1 month) and postage; A. Pitt, London, 1 copy, (two months) and postage.

*Twelve Lectures*.—R. Murray, Lanark, 1 copy; W. Osborne, Tewkesbury, 12 copies; Jane Robertson, Portsmouth, 1 copy; J. Gibbs, Drolwich, 1 copy; T. C. Cleverdon, Burford, C.W., 2 copies; "Rev." A. Wolfe, Bury St. Edmunds, 1 copy; B. Withers, Birmingham, 2 copies; A. Brother, ditto, 1 copy; George Adam, Young and Company, Edinburgh, 1 copy; T. Boshier, London, 1 copy; J. Robinson, Blyth, 1 copy; A. L. Drake, Guelf, C. W., £3 to account of 50 copies and sundries; J. W. Moore, Devonport, 4 copies; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 1 copy; A. Grant, Cluny Castle, Aberdeenshire, 2 copies.

MISCELLANEOUS.—J. Soothill, Stainland, 4 *Declarations*; W. Osborne, Tewkesbury, 1 *Elpis Israel*, 1 *Record*, 1 *Hymn Book*, 4 *How to Search*, 1 *Bible Comp.*; H. Dyer, Bradford-on-Avon, 1 *Record*; J. Atkinson, Stancliffe, 2 *How to Search*; W. Dent, Nottingham, 12 *Roman Question*; R. C. Bingley, Kanaksee, Ill., U.S.A., £5 towards deficiency on the 4th edition of *Lectures*; W. Dent, Haber, 1 *Record*; T. Boshier, London, 1 *Record*, 3 *How to Search*, 12 *Bible Companions*, 1 *Evangelist*, vol. 2, 6 *Declarations*; W. Johnstone, Peckham, 6 *Declarations*, 1 *Discussion*, 1 *Devil and Hell*; T. Kidd, Dundee, 3 *Discussions*, 1 *Contrast*; J. Kirkwood, Wishaw, 2 *Devil and Hell*; George Adam, Young and Company, Edinburgh, 1 *How to Search*, 1 *Declaration*, 1 *Discussion*, 1 *Contrast*, 1 *Devil and Hell*; A. Williams, Stratford, 1 *Record*; W. Newport, Weston-super-mare, 1 *Declaration*, 3 *Bible Companion*; J. W. Moore, Devonport, 6 *Records*; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 3 *Hymn Books*, 1 *Contrast*, F. R. Shuttleworth, Whitley, 5 *Hymn Books*

The Ambassador of the  
Coming Age, May 1, 1868

# 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.

---

MAY.

---

BIRMINGHAM:

PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR,  
ROBERT ROBERTS, CARLTON PLACE, 64, BELGRAVE ROAD.

---

PRINTED BY WILLIAM H. DAVIS,  
8, NEEDLESS ALLEY, TEMPLE ROW.

---

1868.

Price FIVE SHILLINGS PER ANNUM, including Postage.



## THE INVITATION TO DR. THOMAS.

### "GO ON WITH YOUR PREPARATIONS."

A reply from Dr. Thomas to the invitation transmitted to him in the name of several hundred persons in Britain, to revisit this country, has been received by the Editor. It amounts to this: "I will come; I cannot exactly say when, owing to the necessity for getting *Eureka* III out of the way first; but when I know, I will write. Meanwhile, go on with your preparations." The literal text of that part of his letter which deals with the subject is as follows: "What can I say in answer to the pressing invitation to revisit England? \* \* \* If I had no anchorage here, I could easily reply. This much is certain, that I cannot come to you until I get *Eureka* III off my hands; I think I may finish the M.S. in a month, if not interrupted. I have then to issue a prospectus, and await returns. When I find I may venture to publish, I shall then proceed to get it through the press. This will bring me near the close of this year. I shall then be better prepared to say *when you may expect me*. In the meantime, you can go on as you are now doing, in preparation of the means to meet the demands of shipmasters, ticket agents, and so forth. When *Eureka* III is in your hands, you shall hear from me further on this subject." This throws the Dr.'s visit a little further off than anticipated. (SEE LATER INTELLIGENCE, TO BE FOUND ON PAGE 153, INSIDE OF *Ambassador*.) In the meantime the brethren cannot do better than act on the suggestion thrown out. A gradual "laying by in store as God hath prospered us" (1 Cor. xvi, 2) will not be so burdensome as an immediate contribution, and will enable us, by placing more money at our disposal, the more efficiently to promote the object of the Dr.'s visit. Therefore, let those who have made a beginning go on, and those who have not begun, start at once. Time flies. If the Lord's advent arrest us in the work, we could not be found better employed than arranging for a more effective publication of the truth.

Brother ARTHUR HALL, of Crimond, Aberdeenshire, Scotland, is reduced to straits, through family illness, and appeals for help. His statements are attested. (See Prov. xxi, 13.)

### ADVERTISEMENT FUND.

AMOUNT EXPENDED AS PER VOUCHERS IN THE HANDS OF THE EDITOR.					
					£ s. d.
1867.					
Nov. 19th.—Public Opinion ...	...	...	...	...	0 10 0
Dec. 5th.—Religious Opinion ...	...	...	...	...	0 7 0
1868.					
Jan. 8th.—Christian World ...	...	...	...	...	0 6 0
" 20th.—Nonconformist ...	...	...	...	...	0 7 6
" 29th.—Methodist Times ...	...	...	...	...	0 6 6
Feb. 22nd.—Freeman (Baptist) ...	...	...	...	...	0 5 0
" 26th.—Wesleyan Times ...	...	...	...	...	0 3 6
" " —Weekly Review (Presbyterian) ...	...	...	...	...	0 5 0
Mar. 3rd.—English Independent ...	...	...	...	...	0 7 0
" 21st.—Christian Times ...	...	...	...	...	0 6 6
" " —Independent ...	...	...	...	...	0 8 6
J. J. ANDREW, LONDON.					£3 12 6

Some few applications for works have been made in consequence of the Advertisements. Ed.

## THE AMBASSADOR

(A monthly periodical of 28 pages, devoted to the exposition and defence of divine truth,  
as apprehended from a CHRISTADELPHIAN point of view.)

Is published on the last Thursday of each month for the month following.

TERMS—Five Shillings per annum, post free.

To Subscribers in the UNITED STATES, at current rates of exchange, *Two Dollars* per annum. to be remitted in advance to *J. DONALDSON, 242, Jefferson Avenue, DETROIT, Mich.*

Canadian subscriptions, the same as English; Agents:—*J. COOMBE, 104, Yonge-st., Toronto*; and *W. H. HACKING, Banner Office, Listowel.*

Where there is no notice of discontinuance, *subscription is taken as renewed.*

SUBSCRIPTION NOT ACCEPTED FOR LESS THAN A VOLUME.

Sets of back numbers from the commencement can be supplied; also bound volumes at 6s.; two vols. bound in one, 9s.; three in one, 12; four ditto, 15s.

Letters & remittances to *R. ROBERTS, Athenæum Rooms, Temp'e Row, Birmingham.*

### A GUIDE FOR TRAVELLING BRETHERN & FRIENDS OF THE TRUTH.

- BARNSTABLE.—D. Atkins, Bradford Villa  
BETH, (Scotland.)—J. Gillies, grocer  
BIRMINGHAM.—Robert Roberts Athenæum  
Rooms, Temple row, or 61, Belgrave-rd.  
CARRBRIDGE, Strathspey, (Scotland.)—J.  
Grant  
CUMNOCK, (Scotland.)—T. Haining, Auch-  
inlech  
DERBY.—T. Meakin, 1, Peel-street, Ash-  
bourn-road  
DEVONPORT.—J. W. Moore, 4, Seymour Cres.  
cent, end of Hotham place, nr Millbridge  
DUBLIN.—W. D. Jardine, 91 Bride-street  
DUNKELD, (Scotland.)—J. Milne, Athol-st.  
EDINBURGH.—Charles Smith, 45, North  
Richmond-street, or W. Ellis, 3, Prim-  
rose-place, Lochend-road, Leith  
GALASHIELLS, (Scotland.)—W. Milne, High  
Town  
GALSTON, (Scotland.)—J. K. Ramsay, M.D  
GLASGOW.—W. Clarke, 54, Harmony-row,  
Govan  
HALIFAX.—R. Whitworth, Moorside  
HECKMONDWIKE.—G. Armitage, Northgate  
HUDDERSFIELD.—J. Rhodes, 25, Albion-st.  
INNERLEITHEN.—W. Dew, Walkerburn  
JERSEY.—S. G. Hayes, (at present  
journeying)
- KINGTON.—J. Griffiths, Headbrook  
LONDON.—J. J. Andrew, 376, Strand ;  
T. Bisset, 92, Charrington-street  
Oakley-square  
LLANELLY, (South Wales.)—George Dell  
LEEDS.—A. P. Willis, grocer, Armley  
LIVERPOOL.—James Lind, 72, Dale-street  
MUMBLS, (South Wales.)—W. Clement  
MANCHESTER.—W. Birkenhead, Sale  
MONTGOMERY, (Wales.)—J. Richards,  
Church Stoke  
NEWARK.—John Hage  
NEWCASTLE.—Cornelius Young, 24, Leazes  
street, Gateshead  
NOTTINGHAM.—E. Turney, Trent Bridge  
Works; J. Phelps, 6, John-st., Sneinton  
OLLERTON.—W. Hage, Bilsthorpe  
RIPLEY.—W. Blount, High-street  
SWANSEA.—R. Goldie, 2, Bellevue street  
STOURBRIDGE.—J. Furney, Cliff Works  
TURRIFF, (Scotland.)—J. Robertson, 18,  
Chapel-street  
WESTON-SUPER-MARE.—W. Newport, 3,  
Claremont Buildings  
WISHAW, (Scotland.)—R. Hodgson, Inland  
Revenue Officer  
WHITBY.—F. R. Shuttleworth, 8, Gray-st.

The Ambassador this month has 32 pages.

Just commenced, a progressive series of

## CHEAP CHRISTADELPHIAN TRACTS,

Four pages. No 1 now ready:

### CHRISTENDOM IN A STATE OF APOSTASY:

Price one halfpenny per copy, or to be had in packets, at the following rates: 12 for 4d; 25 for 7d.; 50 for 1s.; 100 for 1s.8d.

When the first No. is disposed of, No. 2 will appear, and so on *ad infinitum*.

The tracts are written by the Editor of the *Ambassador* for a number of the brethren in Birmingham, who have formed themselves into a committee for the publication of tracts cheap enough for gratuitous distribution.

The first two thousand will bear the address of the Birmingham ecclesia, and hours of meeting; after that, where an order reaches 500 or upwards, the address will be altered (WITHOUT EXTRA COST), to suit locality. Less orders will bear no address.

Just published, a new Tract (by Brother Dr. HAYES), price 2d.,

## THE DOCTRINE OF GOD-MANIFESTATION

CONSIDERED IN RELATION TO THE FUTURE AS WELL AS TO THE PAST.

Orders to the Editor.

### LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE LAST NUMBER.

Mar. 25 J. S. Aplin, R. Hodgson, T. Haining, J. Pettigrew; 28, T. Randles, J. B. Newlands, J. Phelps, J. Coombe; 30, D. White (Dunedin), J. Mitchell, A. E. Thomas, Mrs. Hage, Mrs. Govett, H. Dyer, J. Phelps, A. Pitt, T. Boshier; 31, W. Graham, T. Chesham, J. W. Moore, J. J. Andrew; April 3, R. Whitworth; 4, J. S. Aplin, W. Allen, Mrs. Hage; 6, D. Brown, E. Gilley (China); 7, F. R. Shuttleworth, W. Newport, J. B. Newlands; 8, Mrs. Hage, J. Phelps, G. Smith, W. Wood; 9, S. Gresham, J. Kirkwood, T. G. Bell; 11, A. Pitt, A. Jones, J. Coombe, T. Boshier; 13, Mrs. Hage, Dr. Thomas, George Balmain, George Simpson, Alfred Jones, J. B. Newlands; 14, W. Dew; 15, W. Gill, W. Dew; 18, A. L. Sweet, W. Allen, D. Brown; 20, Daniel Brown, J. Phelps, A. Hall; 21, G. Armitage, Elliot Stock, J. Robertson, W. Gall; 22, R. Hodgson, T. Harrison, T. Watton, F. Malcolm, H. L. Drake, W. King, T. Gruit; 23, J. S. Aplin, J. K. Ramsay; 14, W. Ellis, W. Cundall, J. J. Andrew; 25, R. P. Gillon, T. Randles; 27, J. K. Ramsay, W. Rooke, W. Allen, A. J. Twelvrees, W. King.

### RECEIPTS FROM MARCH 25TH TO APRIL 27TH, INCLUSIVE.

*Ambassador*.—J. Pettigrew, Dalry, 2 copies, (three months); J. Coombe, Toronto, (for J. Grady, T. Cornish, H. Richards and W. Pengilly) 4 copies (12 months) and postage; J. B. Newlands, Paisley, 1 copy (12 months) and postage; A. Pitt, London, 1 copy (7 months) and postage; H. Dyer, Bradford-on-Avon, 3 copies (4 months) and postage; D. White, Dunedin, Otago, New Zealand, 3 copies (12 months) and postage, with balance to credit; W. Graham, Leeds, 10 copies, (3 months) and postage; R. Whitworth, Halifax, 20 copies (1 month) and postage; T. Davis, Birmingham, 60 copies (1 month); F. R. Shuttleworth, Whiteb., 13 copies (1 month) and postage; Mrs. Hage, Newark, 3 copies (1 month) and postage; George Smith, Ryde, 1 copy (1 month) and postage; S. Gresham, Sheffield, 1 copy (12 months) and postage; T. Boshier, London, 1 copy, (1 month) and postage; W. Vernon, Dorchester, 1 copy (12 months) and postage; D. Brown, London, 3 copies (12 months) and postage; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 34 copies (1 month) and postage; Daniel Brown, Calcutta, 4 copies (12 months) and postage; George Armitage, Heckmondwike, 4 copies (3 months) and postage; W. Gall, Fraserburgh, 1 copy (6 months) and postage; H. L. Drake, Guelph, C.W., 1 copy (12 months) and postage; J. K. Ramsay, Galston, 6 back nos.; W. King, Littlebury, 1 copy (1 month) and postage; R. P. Gillox, Lintihgow, 1 copy (4 months) and postage.

*Twelve Lectures*.—J. Coombe, Toronto, C.W. 27 copies; T. Webster, Birmingham, 1 copy. T. Boshier, London, 3 copies; R. Whitworth, Halifax, 2 copies; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 1 copy; Alfred Jones, Sheffield, 1 copy; W. Vernon, Dorchester, 6 copies; D. Brown, London, 30 copies; D. Brown, Calcutta, 12 copies; C. Rickus, Birmingham, 1 copy; B. Withers, ditto, 1 copy; J. K. Ramsay, Galston, 1 copy.

*MISCELLANEOUS*.—J. Phelps, Nottingham, 2 copies *Anastasia*; J. Coombe, Toronto, 100 *Declarations, 12 Soul and Kingdom*; H. Dyer, Bradford-on-Avon, 1 *Record*; W. Govett, Norwich, 1 *Declaration, 1 Discussion, 1 Reward 1 Name of Blasphemy*; J. Mitchell, Huddersfield, 1 *Record*; J. B. Newlands, Paisley, 4 *Discussions, 1 Hymn Book*; R. Whitworth, Halifax, 1 *Anatolia, 1 Contrast, 1 Destiny, 1 Phelps, Nottingham, 12 Roman Question*; J. Kirkwood, Wishaw, 1 *Discussion, 1 Contrast*; S. Gresham, Sheffield, 1 *Record*; Alfred Jones, Sheffield, 2 *Declarations*; George Simpson, Philadelphia, U.S. (in U.S. greenback, not current in England), 2 *Records* and the balance in copies of *Way of Life*, if republished; D. Brown, London, 25 *Declarations*; W. Vernon, Dorchester, 1 *Emphatic Diaplott*; D. Brown, Calcutta, 12 *Declarations, 6 Records, 6 God-Manifestations*, and a liberal business to the general service of the truth; George Armitage, Heckmondwike, 1 *Elpis Israel*; J. K. Ramsay, Galston, 3 *Records, 1 Hymn Book, 1 Emphatic Diaplott*.

The Ambassador of the  
Coming Age, June 1, 1868.]

# 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.

---

JUNE.

---

BIRMINGHAM :

PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR,  
ROBERT ROBERTS, CARLTON PLACE, 64, BELGRAVE ROAD.

---

PRINTED BY WILLIAM H. DAVIS,  
8, NEEDLESS ALLEY, TEMPLE ROW.

---

1868.

*Price FIVE SHILLINGS PER ANNUM, including Postage.*

---

## NOTES.

**THE WHITBY BOOK-LENDING LIBRARY.**—Brother Shuttleworth acknowledges the following liberal contributions to this scheme, from a brother at Berwick, viz, 2 *Eurekas*, vol. II; 1 *Elpis Israel*; 5 *Twelve Lectures*; 49 *Testimony*; 17 *No. 1 Tract*; 12 *God-Manifestation*; 140 papers.

**THE CASE OF BROTHER HALL.**—The Editor has to acknowledge the following contributions:—A brother, 5s.; a sister, 10s.; an ecclesia, £1; a brother, 2s.; a brother, 10s.; a brother, 2s6d.; a brother, 2s; an ecclesia, 10s.; a brother, £1; an ecclesia, 10s.; a brother, 10s.; a brother, 2s. 6d. Brother Hall acknowledges the foregoing sums in emphatic terms of gratitude, expressing regret that he should be a burden.

“PURE RELIGION AND UNDEFILED.” (Jas. i, 27.)—Brother R. Hodgson, Wishaw, Scotland, appeals to the brethren in behalf of a widowed sister who has come from Iowa, U.S., to the west of Scotland, to look after some property left her by her deceased mother, but who has been disappointed of her right and left in debt and without the means of returning to her family. He will take charge of anything sent to aid her in her difficulty.

---

### TO AMERICAN SUBSCRIBERS.

Brother Donaldson dislikes dunning notices, but thinks it necessary that subscribers in the States who have not yet paid up for '68, should be reminded of the necessity from a purely business point of view, of their doing so at once. There is a large outlay on this side of the water which can only be met by subscribers discharging their obligations with promptitude and regularity. The cost out of pocket for postages on *Ambassador* alone is £43. 8s. per annum, or £3. 12s 4d. per month. It has risen to this large figure since the alteration of the American postal law, which requires the total postage (2d. per copy) to be pre-paid. The amount to be remitted to brother Donaldson is 6s. per vol., which, at current rates of exchange, is exactly 2 dollars. Trusting to the attention of all concerned, we leave the matter in their hands.—EDITOR.

---

## THE THIRD VOLUME OF EUREKA.

**TERMS.**—The terms of subscription will be the same as for the second volume, viz., FOURTEEN SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE sterling per copy, exclusive of freight and duty, which will come to about 1s6d. per copy extra.

### ORDERS AND REMITTANCES.

**BRITAIN.**—Subscribers in Britain may send their orders and remittances to the Editor of the *Ambassador*, (Athenæum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham); or to Mr. W. Ellis, 2, Janefield, Leith, Scotland.

**CANADA.**—Orders will be received by J. Coombe, 104, Yonge Street, Toronto.

**UNITED STATES.**...Subscribers in the States should remit direct to Dr. John Thomas, West Hoboken, Hudson Co., New Jersey.

### A FEW WORDS ABOUT THE FIRST VOLUME.

The first volume is “out of print.” There are some who have the second volume who would like to possess the first. If a sufficient number of orders to pay the cost of publication should be received, the Dr. will republish the first volume, at three dollars per copy, or 8s6d. English money, at the present rate of exchange.

### A WORD ABOUT THE SECOND VOLUME.

There are still 250 copies of vol. II on hand, and anyone having the first, who has not got the second, has now an opportunity of supplying himself while ordering the third.

☞ After the third volume is issued, *single volumes will no longer be supplied.* Those who may desire the Dr's. exposition of the Apocalypse, will thenceforth have to purchase the three vols. together.

## THE AMBASSADOR

(A monthly periodical of 28 pages, devoted to the exposition and defence of divine truth,  
as apprehended from a CHRISTADELPHIAN point of view.)

Is published on the last Thursday of each month for the month following.

**TERMS**—Five Shillings per annum, post free.

To Subscribers in the UNITED STATES, at current rates of exchange, *Two Dollars* per annum, to be remitted in advance to *J. DONALDSON, 242, Jefferson Avenue, DETROIT, Mich.*

Canadian subscriptions, the same as English; Agents:—*J. COOMBE, 104, Yonge-st., Toronto*; and *W. H. HACKING, Banner Office, Listowel.*

Where there is no notice of discontinuance, *subscription is taken as renewed.*

**SUBSCRIPTION NOT ACCEPTED FOR LESS THAN A VOLUME.**

Sets of back numbers from the commencement can be supplied; also bound volumes at 6s.; two vols. bound in one, 9s.; three in one, 12; four ditto, 15s.

*Letters & remittances to R. ROBERTS, Athenæum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham.*

### A GUIDE FOR TRAVELLING BRETHERN & FRIENDS OF THE TRUTH.

- BARNSTABLE.**—D. Atkins, Bradford Villa  
**BEITH, (Scotland.)**—J. Gillies, grocer  
**BIRMINGHAM.**—Robert Roberts. Athenæum  
Rooms, Temple row, or 64, Belgrave-rd.  
**CARRBRIDGE, Strathspey, (Scotland.)**—J.  
Grant  
**CUMNOCK, (Scotland.)**—T. Haining,  
Crichton Place  
**DERRY.**—T. Meakin, 1, Peel-street, Ash-  
bourn-road  
**DEVONPORT.**—J. W. Moore, 4, Seymour Cres-  
cent, end of Hotham place, nr Millbridge  
**DUBLIN.**—W. D. Jardine, 91 Bride-street  
**DUNKELD, (Scotland.)**—J. Milne. Athol-st.  
**EDINBURGH.**—Charles Smith, 45, North  
Richmond-street, or W. Ellis, 2, Jane-  
s ll, Leith  
**GALASHIELS, (Scotland.)**—J. Bell, clothier,  
High Street  
**GALSTON, (Scotland.)**—J. K. Ramsay, M. D  
**GLASGOW.**—W. Clarke, 54, Harmony-row,  
Govan  
**HALIFAX.**—R. Whitworth, Moorside  
**HECKMONDWIKE.**—G. Armitage, Northgate  
**HUDDESFIELD.**—J. Rhodes, 25, Albion-st.  
**INNERLEITHEN.**—W. Dew, Walkerburn  
**JERSEY.**—S. G. Hayes, (at present  
journeying)  
**KINGTON.**—J. Griffiths, Headbrook  
**LONDON.**—J. J. Andrew, 376, Strand;  
T. Bisset, 92, Charrington-street  
Oakley-square  
**LLANELLY, (South Wales.)**—George Dell  
**LEEDS.**—A. P. Willis, grocer, Armley  
**LIVERPOOL.**—James Lind, 72, Dale-street  
**MUMBLES, (South Wales.)**—W. Clement  
**MANCHESTER.**—W. Birkenhead, Sale  
**MONTGOMERY, (Wales.)**—J. Richards,  
Church Stoke  
**NEWARK.**—John Hage  
**NEWCASTLE.**—Cornelius Young, 24, Leazes  
street, Gateshead  
**NOTTINGHAM.**—E. Turney, Trent Bridge  
Works; J. Phelps, 6, John-st., Sneinton  
**OLLERTON.**—W. Hage, Bilsthorpe  
**RIPLEY.**—W. Blount, High-street  
**SCARBORO'**—C. Walker, 4, Falconer Road  
**SWANSEA.**—R. Goldie, 2, Bellevue street  
**STOURBRIDGE.**—J. Turney, Cliff Works  
**TURRIFF, (Scotland.)**—J. Robertson, 18,  
Chapel-street  
**WESTON-SUPER-MARE.**—W. Newport, 3,  
Claremont Buildings  
**WISHAW, (Scotland.)**—R. Hodgson, Inland  
Revenue Officer  
**WHITBY.**—F. R. Shuttleworth, 8, Gray-st.

*Just commenced, a progressive series of*

## CHEAP CHRISTADELPHIAN TRACTS,

Four pages. No. 1 now ready:

### CHRISTENDOM IN A STATE OF APOSTASY:

Price one halfpenny per copy, or to be had in packets, at the following rates: 12 for 4d.; 25 for 7d.; 50 for 1s.; 100 for 1s.8d.

When the first No. is disposed of, No. 2 will appear, and so on *ad infinitum*.

The tracts are written by the Editor of the *Ambassador* for a number of the brethren in Birmingham, who have formed themselves into a committee for the publication of tracts cheap enough for gratuitous distribution.

The first two thousand will bear the address of the Birmingham ecclesia, and hours of meeting; after that, *where an order reaches 250 or upwards, the address will be altered (WITHOUT EXTRA COST), to suit locality.* Less orders will bear no address.

*Just published, a new Tract (by Brother Dr. HAYES), price 2d.,*

## THE DOCTRINE OF GOD-MANIFESTATION

CONSIDERED IN RELATION TO THE FUTURE AS WELL AS TO THE PAST.

Orders to the Editor.

### LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE LAST NUMBER.

April 28, M. A. Hayes, W. Cundall, Dr. Thomas, R. O. McIlwrick; 29, J. Coombe, J. Davidson, J. Brown, H. Dyer, T. Randles, T. Bosher. May 1, T. Randles, R. C. Bingley; 4, Mrs. Hage, T. Fisher, J. J. Slack; 5, Mrs. C. B. Hume, G. M. Mitchell, S. G. Hayes, P. Scrimshaw, P. Robertson, M. Bryant, W. Osborne, T. Randles; 6, G. Dick, T. F. Clegg; 7, J. K. Ramsay, C. Dealtry, F. R. Shuttleworth; 8, D. Graham, P. Robertson, J. Boyd, C. Bennett; 9, W. Milne, Mrs. Hage, J. W. Moore, J. Wilson, R. Whitworth; 11, J. J. Andrews, W. Allen, J. Hodgson, R. Bell; 12, J. S. Apin, W. Graham; 15, J. Grant; 16, T. Bosher, A. Pitt, G. Andrew, J. Kay, W. Paine, W. D. Jardine, T. Randles; 18, W. Ellis, F. R. Shuttleworth, A. Hall; 12, C. Walker, G. Davidson, W. Dent, W. D. Jardine; 20, W. Gall, J. Wilson, J. Mitchell, T. Randles, J. Phelps; 21, W. H. Kidson, J. Rhodes, R. Paterson; 22, G. Davidson, T. Haining, Mrs. Hage, James Thomas; 23, Mrs. Hage, F. R. Shuttleworth, R. Hodgson; A. Pitt.

### RECEIPTS FROM APRIL 28TH TO MAY 25TH, INCLUSIVE.

*Ambassador*.—H. Dyer, Bradford-on-Avon, 1 copy, (8 months) and postage; R. H. Dean, Birmingham, 2 copies, (12 months); P. Robertson, Blairgowrie, 5s. to account; F. R. Shuttleworth, 13 copies, (1 month) and postage; R. Whitworth, 20 copies, (1 month) and postage; W. Milne, Galashiels, 10 copies, (6 months) and postage; W. Paine, San Francisco, U.S., back Nos.; G. Andrew, Whitehills, 1 copy, (6 months) and postage; J. Mitchell, Ballus, 1 copy, (6 months) and postage; J. Rhodes, Huddersfield, 3 copies, (6 months) and postage; R. Hodgson, Wislaw, 12 copies, (6 months) and postage. T. Davis, Birmingham, 60 copies, (1 month); T. Meakin, Derby, 5 copies (6 months) and postage.

*Twelve Lectures*.—R. O. McIlwrick, Manchester, 1 copy; Miscellaneous, Birmingham, 7 copies; F. R. Shuttleworth, Whitby, 1 copy; C. Meakin, Birmingham, 3 copies; W. Graham, Leeds, 3 copies; T. Randles, Swansea, 36 copies; W. Paine, San Francisco, 3 copies; J. Kay, Motherwell, (3rd edition) 40 copies; C. Walker, Scarborough, 14 copies; W. H. Kidson, Harrogate, 1 copy; James Thomas, London 1 copy.

*Eureka, III*.—Mrs. Hage, Newark, 5 copies; S. G. Hayes, Jersey, 3 copies; a brother, 6 copies; J. K. Ramsay, M.D., Galston, 1 copy, and balance to *Ambassador*; C. Dealtry, Bath, 1 copy, and balance to *Ambassador*; C. Bennett, Mumbles, 2 copies, (for self and sister Jones); J. J. Andrew, London, 1 copy; T. Randles, Swansea, 4 copies; J. Beavan, Sandford Park, Oxon, 1 copy; R. Hodgson, Wislaw, 8 copies, and 1 copy, vol. II, (besides the foregoing, a number of unpaid orders are to hand).

*Christadelphian Tracts*.—S. G. Hayes, Jersey, 100 copies; M. Bryant, Bradford-on-Avon, 12 copies; F. R. Shuttleworth, 100 copies; W. Graham, Leeds, 100 copies; H. Dyer, Bradford-on-Avon, 100 copies; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 150 copies; Miscellaneous in Birmingham, 1300 copies.

*Roman Question*.—S. G. Hayes, Jersey, 4 copies; R. Scrimshaw, Nottingham, 1 copy; G. Dick, Glasgow, 1 copy; W. Graham, Leeds, 6 copies; J. Grant, Carrbridge, 1 copy; C. Meakin, Birmingham (for Derby) 12 copies; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 12 copies; R. Hodgson, Wislaw, 50 copies; Miscellaneous, Birmingham, 65 copies.

*Miscellaneous*.—R. O. McIlwrick, Manchester, 1 *Discussion*; W. Shelton, Birmingham, 1 *Elpis Israel*; J. Sack, Hindlow, 1 *Elpis Israel*; S. G. Hayes, Jersey, 1 *Barnett's Pamphlet*; G. M. Mitchell, Edinburgh, 1 *Record*; G. Dick, Glasgow, 1 *Barnett's Pamphlet*, 1 *God-manifestation*; J. K. Ramsay, 1 *Barnett's Pamphlet*, 3 *God-manifestation*; F. R. Shuttleworth, Whitby, 1 *Barnett's Pamphlet*, 3 *God-manifestation*; P. Robertson, Blairgowrie, 2 *Barnett's Pamphlet*; W. Williams, Birmingham, 1 *Elpis Israel*; Geo. Lillie, 1 *Contrast*, 1 *Devil and Hell*; W. Graham, Leeds, 2 *Barnett's Pamphlet*, 2 *Destiny B. Empire*, 12 *God-manifestation*, 3 *Records*, 2 *Contrast*; J. Grant, Carrbridge, 1 *God-manifestation*; G. Andrew, Whitehills, 1 *God-manifestation*; F. R. Shuttleworth, Whitby, 5 *Hymn Books*; W. Dent, Nottingham, 2 *Discussions*; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 3 *Hymn Books*; J. Rhodes, Huddersfield, 6s *Advertising Fund*.

The Ambassador of the  
Coming Age, July 1, 1868.

# 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.

---

JULY.

---

BIRMINGHAM :

PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR,  
ROBERT ROBERTS, CARLTON PLACE, 64, BELGRAVE ROAD.

PRINTED BY WILLIAM H. DAVIS,  
8, NEEDLESS ALLEY, TEMPLE ROW.

1868.

*Price FIVE SHILLINGS PER ANNUM, including Postage.*



## NOTES.

**SUMMER TOUR.**—See foot of page 202.

**AN ENQUIRER.**—There is no new translation of the Bible by Dr. Thomas—we wish there were.

**THE *Ambassador*** has this month been thrown a week late by the *Defence*, which is NOW READY.

**"PURE RELIGION AND UNDEFINED."**—Brother R. Hodgson, Wishaw, acknowledges receipt from an ecclesia, of £1 5s 6d.; a brother £1; a brother 10s.; a brother 10s.; a sister 2s.; a brother 18s.; a sister 5s.; a brother 2s.; a brother 2s.; a brother 2s.; a brother 1s.; a brother 2s6d. He begs respectfully to remind other brethren of our widowed sister's great distance from home, and her present inability to proceed thither.

**THE DECLARATION.**—We hear that another edition of this useful pamphlet is on the eve of making its appearance. Till then we cannot supply copies. The copies acknowledged among "Receipts," were had long ago. Some overlooking this, have supposed they are in present supply, and have made application only to be disappointed.

## THE NEW TRACTS.

**REDUCTION IN PRICE.**—The first Tract having gone off well, it is presunnable that subsequent issues may with safety be sold as near cost price as possible. The doubt was whether 5000 would be disposed of. As this doubt is practically at an end, the following scale will apply to future issues:—4 copies, 1d.; 25 copies, 4d.; 50 copies, 8d.; 100 copies, 1s.4d.; postage extra, 6d. per 100. No. 2 will be ready in a few days.

### TO AMERICAN SUBSCRIBERS.

Brother Donaldson dislikes dunning notices, but thinks it necessary that subscribers in the States who have not yet paid up for '68, should be reminded of the necessity from a purely business point of view, of their doing so at once. There is a large outlay on this side of the water which can only be met by subscribers discharging their obligations with promptitude and regularity. The cost out of pocket for postages on *Ambassador* alone is £43. 8s. per annum, or £3. 12s 4d. per month. It has risen to this large figure since the alteration of the American postal law, which requires the total postage (2d. per copy) to be pre-paid. The amount to be remitted to brother Donaldson is 6s. per vol., which, at current rates of exchange, is exactly 2 dollars. Trusting to the attention of all concerned, we leave the matter in their hands.—EDITOR.

## THE THIRD VOLUME OF EUREKA.

**TERMS.**—The terms of subscription will be the same as for the second volume, viz., FOURTEEN SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE sterling per copy, exclusive of freight and duty, which will come to about 1s6d. per copy extra.

### ORDERS AND REMITTANCES.

**BRITAIN.**—Subscribers in Britain may send their orders and remittances to the Editor of the *Ambassador*, (Athenæum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham); or to Mr. W. Ellis, 2, Jane-field, Leith, Scotland.

**CANADA.**—Orders will be received by J. Coombe, 104, Yonge Street, Toronto.

**UNITED STATES.**—Subscribers in the States should remit direct to Dr. John Thomas, West Hoboken, Hudson Co., New Jersey.

## THE AMBASSADOR

(A monthly periodical of 28 pages, devoted to the exposition and defence of divine truth,  
as apprehended from a CHRISTOPHEAN point of view.)

Is published on the last Thursday of each month for the month following.

**TERMS**—Five Shillings per annum, post free.

To Subscribers in the UNITED STATES, at current rates of exchange, *Two Dollars* per annum, to be remitted in advance to *J. DONALDSON, 242, Jefferson Avenue, DETROIT, Mich.*

Canadian subscriptions, the same as English; Agents:—*J. COOMBE, 104, Yonge st., Toronto*; and *W. H. HACKING, Banner Office, Listowel.*

Where there is no notice of discontinuance, *subscription is taken as renewed.*

SUBSCRIPTION NOT ACCEPTED FOR LESS THAN A VOLUME.

Sets of back numbers from the commencement can be supplied; also bound volumes at 6s.; two vols. bound in one, 9s.; three in one, 12; four ditto, 15s.

*Letters & remittances to R. ROBERTS, Athenæum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham.*

### A GUIDE FOR TRAVELLING BRETHREN & FRIENDS OF THE TRUTH.

**BARNSTABLE.**—D. Atkins, Bradiford Villa  
**BEITH, (Scotland.)**—J. Gillies, grocer  
**BIRMINGHAM.**—Robert Roberts, Athenæum  
Rooms, Temple row, or 64, Belgrave-rd.  
**CARRBRIDGE, Strathspey, (Scotland.)**—J.  
Grant  
**CUMNOCK, (Scotland.)**—T. Haining,  
Crichton Place  
**DERBY.**—T. Meakin, 1, Peel-street, Ash-  
bourn-road  
**DEVONPORT.**—J. W. Moore, 4, Seymour Cres.  
cent, end of Hotham place, nr Millbridge  
**DUBLIN.**—W. D. Jardine, 91 Bride-street  
**DUNKELD, (Scotland.)**—J. Milne, Atbol-st.  
**EDINBURGH.**—Charles Smith, 45, North  
Richmond-street, or W. Ellis, 2, Jane-  
â 11, Leith  
**GALASHIELS, (Scotland.)**—J. Bell, clothier,  
High Street  
**GALSTON, (Scotland.)**—J. K. Ramsay, M.D  
**GLASGOW.**—J. Anderson, 310, Argyle-st  
**HALFAX.**—R. Whitworth, Moorside  
**HECKMONDWIKE.**—G. Armitage, Northgate  
**HUDDERSFIELD.**—J. Rhodes, 25, Albion-st.  
**INNERLEITHEN.**—W. Dew, Walkerburn  
**JERSEY.**—S. G. Hayes, (at present  
journing)  
**KINGTON.**—J. Griffiths, Headbrook  
**LONDON.**—J. J. Andrew, 376, Strand;  
T. Bisset, 92, Charrington street  
Oakley-square  
**LLANELLY, (South Wales.)**—George Dell  
**LEEDS.**—A. P. Willis, grocer, Armley  
**LIVERPOOL.**—James Lind, 72, Dale-street  
**MUMBLES, (South Wales.)**—W. Clement  
**MANCHESTER.**—W. Birkenhead, Sale  
**MONTGOMERY, (Wales.)**—J. Richards,  
Church Stoke  
**NEWARK.**—John Hago  
**NOTTINGHAM.**—E. Turney, Trent Bridge  
Works; J. Phelps, 6, John-street,  
Sneinton  
**OLLERTON.**—W. Hage, Bilsthorpe  
**RIPLEY.**—W. Blount, High-street  
**SCARBORO'**—C. Walker, 4, Falconer Road  
**SWANSEA.**—R. Goldie, 2, Bellevue street  
**STOURBRIDGE.**—J. Turney, Cliff Works  
**TURRIFF, (Scotland.)**—J. Robertson, 18,  
Chapel-street  
**WESTON-SUPER-MARE.**—W. Newport, 3,  
Claremont Buildings  
**WISHAW, (Scotland.)**—R. Hodgson, Inland  
Revenue Officer  
**WHITBY.**—F. R. Shuttleworth, 8, Gray-st

# THE DEFENCE;

(A Reply to "the Rev." J. B. Barnett's Attack on the Truth, as set forth in  
*Twelve Lectures.*)

**NOW READY.—PRICE NINEPENNE.**

The *Defence* contains 90 pages of closely-printed matter, and is beautifully got up  
by the printer.

## LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE LAST NUMBER.

May 26, W. H. Kidson, J. J. Andrew, J. Grant, F. R. Shuttleworth, T. Bosher, W. Ellis; 27, D. Clement, J. W. Moore, S. Davidson, J. Grant, T. Randles; 29, S. G. Hayes, A. C. Gillespie. June 1, W. Newport, T. Bosher, J. Hawkins; 2, Helen Smith, J. Haggood, Jane Robertson, T. Wilson, J. Donaldson, F. Malcolm; 3, R. C. Bingley, C. Deatry; 4, W. Sinclair, T. Fuller; 5, J. Douglas, A. B. C. Yeovil; 6, J. W. Moore; 8, W. Osborne, W. Hurt, J. Grant; 9, W. Clarke, J. Hodgson, J. Gillies, J. W. Moore; 10, J. Coombe, J. Milne, Jane Hendry, Geo. Dick; R. Whitworth, J. Boyd; 12, W. Hurt; 13, T. Betts; 15, S. G. Hayes, E. Lilly, G. Lilly, A. Pitt; 16, T. Haining, W. R. Otter; 17, J. Donaldson, J. MacIntyre, R. Whitworth, T. Randles, S. G. Hayes; 18, J. Gray, P. Naver, John Scott; 19, J. K. Ramsay; 20, P. Naver, J. Macdonald, F. Lofthouse; 22, J. Phelps; J. Pettigrew, J. Robertson; 23, P. Naver; 24, H. L. Drake; 25, J. Macdonald, G. Lilly, R. Hodgson, W. Dent; 26, T. Bosher, T. S. Barrett; J. Grant; 29, Geo. T. Simpson, Peter Graham, W. Dew; 20, T. Moss, W. Newport, E. Turney, W. Egginton, F. Lofthouse, A. Pitt.

## RECEIPTS FROM MAY 26TH TO JUNE 30TH, INCLUSIVE.

*Ambassador*—T. Meakin, Derby, 5 copies, (6 months) and postage; J. Grant, Tomintoul, 1 copy, (12 months) and postage; T. Bosher, London, 1 copy; D. Clement, Mumbles, £1. to account; A. C. Gillespie, Tarbolton, 1 copy, (12 months) and postage; Jane Robertson, (balance) 1 copy, (12 months) and postage; Mrs. W. Hage, Newark, 1 copy, (12 months) and postage; A. B. C. Yeovil, 1 copy, (2 months) and postage; W. Clark, Glasgow, 8 copies, (6 months) and postage; J. Gillies, Beith, 6 copies, (7 months) and postage and 1 copy 12 months; J. W. Moore, 13 copies, (6 months) and postage; J. Coombe, Toronto, (for John Case) 1 copy, (12 months) and postage; Jane Hendry, Glasgow, 1 copy, (12 months) and postage; R. Whitworth, Halifax, 20 copies, (6 months) and postage; W. H. Otter, Cheltenham, 1 copy, (5 months) and postage; J. MacIntyre, Glasgow, 2 copies, (12 months) and postage; James Donaldson, Detroit, Mich., U.S., remittance to account, of 264 copies, (12 months); T. Fandles, Swansea, 3 6d. to account; F. R. Shuttleworth, Whitby, 14 copies, (1 month) and postage; J. K. Ramsay, Galston, 1 copy, (8 months) and postage; W. Rooke, Sydney, 4 copies, (12 months) and postage; F. Lofthouse, Leeds, 1 copy, (6 months) and postage; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 34 copies, (1 month) and postage; J. Pettigrew, Dalry, 1 copy, (3 months) and postage; W. Dent, Nottingham, 1 copy, (6 months) and postage; P. Scrimshaw, Nottingham, 2 copies, (6 months) and postage; T. Davis, Birmingham, 60 copies, (1 month); Peter Graham, New South Wales, 1 copy, (12 months) and postage; W. J. Dew, Innerleithen, 4 copies, (6 months) and postage; T. Moss, Earlstendale, 1 copy, (6 months) and postage.

*Twelve Lectures*—T. Bosher, London, 3 copies; J. Haggood, Stratford-on-Avon, 1 copy; J. Hayward, Mumbles, 13 copies; J. W. Moore, Devonport, 5 copies; W. Hurt, Dungannon, Ireland, 1 copy; James Donaldson, Detroit, Mich., U.S., 186 copies, miscellaneous; Birmingham, 8 copies; P. Naver, London, 1 copy; J. Macdonald, Forres, 1 copy; Geo. Lilley, Fraserburgh, 1 copy; H. L. Drake, Guelf, £2. to account.

*Roman Question*—F. R. Shuttleworth, Whitby, 12 copies; A. C. Gillespie, Tarbolton, 1 copy; J. Gillies, Beith, 12 copies; J. W. Moore, Devonport, 12 copies; T. Haining, Cumnock, 3 copies; F. Lofthouse, Leeds, 13 copies; W. Dew, Innerleithen, 3 copies.

*Evils, III.*—D. Clement, Mumbles, 1 copy; A. C. Gillespie, Tarbolton, 1 copy; Mrs. Hewitt, Birmingham, 1 copy; R. Norrie, Edinburgh, 1 copy; J. Gillies, Beith, 2 copies; Geo. Dick, Glasgow, for self and sister Craig 2 copies; T. Haining, Cumnock, 2 copies; Peter Graham, Sydney, 1 copy, (also vol. II).

*Christadelphian Tracts.*—T. Bosher, London, 100 copies; D. Clement, Mumbles, 500 copies; W. Newport, Weston-super-mare, 100 copies; T. Wilson, Nottingham, 12 copies; Mrs. Hage, Newark, (for brethren at Osbury) 250 copies; J. Gillies, Beith, 100 copies; J. W. Moore, Devonport, 50 copies; R. Whitworth, Halifax, 300 copies; Geo. Lilly, Fraserburgh, 12 copies; T. Randles, Swansea, 500 copies.

*Miscellaneous.*—D. Clement, Mumbles, 100 copies *Defence*; J. Grant, Fraserburgh, 1 copy *Devil and Hell*; A. C. Gillespie, Tarbolton, 1 *Barnett's Pamphlet*, 3 *God-manifestation*; W. Newport, Weston-super-mare, 2 *God-manifestation*; Mrs. Hage, Newark, 1 *Barnett's Pamphlet*, 1 *God-manifestation*; W. Sinclair, Turiff, 1 *Bozell's Pamphlet*; J. Hodgson, Liverpool, 1 *Barnett's Pamphlet*; R. Whitworth, Halifax, 1 *Born Pamphlet*; J. Gillies, Beith, 12 *God-manifestation*, 2 *Elpis Israel*; J. W. Moore, Devonport, 1 *Lord*; Geo. Lilly, Fraserburgh, 1 *God-manifestation*; J. Donaldson, Detroit, Mich., U.S., 200 *Discussions*, 11 *Destiny B. Empire*, 1 *Contrast*; J. Gray, Fraserburgh, 1 *Discussion*, 1 *Devil and Hell*, 1 *Declaration*; P. Naver, London, 1 *Discussion*, 1 *Declaration*, 1 *Contrast*; W. Dent, Nottingham, 1 *Destiny*; P. Graham, Sydney, 6 *Declarations*, 1 *Elpis Israel*, 1 *Anatolia*, 1 *Copyd.*

The Ambassador of the  
Coming Age, Aug. 1, 1868 ]

# 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.

---

**AUGUST.**

---

BIRMINGHAM:

PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR,  
ROBERT ROBERTS, CARLTON PLACE, 64, BELGRAVE ROAD.

---

PRINTED BY WILLIAM H. DAVIS,  
8, NEEDLESS ALLEY, TEMPLE ROW.

---

1868.

*Price FIVE SHILLINGS PER ANNUM, including Postage.*

---

**NOTES.**

A.H.—The money in hand for “the advertising scheme” is only available for the advertising of books. It could not, compatibly with the objects of the contributors, be spent in the publication of letters in newspapers.

APPOINTMENTS FOR SUMMER TOUR.—Nottingham, Tuesday, Aug. 4th; London, Monday, Aug. 10th; Halifax, Friday, Aug. 14th; Beith, Tuesday, Aug. 18th; Glasgow, Saturday, Aug. 22nd; Paisley, Wednesday, Aug. 26th; Wishaw, Saturday, Aug. 29th; Edinburgh, Thursday, Sep. 3rd to Sep. 7th.

M.A.H.—Yes, the advertising scheme is still in progress. Brother Andrew, of London, has the money in hand, and is expending it week by week in the way intended, viz., in the insertion of advertisements, first in one paper, then in another, by which the works expository of the truth are brought under notice over an extended circle. The result is apparent in occasional orders from strange quarters. We have already published one voucher report from bro. Andrew: others will appear as the money is spent.

A CASE FOR MORE THAN SYMPATHY.—At the request of Bro. Clark, of Glasgow, we mention a case of need which we can personally commend to the consideration of all who desire to fellowship the sufferings of Christ in his brethren. It is that of an old man who has been the steadfast friend of the truth for 20 years, and who is beloved by all who have his acquaintance in the truth. The infirmity of age has for two years unfitted him for work, and during all that time, he has eked out a subsistence on the little spare means at his command till now these are exhausted, and he is at the last extremity. Bro. Clark writes “being in lodgings, his case is sad indeed. We have endeavoured by our united aid to keep back this the day of his calamity, and it is with sorrow that we have at last to succumb to the extremity of mentioning his case. Our poor bro. is in terror at the idea of seeing his name in the *Ambassador*, and he requested me to tell you that if it were possible to keep back his name, it would relieve his mind greatly.” To any bro. desiring particulars, we shall furnish them privately. All that we deem it necessary now to say is that we can say from personal knowledge that he is worthy for whom this appeal is made. It will give us a peculiar pleasure to take charge of any sums sent in relief of his need.

---

**THE NEW TRACTS.**

REDUCTION IN PRICE.—The first Tract having gone off well, it is presumable that subsequent issues may with safety be sold as near cost price as possible. The doubt was whether 5000 would be disposed of. As this doubt is practically at an end, the following scale will apply to future issues:—4 copies, 1d.; 25 copies, 4d.; 50 copies, 8d.; 100 copies, 1s.4d.; postage extra, 4d. per 100.

TRACT No. 2, NOW READY. Subject.—“Clerical Interpretation of the Bible a Delusion.”

By a mistake of the printer last month, postage was stated to be at the rate of 6d. instead of 4d. per hundred copies.

---

**THE THIRD VOLUME OF EUREKA, AND THE VISIT OF DR. THOMAS.**

Arrangements having been made (through facilities provided by the liberality of an English sister and an American brother) for the publication of *Eureka* iii forthwith, those who mean to have the new volume, and who have not yet remitted the price, had better do so without further delay. Those also who mean to contribute to the cost of bringing the author of *Eureka* on a visit to Britain would do well to forward their arrangements, as that event (all being well) will follow the publication of the new vol. The editor will now take charge of any sums intended for the general fund out of which it is proposed to pay the traveling expenses to, in, and from this country. Local expenses will be separate and not chargeable upon the general contributions.

TERMS.—The terms of subscription will be the same as for the second volume, viz., **FOURTEEN SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE sterling per copy**, exclusive of freight and duty, which will come to about 1s6d. per copy extra.

**ORDERS AND REMITTANCES.**

BRITAIN.—Subscribers in Britain may send their orders and remittances to the Editor of the *Ambassador*, (Athenaeum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham); or to Mr. W. Ellis, 2, Janefield, Leith, Scotland.

CANADA.—Orders will be received by J. Coombe, 104, Yonge Street, Toronto.

UNITED STATES.—Subscribers in the States should remit direct to Dr. John Thomas, West Hoboken, Hudson Co., New Jersey.

## THE AMBASSADOR

(A monthly periodical of 28 pages, devoted to the exposition and defence of divine truth,  
as apprehended from a CHRISTOPHELPHIAN point of view.)

Is published on the last Thursday of each month for the month following.

**TERMS**—Five Shillings per annum, post free.

To Subscribers in the UNITED STATES, at current rates of exchange, *Two-and-a-half Dollars* per annum. to be remitted in advance to J. DONALDSON, 242, Jefferson Avenue, DETROIT, Mich.

Canadian subscriptions, the same as English; Agents:—J. COOMBE, 104, Yonge st., Toronto; and W. H. HACKING, Marturion Office, Listowe l.

Where there is no notice of discontinuance, *subscription is taken as renewed.*

SUBSCRIPTION NOT ACCEPTED FOR LESS THAN A VOLUME.

Sets of back numbers from the commencement can be supplied; also bound volumes at 6s.; two vols. bound in one, 9s.; three in one, 12; four ditto, 15s.

Letters & remittances to R. ROBERTS, Athenæum Rooms, Temp'e Row, Birmingham.

### THE ORIGIN AND NATURE OF JESUS CHRIST,

By DR. THOMAS'S DAUGHTER. *with an Appendix* by DR. THOMAS,

On Deity Manifested in the Flesh and the Name of Jesus the Christ.

*Only a few copies, post free, 5d.*

The Editor has received a fresh supply of ANASTASIS, post free, 1/10.

*Just published, a new Tract (by Brother Dr. HAYES), price 2d.,*

### THE DOCTRINE OF GOD-MANIFESTATION

CONSIDERED IN RELATION TO THE FUTURE AS WELL AS TO THE PAST.

Orders to the Editor.

### A GUIDE FOR TRAVELLING BRETHERN & FRIENDS OF THE TRUTH.

BARNSTAPLE.—D. Atkins, Bradford Villa  
BRITH. (Scotland.)—J. Gillies, grocer  
BIRMINGHAM.—Robert Roberts, Athenæum  
Rooms, Temple row, or 64, Belgrave-road.  
CARRIDGE, Strathspey. (Scotland.)—J. GIBB  
CUMOCK, (Scotland)—T. Haining, Crichton  
place  
DARBY.—T. Meakin, 1, Peel-street, Ashbourn  
road  
DEVONPORT.—J. W. Moore, 4, Seymour Crescent,  
end of Hotham-place, near Millbridge.  
DUBLIN.—W. D. Jardine, 91, Bride-street.  
DUNKELD. (Scotland.)—J. Milne, Athol-street  
EDINBURGH.—Charles Smith, 45, North Rich-  
mond-street, or W. Ellis, 2, Jane-field, Leith  
GALASHIELS. (Scotland)—J. Bell, clothier,  
High-street  
GALSTON. (Scotland.)—J. K. Ramsay, M. D.  
GLASGOW.—J. Anderson, 810, Argyle-street  
HALIFAX.—R. Whitworth, Moorside  
HECKMONDWICK.—G. Amitage, Northgate  
HIDDEN-FIELD.—J. Rhodes, 25, Albion street  
INNERLEITHEN.—W. Dew, Waikerburn  
JERSEY.—S. G. Hayes, (at present in Scarborough)

KINGTON.—J. Griffiths, Headbrook  
LONDON.—J. J. Andrew, 376, Strand; T. Biers-  
t, 92, Charrington-street, Oakley-square  
LJANELLY. (South Wales).—George Dell  
LESLI.—A. P. Willis, grocer, Armley  
LIVERPOOL.—James Lind, 72, Dale-street  
NIMBLE. (South Wales)—W. Clement  
MANCHESTER.—W. Birkenhead, Sale  
MONTGOMERY. (Wales.)—J. Richards, shoe-  
maker  
NEWARK.—John Hage  
NOTTINGHAM.—E. Torney, Trent Bridge Works;  
J. Phelps, 6, John-street, Sneinton  
OLKERTON.—W. Hage, Bishopscote  
SCARBOROUGH.—C. Walker, 4, Falconer Road  
SWANSEA.—R. Goldie, 2, Bellevue-street  
STOCKBRIDGE.—J. Turney, Giff Works  
TURRIFF. (Scotland.)—J. Robertson, 18, Chapel  
street  
WESTON SUPER-MARE.—W. Newport, 3, Clare-  
mont Buildings  
WISHAW. (Scotland.)—R. Hodgson, Inland  
Revenue Officer  
WHITBY.—F. R. Shuttleworth, 8, G. ay-street

# THE DEFENCE;

(A Reply to "the Rev." J. P. Barnett's Attack on the Truth, as set forth in  
*Twelve Lectures.*)

**NOW READY.—PRICE NINEPENNE;**

OR POST FREE, TENPENNE.

The *Defence* contains 90 pages of closely-printed matter, and is beautifully got up by the printer.

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Introduction	3	Mr. Barnett's Arguments in favour of Human Immortality	55
Mr. Barnett's Teaching concerning God	10	Mr. Barnett's Review of Scripture Arguments on Mortality	64
The Teaching of the Bible concerning the Devil	19	Mr. Barnett's Scripture arguments in favour of Natural Immortality	72
The Nature of Christ	26	Mr. Barnett becomes Aggressive	83
The Death of Christ	35	Conclusion	88
The Kingdom of God	42		
The Nature of Man	45		

## LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE LAST NUMBER.

July 1 Miss Hayes, R. Bowman; 2. W. R. Otter, J. Coombe, J. Roberts; 3. F. Chetham; 4. M. A. Lodge; 5. W. Vernon, A. Pitt, T. E. Clegg, Dr. Thomas; 7. J. J. Andrew, W. Osborne, W. Birkenhead, W. H. Kidson, H. Lovell, T. Boshier, J. K. Ramsay; 8. R. Hodgson, A. C. Gillespie, E. Furney, R. Whitworth, W. Fleming, C. Deatry, A. S. Findlay, T. Waton; 9. T. Randles, "Rev." H. H. Carson, J. F. Beake, J. Durrie; 10. W. King, R. P. Gillon, W. Graham, J. Coombe; 11. W. H. Hacking, Wood and Co., J. F. Beake, P. Robertson, W. Ellis; 13. E. A. Roberts, A. S. Findlay, J. B. Newlands, R. Sayle, A. Pitt, C. B. Hulme; 14. "Rev." H. H. Carson, P. Scrimshaw, W. Dent, (Wolverhampton), W. Graham, J. Donaldson, J. Rhodes; 15. A. S. Findlay, J. Hawkins, R. Beck, W. M. Wilson; 16. E. Lilley, W. Newport; 17. W. H. Kidson, W. L. Hipwell; 18. J. Mulholland, F. R. Shuttleworth, T. Fuller, J. Gillespie, T. Randles; 20. J. Phelps; 21. J. J. Andrew, J. Richards, F. R. Shuttleworth, W. Osborne, J. Mulholland, J. Coombe, H. L. Drake, R. Paton; 22. D. Brown, G. Hardy, J. F. Beake, R. Bell, A. S. Findlay; 23. J. Robertson, W. Clark, T. Randles; 24. Dr. Beaver, J. W. Moore, Finlay Cameron; 25. S. G. Hayes, J. J. Andrew; 27. W. Newport, J. Milne, Wood and Co., T. Wootton, A. Hal, J. Mortimer.

## RECEIPTS FROM JULY 2ND, TO JULY 27TH INCLUSIVE.

*Ambassador*.—W. R. Otter, Cheltenham, 2 copies; (6 months) and postage; A. Pitt, London, 1 copy, (6 months) and postage; W. Osborne, Tewkesbury, 1 copy (9 months) and postage; R. Whitworth, Halifax, 20 copies; (one month) and postage; J. Durrie, Newtonsham, 1 copy (12 months) and postage; R. P. Gillon, Linnithgow, 189d to account; W. Graham, Leeds, 10 copies, (6 months) and postage; J. Coombe, Toronto, (for A. Gordon, J. Watless, J. Cove and D. D. Has) 4 copies, (12 months) and postage; W. H. Hacking, Lisowell, (for J. Evans and J. Mitchell) 2 copies, (12 months) and postage; Mrs. C. B. Hulme, Halifax, Nova Scotia, 7 copies, (12 months) and postage; E. Lilley, Hong Kong, back vols. of *Ambassador*; R. Beck, Glasgow, 5 copies, (6 months) and postage; J. Hawkins, Frome, 1 copy, (12 months) and postage; F. R. Shuttleworth, Whithy, 14 copies, (1 month) and postage; J. Mulholland, Glasgow, 8 copies, (6 months) and postage; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 34 copies, (1 month) and postage; T. Kidd, Dundee, (per J. Mortimer), 1 copy, (3 months) and postage; J. Wootton, Grantham, 2 copies, (6 months) and postage; J. Milne, Dunkeld, £1, to account.

*Defence*.—W. Vernon, Dorchester, 1 copy; T. E. Clegg, Whitby, 1 copy; W. Birkenhead, Manchester, 1 copy; W. Osborne, Tewkesbury, 1 copy; W. H. Kidson, Harrogate, 1 copy; J. K. Ramey, Gt. St. Andrew, 2 copies; C. Deatry, Weston-super-Mare, 1 copy; A. S. Findlay, Fraserburgh, 1 copy; R. Hodgson, Wishaw, 10 copies; W. Fleming, Glasgow, 2 copies; A. C. Gillespie, Tarbolton, 1 copy; J. Durrie, Newtonsham, 2 copies; R. P. Gillon, Linnithgow, 1 copy; P. Robertson, Blairgowrie, 2 copies; W. Graham, Leeds, 3 copies; P. Scrimshaw, Nottingham, 2 copies; W. Newport, Weston-super-Mare, 2 copies; F. R. Shuttleworth, Whithy, 9 copies; T. Fuller, Headingly, 1 copy; T. Randles, Swansea, 150 copies; Miscellaneous, Birmingham, 51 copies; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 1 copy; J. Mulholland, Glasgow, 6 copies; R. Bell, Glasgow, 1 copy; J. W. Moore, Devonport, 1 copy; Finlay Cameron, Glasgow, 1 copy; J. Mortimer, Dundee, 1 copy.

*Twelve Lectures*.—T. Boshier, London, 2 copies; W. Birkenhead, Manchester, 1 copy; A. S. Findlay, Fraserburgh, 1 copy; R. Whitworth, Halifax, 6 copies, "Rev." H. H. Carson, Belfast, 1 copy; W. Newport, Weston-super-Mare, 2 copies, James Mortimer, Dundee, 1 copy; H. L. Drake, Guelph, C. W. £2 to account; (balance still outstanding, 16s. stated by request.)

*Eureka Vol. III*.—T. Boshier, London, 1 copy; W. Osborne, Tewkesbury, 1 copy; E. Lilley, Hong Kong, 1 copy; T. Fuller, Headingly, 1 copy; J. W. Moore, Devonport, 1 copy.  
*Christadelphian Tracts*.—W. Birkenhead, Manchester, 50 copies; W. Osborne, Tewkesbury, 100 No. 1 and 100 No. 2; R. P. Gillon, Linnithgow, 8 copies; a Friend, 360 copies, (for presentation to poor brethren for distribution); E. Lilley, Hong Kong, 150 copies; A. S. Findlay, Fraserburgh, 25 copies; J. Rhodes, Huddersfield, 100 No. 2; R. Bell, Glasgow, 25 copies; Finlay Cameron, 25 copies.

*Miscellaneous*.—M. A. Hodges, Plymouth, 2 *Declarations*; W. Vernon, Dorchester, 1 *Barnett's Pamphlet*; W. Birkenhead, Manchester, 2 *Records*; W. Osborne, Tewkesbury, 2 *Roman Questions*; R. Whitworth, Halifax, 1 *Destiny*, 1 *Anastasis*; R. P. Gillon, Linnithgow, 1 *Devil and Hell*; A. S. Findlay, Fraserburgh, 2 *Declarations*, 1 *Elpis Israel*, 2 *Barnett's Pamphlet*, 1 *Devil and Hell*; P. Scrimshaw, Nottingham, 1 *Barnett's Pamphlet*, 1 *Devil and Hell*, 1 *God Manifestation*, 1 *Contrast*; J. Drew, and T. Webster, Birmingham, each 1 *Elpis Israel*; T. Fuller, Headingly, 8 *Roman Questions*; J. Mulholland, Glasgow, 6 *God Manifestation*; R. Bell, Glasgow, 1 *Barnett's Pamphlet*; J. W. Moore, Devonport, 5 *Discussion*.

The Ambassador of the  
Coming Age, Sep. 1, 1868.]

# 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.

---

SEPTEMBER.

---

BIRMINGHAM :

PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR,  
ROBERT ROBERTS, CARLTON PLACE, 64, BELGRAVE ROAD.

PRINTED BY WILLIAM H. DAVIS,  
8, NEEDLESS ALLEY, TEMPLE ROW.

1868.

*Price FIVE SHILLINGS PER ANNUM, including Postage.*



---

**NOTES.**

Z's article on "Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father," received; will appear next month.

We have a goodly number of queries which shall have attention as time and space may allow: we must ask the patience of correspondents.

**ERRATA IN "APOCALYPSE PARAPHRASED," LAST MONTH.**—Page 220: the word "of" should be inserted between "half-hour" and "silence" in line 28. In line 30, the words "and brought" should be inserted after "political heaven."

**SOLDIERS, TO ACTION!**—*The Voice upon the Mountains* continues its assaults on the truth. We hope to see it effectually answered by bro. Jardine, who, after bro. Butler, makes a commencement this month. *The Truth Promoter* (edited by J. Bowes) is also in a belligerent temper, and is putting forth efforts to repress the rising influence of the faith. Who will do battle against it? What does brother Hodgson say? he seems the special object of its attacks.

**THE CASE FOR MORE THAN SYMPATHY.**—We have to acknowledge the following contributions:—a sister, £1 10s; an ecclesia, £1 10s; a sister, £1; a brother, 5s.; a sister, 1s.; an ecclesia, 10s.; a brother, 2s.; an ecclesia, 10s.; a brother, 2s6d.; a brother, 5s.; a brother, 10s.; a brother, 8d.; a brother, 5s. The case, as we said last month, is one which we can personally commend to the consideration of all who desire to fellowship the suffering of Christ in his brethren. It is that of an old man who has been the steadfast friend of the truth for twenty years, and is beloved by all who have his acquaintance in the truth. The infirmity of age has for two years unfitted him for work, and during all that time, he has eked out a subsistence on the little spare means at his command till now these are exhausted, and he is at the last extremity.

---

**THE NEW TRACTS.**

**REDUCTION IN PRICE.**—The first Tract having gone off well, it is presumable that subsequent issues may with safety be sold as near cost price as possible. The doubt was whether 5000 would be disposed of. As this doubt is practically at an end, the following scale will apply to future issues:—4 copies, 1d.; 25 copies, 4d.; 50 copies, 8d.; 100 copies, 1s.4d.; postage extra, 4d. per 100.

**TRACT No. 2, NOW READY.** Subject.—"Clerical Interpretation of the Bible a Delusion."

By a mistake of the printer last month, postage was stated to be at the rate of 6d. instead of 4d. per hundred copies.

---

**THE THIRD VOLUME OF EUREKA, AND THE VISIT OF DR. THOMAS.**

Arrangements having been made (through facilities provided by the liberality of an English sister and an American brother) for the publication of Eureka iii forthwith, those who mean to have the new volume, and who have not yet remitted the price, had better do so without further delay. Those also who mean to contribute to the cost of bringing the author of Eureka on a visit to Britain would do well to forward their arrangements, as that event (all being well) will follow the publication of the new vol. The editor will now take charge of any sums intended for the general fund out of which it is proposed to pay the traveling expenses to, in, and from this country. Local expenses will be separate and not chargeable upon the general contributions.

**TERMS.**—The terms of subscription will be the same as for the second volume, viz., **FOURTEEN SHILLING AND SIXPENCE** sterling per copy, exclusive of freight and duty, which will come to about 1s6d. per copy extra.

**ORDERS AND REMITTANCES.**

**BRITAIN.**—Subscribers in Britain may send their orders and remittances to the Editor of the *Ambassador*, (Athenæum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham); or to Mr. W. Ellis, 2, Jane-field, Leith, Scotland.

**CANADA.**—Orders will be received by J. Coombe, 104, Yonge Street, Toronto.

**UNITED STATES.**—Subscribers in the States should remit direct to Dr. John Thomas, West Hoboken, Hudson Co., New Jersey.

---

## THE AMBASSADOR

(A monthly periodical of 28 pages, devoted to the exposition and defence of divine truth,  
as apprehended from a CHRISTOPHEAN point of view.)

Is published on the last Thursday of each month for the month following.

**TERMS—Five Shillings per annum, post free.**

To Subscribers in the UNITED STATES, at current rates of exchange, *Two-and-a-half Dollars* per annum to be remitted in advance to J. DONALDSON, 242. Jefferson Avenue, DETROIT, Mich

Canadian subscriptions, the same as English; Agents:—J COOMBE, 104, Yonge st., Toronto; and W H. HACKING, Marturion Office, Listowe l.

Where there is no notice of discontinuance, *subscription is taken as renewed.*

**SUBSCRIPTION NOT ACCEPTED FOR LESS THAN A VOLUME.**

Sets of back numbers from the commencement can be supplied; also bound volumes at 6s.; two vols. bound in one, 9s.; three in one, 12; four ditto, 15s.

*Letters & remittances to R. ROBERTS, Athenæum Rooms, Temp'e Row, Birmingham.*

---

### THE ORIGIN AND NATURE OF JESUS CHRIST,

By DR. THOMAS'S DAUGHTER, with an Appendix by DR. THOMAS,

On Deity Manifested in the Flesh and the Name of Jesus the Christ.

*Only a few copies, post free, 5d.*

---

The Editor has received a fresh supply of ANASTASIS, post free, 1/10.

*Just published, a new Tract (by Brother Dr. HAYES), price 2d.,*

### THE DOCTRINE OF GOD-MANIFESTATION

CONSIDERED IN RELATION TO THE FUTURE AS WELL AS TO THE PAST.

Orders to the Editor.

---

### A GUIDE FOR TRAVELLING BRETHREN & FRIENDS OF THE TRUTH.

BARNSTAPLE.—D. Atkins, Bradford Villa  
BRIDE, (Scotland).—J. Gillies, grocer  
BIRMINGHAM.—Robert Roberts, Athenæum Rooms, Temple row, or 64, Belgrave-road.  
CARBRIDGE, Strathpey, (Scotland).—J. Grant  
CUMOCK, (Scotland).—T. Haining, Crichton place  
DERBY.—T. Meakin, 1, Peel-street, Ashbourn road  
DEVONPORT.—J. W. Moore, 4, Seymour Crescent, end of Hotham-place, near Millbridge.  
DUBLIN.—W. D. Jardine, 91, Bride-street.  
DUNKELD, (Scotland).—J. Milne, Athol-street  
EDINBURGH.—Charles Smith, 1, North Richmond-street, or W. Ellis, 2, Jane-field, Leith  
GALASHIELS, (Scotland).—J. Bell, clothier, High-street  
GALSTON, (Scotland).—J. K. Ramsay, M.D.  
GLASGOW.—J. Anderson, 510, Argyle-street  
GRANTHAM.—James Wootton, 96, Grantley-st.  
HALIFAX.—R. Whitworth, Moorside  
HECKMONDWIKE.—G. Armitage, Northgate  
HIDDERSFIELD.—J. Rhodes, 25, Albion-street  
JMKELBITHEN.—W. Dew, Walkerburn  
JERSEY.—S. G. Hayes, (at present in Scarborough)

KINGTON.—J. Griffiths, Headbrook  
LONDON.—J. J. Andrew, 376, Strand; T. Bisset, 92, Charington-street, Oakley square  
LIANELLY, (South Wales).—George Dell  
LEWIS.—A. P. Willis, grocer, Armeley  
LIVERPOOL.—James Lind, 72, Dale-street  
NUMBLES, (S. nth Wales).—W. Clement  
MANCHESTER.—W. Birkenhead, Sale  
MONTGOMERY, (Wales).—J. Richards, shoe-maker  
NEWARK.—John Hage  
NOTTINGHAM.—E. Turney, Trent Bridge Works; J. Phelps, 6, John-street, Smeinton  
OLLERTON.—W. Hage, Birsthorpe  
SCARBORO.—C. Walker, 4, Falconer Road  
SWANSEA.—R. Goldie, 2, Bellevue-street  
STOURBRIDGE.—J. Turney, Cliff Works  
TURRIFF, (Scotland).—J. Robertson, 18, Chapel street  
WESTON SUPER-MARE.—W. Newport, 3, Claremont Buildings  
WISHAW, (Scotland).—R. Hodgson, Inland Revenue Office  
WHITBY.—F. R. Shuttleworth, 8, Gray-street

# THE DEFENCE;

(A Reply to "the Rev." J. P. Barnett's Attack on the Truth, as set forth in  
*Twelve Lectures.*)

**NOW READY.—PRICE NINEPENCE;  
OR POST FREE, TENPENCE.**

The *Defence* contains 90 pages of closely-printed matter, and is beautifully got up  
by the printer.

## CONTENTS.

Introduction .. .. .	PAGE 3	Mr. Barnett's Arguments in favour of	PAGE
Bible Teaching concerning God .. .. .	10	Human Immortality .. .. .	57
The Teaching of the Bible concerning		Mr. Barnett's Review of Scripture	
the Devil .. .. .	19	Arguments on Mortality .. .. .	64
The Nature of Christ .. .. .	26	Mr. Barnett's Scripture arguments in	
The Death of Christ .. .. .	35	favour of Natural Immortality .. .. .	72
The Kingdom of God .. .. .	42	Mr. Barnett becomes Aggressive .. .. .	83
The Nature of Man .. .. .	45	Conclusion .. .. .	88

## LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE LAST NUMBER.

July 28, W. Clark, J. Phelps, R. Goldie, C. Dealtry, A. S. Findlay, T. Wootton, W. Gill, A. Lowe, H. Sharp; 29, T. Rosher, W. D. Jardine, J. Gray, J. W. Moore, T. Rundles, P. Scrimshaw, R. Hodgson, W. Wood, H. Dyer, W. Birkenhead, E. Turner. July 31, R. Wood, W. Ellis, J. W. Moore. August 1, H. Dyer, J. Robertson; 3 W. Coutts, F. Shuttleworth, J. Mutimer, F. Cheetham, W. Birkenhead, J. Richards; 4, F. Roe, F. R. Shuttleworth, T. Fuller, J. Beevor, W. Clark, M. A. Hayes; 5, A. Lowe, A. Willis, J. Kay, J. Donaldson, R. C. Bingley, J. Phelps, J. W. Moore; 6 J. J. Andrew, J. Alexander, W. Wool, W. H. Kidson, H. Howard, T. Randles; 8, D. Brown, — Smitbarl; 10, J. W. Moore, E. Lilley; 11, C. Smith, R. Whitworth, F. Cheetham, A. S. Findlay; 12, R. C. Bingley, J. Clark; 13, J. Phelps, J. Coombe; 14, G. Lilley, J. Grant, J. W. Moore; 15, W. G. Dresser; 18, F. R. Shuttleworth, W. Clark, W. G. Dresser, D. Brown; 19, J. Donaldson, B. L. Green, F. Malcolm; 21, J. Phelps, J. Brown; 22, J. Phelps; 24, J. Pardoe.

## RECEIPTS FROM JULY 27TH TO AUGUST 24TH, INCLUSIVE.

*Ambassador*.—T. Davis, Birmingham, 60 copies, (1 month); A. S. Findlay, Fraserburgh, 1 copy, (24 months) and postage; J. Robertson, Turrif, 10 copies (7 months); 1 copy, (12 months) and postage; W. Clark, dovan, balance of account; M. A. Hayes, Scarborough, 4 copies (6 months) and postage; R. Whitworth, Halifax 21 copies, (1 month) and postage; J. Clark, Balfaton, 1 copy (6 months) and postage; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 10 copies, (back numbers) and postage; J. Coombe, Toronto, for J. Teece, Detroit, 1 copy, (12 months) and postage; F. R. Shuttleworth, Whitby, 14 copies, (1 month) and postage; G. Hewlett, Burton End, 1 copy, (3 months) and postage; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 35 copies (1 month) and postage; T. Davis, Birmingham, 60 copies, (1 month.)

*Defence*.—T. Davis, Birmingham, 12 copies; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 3 copies; J. Gray, Fraserburgh, 1 copy; J. W. Moore, Devonport, 1 copy; J. Robertson, Turrif, 4 copies; F. Cheetham, Ripponden, 1 copy; F. R. Shuttleworth, Whitby, 2 copies; J. Kay, Motherwell, 1 copy; J. Alexander, Innerleithen, 1 copy; J. W. Moore, Devonport, 5 copies; R. Whitworth, Halifax, 1 copy; J. Clark, Balfaton, 1 copy; G. Lillie, Fraserburgh, 1 copy; J. Grant, Carrbridge, 2 copies; W. Coutts, Rothes, 1 copy.

*Christadelphian Tracts*.—A. S. Findlay, Fraserburgh, 50 copies and miscellaneous; F. R. Shuttleworth, Whitby, 100 copies, No. 2; M. A. Hayes, Scarborough, 100 copies, Nos. 1 and 2; J. Kay, Motherwell, 12 copies; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 500 copies, No. 2; W. Coutts, Rothes, 100 copies, Nos. 1 and 2.

THE ORIGIN AND NATURE OF JESUS CHRIST.—J. W. Moore, Devonport, 1 copy; H. Dyer, Bradford, 1 copy; J. Robertson, Turrif, 2 copies; M. A. Hayes, Scarborough, 4 copies, T. Fuller, Headingley, 2 copies; J. Kay, Motherwell, 1 copy; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 2 copies; J. Alexander, Innerleithen, 2 copies; R. Whitworth, Halifax, 1 copy.

TWELVE LECTURES.—J. Phelps, Nottingham, 2 copies; W. H. Kidson, Harrowgate, 1 copy; W. Coutts, Rothes, 3 copies.

PUREKA, VOL. III. —P. Scrimshaw, Nottingham, 1 copy; A. Willis, Leeds, 1 copy.

MISCELLANEOUS.—T. Davis, Birmingham, 1 Discussion; A. S. Findlay, Fraserburgh, 6 Declarations; A. Lowe, Glasgow, 1 Devil and Hell; J. Gray, Fraserburgh, 1 Declaration; J. W. Moore, Devonport, 3 Discussions and 4 Roman Questions; P. Scrimshaw, Nottingham, 1 Bible Companion, 1 Record, 1 Contrast, 1 Summary, 2 Devil and Hell; H. Dyer, Bradford, 1 Roman Question, 1 God manifestation; J. Robertson, Turrif, 8 Roman Questions; J. Kay, Motherwell, 1 Elpis Israel; G. W. Dresser, London, 1 Contrast, 1 Discussion; B. L. Green, London, 1 Declaration; W. Coutts, Rothes, 1 Contrast, 1 Record, 2 Discussions, 2 Devil and Hell, 1 Anastasia, 1 Roman Question, 1 God-manifestation; M. A. Hayes, Scarborough, 1 Barnett's Pamphlet.

The Ambassador of the  
Coming Age, Oct. 1, 1868.]

# 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.

---

OCTOBER.

---

BIRMINGHAM :

PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR,  
ROBERT ROBERTS, CARLTON PLACE, 64, BELGRAVE ROAD.

PRINTED BY WILLIAM H. DAVIS,  
8, NEEDLESS ALLEY, TEMPLE ROW.

1868.

FIVE SHILLINGS PER ANNUM, POST FREE, *in Britain and her provinces.*  
*To subscribers in the United States, the terms are TWO-AND-A-HALF DOLLARS*  
*in advance.*

---

**NOTES.**

D.B.—The first volume of Eureka is to be re-published. We expect 50 copies along with the supply of vol. iii, which is promised for the close of November.

THE CASE FOR MORE THAN SYMPATHY.—In addition to the contributions recorded last month, we have to acknowledge the following:—a sister, 1s; brethren at Liverpool, £1; a brother 5s; a brother 2s.; a brother (anonymous) 3s. The brother in whose aid these contributions have been made, returns thanks in terms of fervent gratitude.

THE following sums sent to the aid of our American sister, should have been reported in the August number—a brother, 3s6d; a friend 2s; an ecclesia 16s6d, for which, and the sums previously received, the brethren and friends will please accept of my sincere thanks.'—R. HODGSON, Wishaw.

---

**ADVERTISING CARD,**

TO BE HUNG UP IN THE MEETING PLACES OF THE BRETHREN.

This is a large card setting forth the names and prices of the various publications to be had of the brethren, expository of the truth. It has been got ready at the suggestion of some who felt the want of it, and will be useful where strangers attend. Price 4d.

---

**LATER ABOUT EUREKA VOL. III, AND DR. THOMAS'S VISIT.**

On Monday, Sep. 21st, the Editor received a letter from Dr. Thomas in which the following passage occurs:—"Yours, containing the funds from sister Hage and yourself, has been duly received. I found it among my letters on my return from Virginia. I immediately put the M.S. into the hands of the printer who forthwith set seven compositors to work upon it. This keeps me very busy reading proof. By the time you receive this, 500 p.p. will be in type. . . . It will be about the end of November before Eureka can be shipped. I have then to distribute to the subscribers here. This year will be consumed in the affairs of Eureka. You may therefore expect me in 1869, which will, doubtless, be a very notable year. Everything indicates this. The devil and his angels are crying, peace and safety; which is a sure indication that great trouble is at the door."

THOSE WHO DESIRE THE FIRST VOLUME will be glad to know that the Dr. has resolved to reprint Vol. I, to the extent of 350 copies.

Terms.—Vol. I, 9s. sterling, or 3 dollars, 40 cents, American currency, post free; Vol. II and III, 16s. or 5 Dollars, 40 cents. each, post free.

British Orders to R. ROBERTS, Athenæum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham; American Orders to Dr. Thomas, West Hoboken; Hudson Co., New Jersey.

---

**TO AMERICAN SUBSCRIBERS INTENDING TO CONTINUE THE  
AMBASSADOR.**

The backwardness of some part of the subscribers in America to keep pace with their pecuniary obligations towards the *Ambassador*, compels the Editor, much against his will, to adopt the principle of pre-payment as the only mode of keeping the machinery in easy motion. Those desiring the *Ambassador* for 1869, will please recognise the necessity for paying up arrears (where any exist) to J. Donaldson, 242, Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich., and remitting to him, at the same time, the price of the next vol., which, at the present rate of exchange, will be TWO DOLLARS-AND-A-HALF. *Only to such will the AMBASSADOR be continued after December next.* Brother Donaldson will forward a list of those who have prepaid, and to these the *Ambassador* will be mailed in January next, and so forward.

To all and sundry, the Editor offers apology for this measure. It is a little more strict than he likes, but it is rendered necessary by the financial exigencies of the situation. The printer cannot be paid, and the enormous demands of the Post Office monthly cannot be met, unless subscribers do their part. Pre-payment will not embarrass or offend honourable subscribers; if it cut off any of an opposite character, there will be no loss.

With these explanations, which the Editor feels confident will commend themselves to the good sense of all reasonable men, the Editor leaves the matter in their hands, to do as seemeth good unto them.

EDITOR.

BIRMINGHAM, September 28th, 1868.

**A NEW EDITION OF THE "DECLARATION."**

The printer promises this by the middle of October. The price will be as before,  
**ONE PENNY.**

Postage extra, at the rate of 4d. per six copies.

**PRICE OF BOOKS, (post free) in AMERICAN PAPER DOLLARS.**

The difference between the value of English money and the American paper currency, enhances the price of British books to purchasers in America. That difference may not be known to every one wishing to remit from the other side of the Atlantic. We therefore publish the following table for their guidance, based on the fact that a paper dollar in the hands of the Editor is only worth 2s.6d. sterling.

The Ambassador (per ann.)	2	dois.	50	cents.	Declaration	0	dols.	14	cents.
Twelve Lectures	1	"	10	"	The Kingdom of God (6 cop.)	0	"	40	"
Defence	0	"	40	"	The One Baptism (6 copie-)	0	"	50	"
Discussion (Immortality of the Soul)	0	"	30	"	Christadelphian Tracts (25 copies)	0	"	25	"

**THE BIBLICAL NEWSPAPER,**

A double sheet, demy 4to. (double *Ambassador* size), published by brother Shuttleworth, of Whitby, at 4d. per copy, post free when twelve copies are taken

The newspaper consists of an ingenious **CLASSIFICATION OF SCRIPTURE TESTIMONY** on various matters, doctrinal and practical; presenting in striking form—as regards typographical arrangement—the various features of the Divine mind, as exhibited in the holy oracles. It also contains extracts, culled from various sources, expository and illustrative of the one faith.

The newspaper will be useful in the hands of enquirers, and deserves to be circulated. Those interested in the attempted publication of *Light for the Path of Life*, some years ago, will receive the newspaper with favour, as an endeavour to revive *Light* in a more attractive form.

Nos. 1 and 2 are out, and can be had on application (enclosing stamps) to

**F. R. SHUTTLEWORTH, 8, Gray Street, WHITBY.**

**THE MARTURION.**

A monthly magazine, 16 pages, demy 8vo. (reduced from 8 pages, 4to), edited by brethren W. H. Hacking and J. Evans, for the Christadelphians of Canada.

*The Marturion* (which means the True Witness) is "set for the advocacy and defence of the faith once for all delivered to the saints."

Terms—One dollar (4s6d) per annum. Orders in Britain will be taken by W. Wood, Joppa, Scotland; or I. Clissitt, Athenæum Rooms, Birmingham.

**A GUIDE FOR TRAVELLING BRETHREN & FRIENDS OF THE TRUTH.**

**BARNSTAPLE.**—D. Atkins, Bradford Villa  
**BATH,** (Scotland.)—J. Gillies, grocer  
**BIRMINGHAM.**—Robert Roberts, Athenæum Rooms, Temple row, or 64, Beigrave-road.  
**CARRBRIDGE,** Strathspay, (Scotland.)—J. Grant  
**CUMNOCK,** (Scotland.)—T. Haining, Crichton place  
**DEBBY.**—T. Meakin, 1, Peel-street, Ashbourn road  
**DEVONPORT.**—J. W. Moore, 4, Seymour Crescent, end of Hotham-place, near Millbridge.  
**DUBLIN.**—W. D. Jardine, 91, Bride-street.  
**DUNKELD,** (Scotland.)—J. Milne, Athol-street  
**EDINBURGH.**—Charles Smith, 19, North Richmond-street, or W. Ellis, 2, Jane-field, Leith  
**GALASHIELS,** (Scotland.)—J. Bell, clothier, High-street  
**GALSTON,** (Scotland.)—J. K. Ramsay, M. D.  
**GLASGOW.**—J. Anderson, 810, Argyle-street  
**GANTHAM.**—James Woolton, 96, Grantley-st.  
**HALIFAX.**—R. Whitworth, Moorside  
**HECKMERSWICK.**—G. Ainslie, Northgate  
**HODDERSFIELD.**—J. Rhodes, 25, Albion-street  
**INNERLEITHEN.**—W. Dew, Waterkield  
**JERSEY.**—G. Hues (at presenter in Devonport)  
**KINGTOWN.**—J. Griffiths, Headbrook

**LONDON.**—J. J. Andrew, 376, Strand; T. Bosher, (Zimmerman Bosher & Vernon,) 7, Bishops-gate-street Without, and 77, Houndsditch  
**LIVANELLY,** (South Wales.)—George Dell  
**LESLIE.**—A. P. Willis, grocer, Armlay  
**LEICESTER.**—Fred. M. Lester, 43, Belgrave-gate  
**LIVERPOOL.**—James Lind, 72, Dale-street  
**MUMBLES,** (South Wales.)—W. Clement  
**MANCHESTER.**—W. Birkenhead, Sale  
**MONTGOMERY,** (Wales.)—J. Richards, shoemaker, the Cockshut  
**NEWARK.**—John Hage  
**NOTTINGHAM.**—E. Turney, Trent Bridge Works; J. Phelps, 6, John-street, Sneinton  
**OLLERTON.**—W. Hare, Firsthorpe  
**SCARBOROUGH.**—C. Walker, 4, Falconer Road  
**SWANSEA.**—R. Goldie, 2, Belvedere-street  
**STOURBRIDGE.**—J. Turney, Cliff Works  
**TRANENT.**—Robert Strathearn, provision dealer  
**TURRIFF,** (Scotland.)—J. Robertson, 18, Chapel street  
**WESTON-SUPER-MARE.**—W. Newport, 3, Claremont Buildings  
**WISHAW,** (Scotland.)—R. Hodgson, Inland Revenue Officer  
**WHITBY.**—F. R. Shuttleworth, 8, Gray-street

**THE KINGDOM OF GOD;**

A Lecture delivered by the Editor, in Myddleton Hall, Islington, London, on Tuesday, August 11th.

Reported phonetically by brother Arthur Andrew, of London, and published by the brethren of that place PRICE TWOPEACE.

**THE ONE BAPTISM;**

OR, REASONS FOR REPUUDIATING EPISCOPALIAN INFANT SPRINKLING AND IMMERSION, AS PRACTISED AMONG THE BAPTISTS; AND SUBMITTING TO RE-IMMERSION ON JOINING

**THE CHRISTADELPHIANS.**

This is a re-publication, in tract form, of the addresses delivered on the occasion of brother Boshers's immersion in London, on Thursday, Aug. 13. It is printed on good paper, in clear type. It was originally intended for circulation in London only; but a sufficient number has been printed to make it available for general circulation.

Price Twopence (six copies post free)

**LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE LAST NUMBER.**

August 25; J. Roberts, C. Dooltry, W. H. Hacking, W. W. Holmes, E. Holland, J. Brown; 27, R. Gray, J. Phelps, Dr. Beevor, M. Loaden; 28, F. R. Shuttleworth, J. W. Moore, Dr. Beevor; Sarrazana 1, Mrs. Bucklin, 2, J. C. Phillips, M. Loaden, J. Grant; 7, I. Lovett; 8, J. Hawkins, J. Bryan, J. Hayward, W. Graham; 9, J. Coombe, J. Mortimer, J. Cameron, J. Wootton; 10, J. Phelps, W. Fleming, T. Boshers, C. Boyer; 14, W. R. Otter, W. Osborne, G. Lilley; 15; G. Armitage, R. Whitworth, J. Kirkwood, J. Silman, W. D. Jardine, Groom, D. J. Atkins; 16, J. Watts, G. Lilly; W. R. Otter; 17, W. Sinclair, C. Roberts, W. Gill; 18, W. Osborne, J. C. Phillips, J. J. Andrew; 19, H. Dyer, E. Turney, W. Ellis, J. Atkinson; 21, brother (anonymous), J. T. Rillstone, J. Watts, W. Osborne, J. Rhodes, T. Cornwall, Dr. Thomas, E. Lilly; 22, J. W. Moore, F. R. Shuttleworth, J. Atkinson; 23, J. Habgood, T. Haining, W. C. Hume, G. M. Mitchell; 24, E. Hodgson, H. Lunn, W. H. Hacking, D. McKenzie; 25, J. Phelps, J. A. M'Combie; 26, G. M. Mitchell, M. Osborne, W. Ellis, W. Newport; 28, J. Gillies, J. B. Newlands, T. Boshers, Mrs. Clarkson.

**RECEIPTS FROM AUGUST 24, TO SEPTEMBER 28 INCLUSIVE.**

*Ambassador*—J. Roberts, Ottawa, 2 copies (12 months) and postage; W. W. Holmes, Cavesham, Otago, New Zealand, 3 copies (12 months) and postage; C. Smith, Edinburgh, 1 copy; (12 months) and postage; W. Ellis, Edinburgh, balance to 31 copies monthly, (12 months) and postage; F. Malcolm, Innerkin, C. W., balance in respect of 12 copies monthly for a year; W. L. Hipwell, Birmingham, one copy, (12 months) and 4 odd numbers and postage; F. M. Lester, Leicester, 1 copy (12 months) and postage; J. Richards, Montgomery, 3 copies (6 months) and postage; Geo. Armitage, Heckmondwike, 4 copies, (6 months) and postage; J. Kirkwood, Wishaw, 4 copies, (6 months) and postage; C. Robertson, Tranent, 1 copy (15 months) and postage; W. Gill, Aberdeen, 15 copies, (6 months) 2 copies (4 months) 1 copy (8 months) and postage; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 35 copies (1 month) and postage; F. R. Shuttleworth, Whithy, 14 copies (one month) and postage; T. Haining, Cumnock, 11 copies (6 months) and postage; T. Davis, Birmingham, 60 copies, (1 month); J. Grant, Carrbridge, 8:4d. to account; T. Boshers, London, 1 copy (one month) and postage.

*Twelve Lectures*.—M. Loaden, Halifax, N.S., 1 copy; Dr. Beevor, Scarborough [for C. Walker], 3 copies; F. Norton, Ramsgate, 1 copy; John Grant, Kirkhill, 2 copies; J. Coombe, Toronto, C.W., 80 copies; J. Cameron, Edinburgh, 1 copy; T. Boshers, London, 2 copies; W. L. Hipwell, Birmingham, 1 copy; H. Dyer, Bradford on Avon, 2 copies; J. T. Rillstone, St. Agnes, Cornwall, 1 copy.

*Defence*.—J. Roberts, Ottawa, C.W., 1 copy; W. H. Hacking, 60 copies [two remittances]; T. Harrison, Brough, 1 copy; W. Fleming, Glasgow, 1 copy; Miss Hayes, Scarborough, 2 copies; W. R. Otter, Cheltenham, 2 copies; J. Richards, Montgomery, 2 copies; J. C. Phillips, Droitwich, 1 copy; T. Haining, Cumnock, 1 copy; W. Ellis, Edinburgh, 12 copies.

*Eureka III*.—W. W. Holmes, Cavesham, Otago, New Zealand, 2 copies; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 1 copy; J. Richards, Montgomery, 1 copy; George Armitage, Heckmondwike, 1 copy; T. Gebhin, [for brethren in Birmingham] £1 15s, toward 24 copies; C. Broughton, Birmingham, 1 copy; W. Newport, Weston-super-Mare, 1 copy.

*Christadelphian Tracts*.—J. Roberts, Ottawa, C.W., 14 copies; J. W. Moore, Devonport, 54 No. 2; F. Norton, Ramsgate, 4 copies; S. Harrison, Brough, 25 copies; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 144 No. 2; J. Richards, Montgomery, 100, Nos. 1 and 2; H. Dyer, Bradford-on-Avon, 100, No. 2; T. Haining, Cumnock, 6, No. 2.

*Miscellaneous*.—J. Roberts, Ottawa, C.W., 1 *Roman Question*, 2 *God-Manifestation*; J. W. Moore, Devonport, 1 *Bible Companion*; W. Graham, Leeds, 1 *Origin and Nature*; Mrs. Hage, Olarton, 1 *Origin and Nature*; J. Mortimer, Dundee, 1 *God Manifestation*; W. Fleming, Glasgow, 1 *God Manifestation*; Miss Hayes, Scarborough, 1 *Origin and Nature*; J. Richards, Montgomery, 1 *God Manifestation*, 1 *Origin and Nature*; J. Kirkwood, Wishaw, 2 *God Manifestation*; A. M'Dunnell, New Fishing, 1 *Contrast*, 1 *Devil and Hell*; J. Watts, London, 6 *Declaration*, 1 *Discussion*; W. Gill, Aberdeen, 12 *Devil and Hell*; J. Atkinson, Dewsbury, 1 *Elpis Israel*; G. M. Mitchell, Edinburgh, 1 *Record*; W. Newport, Weston-super-Mare, 1 *Origin and Nature*; T. Boshers, London, 1 *One Baptism*.

*Dr. Thomas's Approaching Visit*.—We acknowledge with thanks the following contributions toward expenses: J. Brown, Green Island, Otago, New Zealand, £10; J. W. Moore, Devonport, (for ecclesia,) £2 10s,

The Ambassador of the  
Coming Age, Nov. 1, 1868.]

# THE AMBASSADOR

OF

## THE COMING AGE :

A MONTHLY PERIODICAL DEVOTED TO THE EXPOSITION AND  
DEFENCE OF

DIVINE TRUTH, AS APPREHENDED FROM A  
CHRISTADELPHIAN POINT OF VIEW.

---

*Published on the last Thursday of each month, for the month following.*

---

**NOVEMBER.**

---

BIRMINGHAM :

PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR,  
ROBERT ROBERTS, ATHENÆUM ROOMS, TEMPLE ROW.

TERMS (*post-free*): FIVE SHILLINGS PER ANNUM; to *Subscribers in the  
United States*, 2½ DOLS., in advance; in *New Zealand and Australia*, 8s.

BRITISH ORDERS TO THE EDITOR.

1 8 6 8 .



## NOTES.

THE CASE FOR MORE THAN SYMPATHY.—We have to acknowledge the following further contributions:—a brother in the States, £1; a brother in Canada West, 4s3d.

W.O.S.—Brother Donaldson's sickness accounts for seeming inattention to (American) orders in time past. Should you prefer, you may communicate direct with the Editor; but this is more costly. A remittance once in brother Donaldson's hands, discharges a subscriber's liability.

THE BIBLICAL NEWSPAPER.—Brother Shuttleworth wishes us to state that No. 3 is now ready. No. 1 is sold out, and there are some orders unfilled; should the demand justify it, brother Shuttleworth will have another 1,000 printed. Terms—½d. per copy, post-free where 12 copies and upward are taken.

BROTHER ROBERTSON'S LABOURS IN THE NORTH.—Through the special circumstances mentioned last month by brother Ellis, brother Robertson stands in urgent need of the annual assistance which some have rendered for the past two or three years. The Editor will gladly take charge of free-will offerings consecrated to this end.

THE NEW HYMN BOOK.—We are not yet in a position to mention the date of the new Hymn Book's appearance. The work is begun—the material is in the rough; but it will take a little time to put it into shape for the printer. There being so many other things demanding attention, it will be much larger than the old hymn book, and much better in every respect. Particulars anon.

NEW EDITION OF TWELVE LECTURES.—The fourth edition of *Twelve Lectures* (2,000 copies) being exhausted, arrangements have been made for the issue of a fifth edition, bound in cloth, at 2s6d; probable postage 4d. The London publishers were applied to, but declined to take the book in hand. It was hoped a publication in the ordinary book-selling channels might give the truth greater publicity, but it seems to be God's will that it should continue as heretofore, a private movement—unrecognised by and unknown to the world. So be it: so much the greater responsibility will rest on "the contemptible few," who have been privileged to receive the light in the midst of prevailing darkness. The printer promises for February next.

## EUREKA VOL. III, AND DR. THOMAS'S VISIT.

Intending subscribers to Eureka, vol. iii, will please recognise the necessity for an early remittance of the amount of subscription.

Brethren, also, appreciating their indebtedness to Dr. Thomas (under God), for their enlightenment in the truth, and desirous of expressing their gratitude by promoting facilities for extending the same saving knowledge to others, will do well to hasten forward their preparations for the Dr.'s visit, which is now at the door. A collection every first day, for this special purpose, (extra to the ordinary contribution) is found the best way of doing duty in the matter without hurting anybody. Contributions to the fund for travelling expenses, will be taken charge of by the Editor.

THOSE WHO DESIRE THE FIRST VOLUME will be glad to know that the Dr. has resolved to reprint Vol. I, to the extent of 350 copies.

Terms.—Vol. I, 9s. sterling, or 3 dollars, 40 cents., American currency, post free; Vol. II and III, 16s. or 5 Dollars, 40 cents. each, post free.

British Orders to R. ROBERTS, Athenæum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham; American Orders to Dr. Thomas, Wet Hoboken; Hudson Co., New Jersey.

## ADVERTISEMENT FUND; amount Expended since March 21, 1868, as per Vouchers in the hands of the Editor.

May 18—Scattered Nation .. ..	£0 15 0	Augt. 24—Public Opinion .. ..	£0 6 0
"   19—Unitarian Herald .. ..	0 6 0		
"   19—Watchman .. ..	0 7 6		4 0 6
June 22—Leader .. ..	0 6 0	Amount already published .. ..	3 12 6
"   24—Beehive .. ..	0 7 0		7 13 0
"   30—Inquirer .. ..	0 6 6	Balance in hand .. ..	0 2 3
July 1—Athenæum .. ..	0 8 0		7 15 3
Augt. 17—Alliance News .. ..	0 6 0	Total subscriptions received.. ..	£7 15 3
"   17—Speciator .. ..	0 6 6		
"   24—London Review .. ..	0 6 0		

J. J. ANDREW, London.

On October 13th, the Editor remitted to brother Andrew a further sum of £1 9s, (the balance of contributions in hand), which will be expended and accounted for, as heretofore.

**A NEW EDITION OF THE "DECLARATION,"**

The printer promised this by the middle of October; but it is not yet to hand—expected daily. The price will be as before,

**ONE PENNY.**—Postage extra, at the rate of 4d. per six copies.

**PRICE OF BOOKS, (post free) in AMERICAN PAPER DOLLARS.**

The difference between the value of English money and the American paper currency, enhances the price of British books to purchasers in America. That difference may not be known to every one wishing to remit from the other side of the Atlantic. We therefore publish the following table for their guidance, based on the fact that a paper dollar in the hands of the Editor is only worth 2s.6d. sterling.

The Ambassador (per ann.)	2 dois.	50 cents.	Declaration	0 dois.	14 cents.
Twelve Lectures	1	" 10 "	The Kingdom of God (6 cop.)	0	" 40 "
Defence	0	" 40 "	The One Baptism (6 copie.)	0	" 50 "
Discussion (Immortality of the Soul)	0	" 30 "	Christadelphian Tracts (25 copies)	0	" 25 "

**THE BIBLICAL NEWSPAPER,**

A double sheet, demy 4to. (double *Ambassador* size), published by brother Shuttleworth, of Whitley, at 4d. per copy, post free when twelve copies are taken.

The newspaper consists of an ingenious CLASSIFICATION OF SCRIPTURE TESTIMONY on various matters, doctrinal and practical; presenting in striking form—as regards typographical arrangement—the various features of the Divine mind, as exhibited in the holy oracles. It also contains extracts, culled from various sources, expository and illustrative of the one faith.

The newspaper will be useful in the hands of enquirers, and deserves to be circulated. Those interested in the attempted publication of *Light for the Path of Life*, some years ago, will receive the newspaper with favour, as an endeavour to revive *Light* in a more attractive form.

Nos. 1, 2 and 3 are out, and can be had on application (enclosing stamps) to

F. R. SHUTTLEWORTH, 8, Gray Street, WHITLEY.

**THE MARTURION.**

A monthly magazine, 16 pages, demy 8vo. (reduced from 8 pages, 4to), edited by brethren W. H. Hacking and J. Evans, for the Christadelphians of Canada.

The *Marturion* (which means the True Witness) is "set for the advocacy and defence of the faith once for all delivered to the saints."

Terms—One dollar (4s6d) per annum. Orders in Britain will be taken by W. Wood, Joppa, Scotland; or I. Clissitt, Athenæum Rooms, Birmingham.

**A GUIDE FOR TRAVELLING BROTHERN & FRIENDS OF THE TRUTH.**

BARNSTAPLE—D Atkins, Bradford Villa  
 BRITH, (Scotland.)—J. Gillies, grocer  
 BIRMINGHAM—Robert Roberts, Athenæum Rooms, Temple row, or 64, Belgrave-road.  
 CARBRIDGE, Strathpey, (Scotland.)—J. Grant  
 CUMNOCK, (Scotland.)—T. Haining, Crichton place  
 DERBY—T. Meakin, 1, Peel-street, Ashbourn road  
 DEVONPORT—J. W. Moore, 4, Seymour Crescent, end of Hotham-place, near Mill-bridge.  
 DUBLIN—W. D. Jardine, 31, Bride-street  
 DUSKELD, (Scotland.)—F. Milne, Athol-street  
 EDINBURGH—Charles Smith, 19, North Richmond-street, or W. Ellis, 2, Jane-field, Leith  
 GALASHIELS, (Scotland.)—J. Bell, clothier, High-street  
 GALSTON, (Scotland.)—J. K. Ramsay, M.D.  
 GLASGOW—J. Anderson, 310, Argyle-street  
 GLANTHAM—James Woodton, 96, Grantley-st  
 HALIFAX—R. Whitworth, Moorside  
 HECKMONDWIKE—G. Armitage, Northgate  
 HODDERSFIELD—J. Rhodes, 25, Albion-street  
 INNEKELITHEN—W. Dew, Walkerburn  
 JERSEY—S. G. Hayes (at present in Devouport)  
 KINGTON—J. Gillies, Headbrook

LONDON—J. J. Andrew, 376, Strand; T. Boshier, (Zimmerman, Boshier & Vernon,) 7, Bishops-gate-street Without, and 77, Roundabout  
 LANELLY, (South Wales)—George Dell  
 LEEDS—A. P. Willis, grocer, Armley  
 LEICESTER—Fred. M. Lester, 43, Belgrave-gate  
 LIVERPOOL—James Lind, 72, Dale-street  
 NUMBLES, (South Wales)—W. Clement  
 MANCHESTER—W. Birkenhead, Sale  
 MONTGOMERY, (Wales.)—J. Richards, shoemaker, the Cockshutt  
 NEWARK—John Hage  
 NOTTINGHAM—E. Turney, Trent Bridge Works; J. Phelps, 6, John-street, Sneinton  
 OLLERTON—W. Hake, Bilsthorpe  
 SCARBORO—C. Walker, 4, Falconer Road  
 SWANSEA—E. Goldie, 2, Bellevue-street  
 STOURBRIDGE—J. Turney, Giff Works  
 TRANENT—Robert Struthern, provision dealer  
 TURNIFF, (Scotland.)—J. Robertson, 13, Chapel street  
 WESTON SUPER-MARE—W. Newport, 3, Claremont Buildings  
 WISHAW, (Scotland.)—R. Hodgson, Inland Revenue Officer  
 WHITLEY—F. R. Shuttleworth, 8, Gray-street

**NOW READY, CHRISTADELPHIAN TRACT, No. 3;**

*Subject:* "THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL, A FABLE." Terms: twenty pence per 100 copies (post free).

Address altered to suit purchasers, if 250 copies are taken.

**THE KINGDOM OF GOD;**

A Lecture delivered by the Editor, in Myddleton Hall, Islington, London, on Tuesday, August 11th; reported phonetically by brother Arthur Andrew, of London, and published by the brethren of that place. This Tract (handsomely got up) has now arrived, and may be had at 2d. per copy, (postage 1d.) or at the following rates, post free:—12 copies, 2s.; 50 copies, 7s. 6d.; 100 copies, 14s.

**THE ONE BAPTISM;**

OR, REASONS FOR REPUDIATING EPISCOPALIAN INFANT SPRINKLING AND IMMERSION, AS PRACTISED AMONG THE BAPTISTS; AND SUBMITTING TO RE-IMMERSION ON JOINING

**THE CHRISTADELPHIANS.**

This is a re-publication, in tract form, of the addresses delivered on the occasion of brother Busher's immersion in London, on Thursday, Aug. 13. It is printed on good paper, in clear type. It was originally intended for circulation in London only; but a sufficient number has been printed to make it available for general circulation.

*Price Twopence (six copies post free)*

**LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE LAST NUMBER.**

*September 29,* S. G. Hayes, W. Wood, W. Lunn, C. Walker, W. Gall, W. R. Otter; *30,* J. Brown, A. Andrew, W. Clark, Agnes Hamilton; *October 1,* W. Gall; *2,* D. Handley; *3,* W. Osborne; *5,* E. Lilley, W. Mitchell, A. D. Black, A. Andrew; *6,* J. Coombe, R. C. Bingley, F. R. Shuttleworth, W. Keeling, W. Graham, J. K. Ramsay, D. Brown; *7,* W. Newport, J. J. Andrew, W. Dent; *8,* T. Fuller, R. Whitworth; *9,* D. Brown, J. J. Andrew; *12,* W. Rooke; *13,* J. Phillip, W. H. Hacking, J. Evans, C. L. Gage, J. Coombe, J. J. Andrew, J. Phelps, J. Skinner; *14,* W. R. Otter, G. Brand, W. D. Jaraine, W. O. Stearns, W. L. Stroud; *15,* J. Mulholland, J. Hodgson; *16,* Mrs. Hayes, F. R. Shuttleworth, W. Eginton; *17,* A. Andrew, T. Boshier; *19,* R. Goldie, W. Ellis, T. Gerbid, F. R. Shuttleworth; *20,* J. Watton; *21,* J. Coombe, M. McDonald, J. Donaldson, W. H. Kidd, J. Phelps, F. R. Shuttleworth, R. Goldie; *22,* J. Robinson, T. Alford; *23,* J. J. Andrew, R. Whitworth, R. Whitworth, R. Hodgson, J. Pettigrew.

**RECEIPTS FROM SEPTEMBER 29th TO OCTOBER 23rd, INCLUSIVE.**

*Ambassador*—W. Gall, Fraserburgh, 1 copy (6 months) and postage; A. Hamilton, Glasgow, 1 copy (1 month) and postage; J. K. Ramsay, Galston, 1 copy, (12 months) and postage; W. Keeling, Rockford, 1 copy (12 months) and postage; F. R. Shuttleworth, Whitby, 14 copies (1 month) and postage; J. Coombe, Toronto, 5 copies (12 months) and postage (for R. Colvin, J. Tilt, Mrs. Colvin, G. Seaborn, and Dr. Emery, the last of whom sends surplus to the general service of the truth; he will find the surplus appropriated toward four extra pages in the present number.) R. Whitworth, Halifax, 21 copies (2 months) and postage, also set from January; J. Voice, Birmingham, back Nos; J. Phillips, Hull, 1 copy (1 month) and postage; J. Phelps, Nottingham, odd Nos., also 35 copies (1 month) and postage, T. Boshier, London, 1 copy (12 months) and postage for—Mortimer, Norwich; T. Davis, Birmingham, 60 copies (1 month); J. Pettigrew, Dairy, 1 copy (12 months) and postage.

*Twelve Lectures*—Agnes Hamilton, Glasgow, 1 copy; W. L. Hipwell, Birmingham (for H. M. Lester, Leicester, 12 copies; J. K. Ramsay, Galston, 1 copy; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 2 copies; G. Brand, Twickenham 1 copy; miscellaneous (Birmingham) 9 copies, F. R. Shuttleworth, Whitby, 3 copies; T. Boshier, London, 1 copy; W. R. Otter, Cheltenham, 1 copy; C. Humphreys, Cheltenham, 1 copy; W. H. Kidd, Scarborough, 1 copy; T. Alford, Shepton Mallet, 1 copy.

*Defence*—J. Voice, Birmingham, 1 copy; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 6 copies; G. Brand, Twickenham, 1 copy; G. Andrew, Whitehills, 1 copy; T. Boshier, London, 1 copy

*Eureka III*—E. Lilley, Hong Kong, China, 1 copy; D. Brown, London, 6 copies; W. Mulholland, Glasgow, 1 copy; W. Holland, Birmingham, 1 copy vol. 1

*MISCELLANEOUS*—J. Brown, Green Island, Otago, New Zealand, £5 to account; E. Lilley, Hong Kong, £3 for sundries; J. K. Ramsay, Galston, 6 'Declarations,' 3 'One Baptism,' 3 'Kingdom of God,' 4 'Roman Question,' 4 back vols. of 'Herald of the Kingdom,' balance for general purposes, used toward 4 extra pages this month; W. Gall, Fraserburgh, 25 'Christadelphian Tracts,' A. Hamilton, Glasgow, 1 'Bible Companion,' W. Graham, Leeds, 1 'One Baptism,' 1 'Kingdom of God,' F. R. Shuttleworth, Whitby, 1 'One Baptism,' 1 'Kingdom of God,' 1 'Discussion,' J. Voice, Birmingham, 1 'Discussion,' 8 'Tracts,' 1 'Devil and Hell,' 2 'One Baptism,' 1 'Record,' 1 'Bible Companion,' 1 'Roman Question,' 1 'Contrast,' 1 'God-manifestation,' W. Rooke, Sydney, £10 bounty for Dr. Thomas, an American brother, £3 for the poor; an English brother, £1 ditto; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 4 'Roman Question,' 2 'Advertising Cards,' J. Hodgson, Liverpool, 1 'Anatolia,' a stranger, Birmingham, 1 'Discussion,' T. Boshier, London, 106 'One Baptism,' W. Vernon, Dorchester, (per T. Boshier), 50 'One Baptism,' W. R. Otter, Cheltenham, 1 'Elpis Israel,' W. H. Kidd, Scarborough, 3 'One Baptism,' 1 'Anatolia,' 2 'Advertising Cards,' 50 'Tracts.'

The Ambassador of the  
Coming Age, Dec. 1, 1868

# THE AMBASSADOR

OF

## THE COMING AGE :

A MONTHLY PERIODICAL DEVOTED TO THE EXPOSITION AND  
DEFENCE OF

DIVINE TRUTH, AS APPREHENDED FROM A  
CHRISTADELPHIAN POINT OF VIEW.

---

*Published on the last Thursday of each month, for the month following.*

---

**DECEMBER.**

---

BIRMINGHAM :

PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR,  
ROBERT ROBERTS, ATHENÆUM ROOMS, TEMPLE ROW.

---

TERMS (*post free*): FIVE SHILLINGS PER ANNUM; to *Subscribers in the  
United States*, 2½ DOLS., in advance; in *New Zealand and Australia*, 8s.

BRITISH ORDERS TO THE EDITOR.

---

1 8 6 8 .

## ARRIVAL OF EUREKA, III.

### DR. THOMAS'S APPROACHING VISIT.—HIS DAUGHTER COMING WITH HIM.

In a letter to the Editor, under date November 2nd, Dr. Thomas writes as follows : "The steamer conveying this, will also bring to Liverpool 350 copies *Eureka* III; 50 vol. I; and 50 vol. II, also six copies *Herald*, vol. 1, 2, 4 and 11, with a few pamphlets, and only a few, stock being very low. They will arrive by the *Iaman* "Liverpool, Queenstown and New York line." I hope they will arrive safely, and give satisfaction to all concerned . . . I suppose you will receive *Eureka* in about two weeks. This will bring us near to December. You will hardly be able to eat it up in a month. . . . I am dreaming about making my daughter my *compagnon de voyage* to Britain. Would there be any objection? . . . It is a troublesome affair transferring one's self to a foreign land. It is not merely embarking at one port and debarking at another; but it is the upsetting of one's domestic order and routine, and the defending the hearth against untoward events that might arise. But I visit Britain in the interests of the truth. This is the Lord's business in which I am one of his *employés*. Otherwise, I should not consent to subject myself to the annoyance of a sea voyage, and the personal discomforts of British R. R. travel. I think, possibly, judging from the past, that I may be of more use for a while in Britain than for the same time I could in this word-despising, and politically bewitched and infatuated community. I shall therefore renew the experiment in the hope that all things will work together for the good of all concerned."

The information contained in the foregoing extracts will incite the earnest about the matter, to the speedy performance of two things; first, the remittance of the price of *Eureka*, III, a long-looked-for vol. which is now within immediate reach to any dweller in the British Isles, but which requires the financial preliminary exacted by the printer as the condition of its appearance in the world of print, viz., pre-payment. The money advanced by a brother and sister to bring the work to light has to be repaid, and there is, therefore, the same necessity for business exactitude as if the printer were unpaid. The second point relates to the expenses incident to the Doctor's approaching visit. It will be observed that he desires to bring his daughter with him, as a journeying companion. This is a wish that every friend of the Doctor will desire to meet with alacrity; first, because it is his wish; second, because it will add to the interest which every friend of the truth will feel in his visit; and, third, because at the Doctor's advanced time of life, it is natural to suppose that the company of one so near to him will contribute an element of comfort which, in so long a journey, could not otherwise be supplied.

What are the friends of the truth disposed to do? To allow the old veteran, who has spent his life in the great battle, and made himself a poor man when, by the application of his talents to secular ends, he might have made himself rich, this little comfort during what, in all probability, is his last journey in the truth's service? This is the practical question to which we invite attention, not that we doubt the answer, but that we may evoke it in a cordial and effective manner. It but requires that we all put on a little extra steam in the work of preparation. If all promises so far made are realised, the Editor will have in his hands £60 towards the object in view. It will require £40 more at least. Shall we raise it? If all will co-operate for the next few weeks, there is nothing to hinder. System and perseverance are the two essentials. For the "system," we refer the favourably-disposed to 1 Cor. xvi, 2; nothing can beat this. For the quality of perseverance, we can only point to the goodness of the object, if which fails to incite it, nothing more need be said.

One word more: There are two aspects to the question of the Doctor's expenses, which must be kept carefully separate. The first is that of which we have already spoken, viz., the cost of bringing the Doctor and his daughter over the Atlantic, and

(Continued on page 3 of cover.)

sending them hither and thither in the country, and back home again when the time arrives. To this, all money confided to the Editor will be exclusively appropriated. The other aspect of the case is that which relates to the Doctor's labours when in the country—maintenance, the hiring of public halls, printing, &c. With these the fund now being raised has nothing to do. Brethren contributing to it must, therefore, reserve sufficient strength to enable them to make use of the Doctor when he happens to be in their locality, otherwise his visit would be lost, so far as the proclamation of the truth in that locality was concerned. With these explanations we leave the matter, reminding our readers that the truth, having, with few exceptions, fallen into the hands of the poor, we can only by co-operation accomplish any thing in its behalf.—EDITOR.

Terms.—Vol. I, 9s. sterling, or 3 dollars, 40 cents., American currency, post free; Vol. II and III, 16s. or 5 Dollars, 40 cents. each, post free.

NOTES.

J.T.B.—The rule of prepayment was not intended to apply to British subscribers, who, on the whole, keep well abreast of their obligations.

CHRISTMAS APPOINTMENTS.—All being well, the Editor will (D.V.) keep the following appointments at the end of the year:—London, December 28; Scarborough, January 4; Whithy, Jan. 8; Leeds Jan. 11; Hcm<sup>s</sup>, Jan. 13.

DIFFICULTIES OF AMERICAN SUBSCRIBERS.—A.C.—Communication direct to the Editor will put an end to your difficulties, and those of every other American subscr.bor. Brother Donaldson has had too much on hand to answer every application; but you and all concerned may rely upon it that money sent to him will find its way to the proper quarter.

“THE WAY OF LIFE.”—Brother Brown announces a re-issue, by himself, of this Tract (by Brother Wood, of Joppa), in glazed paper covers, at 1d., under the title of *The Way of the Truth and the Life*. The Tract is revised and enlarged by bro. Brown with the sanction of brother Wood. We shall be glad to take charge of orders

THE BIBLICAL NEWSPAPER, No. 4.—NOW READY.

CONTENTS.

What is Eternal Life?  
Who has it?  
Can it be obtained by the Sons of Adam?  
Yes, as an offered Gift.  
When?

Upon what Conditions?  
Bible Promises to the Accepted.  
The Gospel Genealogical; or, the Meaning of the Names of the Patriarchs from Adam to Noah.

*The “Biblical Newspaper” will now be issued monthly.*

A GUIDE FOR TRAVELLING BRETHREN & FRIENDS OF THE TRUTH.

BARNSTAPLE—D Atkins, Bradford Villa  
BRITH, (Scotland.)—J. Gillies, grocer  
BIRMINGHAM—Robert Roberts, Athenæum  
Rooms, Temple row, or 64, Beigrave-road.  
CAMBRIDGE, Strathspey, (Scotland.)—J. Grant  
CUMMOCK, (Scotland.)—T. Haining, Crichton  
place  
DERBY—T. Meakin, 1, Peel-street, Ashbourn  
road  
DEVONPORT—J. W. Moore, 4, Seymour Crescent,  
end of Hobart-place, near Millbridge.  
DUBLIN—W. D. Jardine, 91, Bride-street  
DUNKELB, (Scotland.)—J. Milne, Athol-street  
EDINBURGH—Charles Smith, 19, North Rich-  
mond-street, or W. Ellis, 2, June-field, Leith  
GALASHIELS, (Scotland.)—J. Bell, clothier,  
High-street  
GAISTON, (Scotland.)—J. K. Ramsay, M.D.  
GLASGOW—J. Anderson, 310, Argyle-street  
GLANTHAM—James Woolton, 96, Grantley-st  
HALIFAX—R. Whitworth, Moorside  
HECKMONDRIE—G. Arncliffe, Northgate  
HODDERSFIELD—J. Rhodes, 25, Albion-street  
INNERLEITHEN—W. Dew, Walkerburn  
JERSEY—S. G. Hayes  
KINGTON—J. Griffiths, Headbrok

LONDON—J. J. Andrew, 376 Strand; T. Bosher,  
(Zimmerman Bosher & Verne), 7, Bishops-  
gate-street Without, and 77 Houndsditch  
LANGLY, (South Wales)—George Dell  
LEANS—A. P. Willis, grocer, Armsley  
LEICESTER—Fred. M. Lester, 43, Belgrave gate  
LIVERPOOL—James Lind, 72, Dale-street  
NUMBLES, (South Wales)—W. Clement  
MANCHESTER—W. Birkenhead, Sale  
MONTGOMERY, (Wales.)—J. Richards, shoe-  
maker, the Cuckshutt  
NORWICH—John Hage  
NOTTINGHAM—E. Turney, Trent Bridge Works;  
J. Phelps, 6, John-street, Sneinton  
OLLERTON—W. Hage, Bishthorpe  
SCARBORO’—C. Walker, 4, Falconer Road  
SWANSEA—R. Goldie, 2, Bellevue-street  
STOURBRIDGE—J. Turney, Cliff Works  
TRAFFORD—Robert Strathead, provision dealer  
TUNBRIDGE (Scotland.)—J. Robertson, 18, Clapel  
street  
WESTON SUPER-MARE—W. Newport, 3, Clire-  
mout Buildings  
WISHAW, (Scotland.)—R. Hodgson, Inland  
Revenue Officer  
WHITBY—F. R. Shuttleworth, 8, Church-street

# NOW READY,

## A NEW EDITION OF THE DECLARATION.

PRICE ONE PENNY.—ORDERS TO THE EDITOR.

### THE KINGDOM OF GOD;

A Lecture delivered by the Editor, in Myddleton Hall, Islington, London, on Tuesday, August 11th; reported phonetically by brother Arthur Andrew, of London, and published by the brethren of that place. This Tract (handsomely got up) has now arrived, and may be had at 2d. per copy, (postage 1d.) or at the following rates, post free:—12 copies, 2s.; 50 copies, 7s. 6d.; 100 copies, 14s.

#### LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE LAST NUMBER.

October 24, S. Skinner; 26, J. J. Andrew, J. W. Moore, T. Moss, M. Mowatt; 27, J. Leach, F. Malcolm, H. L. Drake, H. Dyer, W. Graham, J. Brown; 28, F. R. Shuttleworth, C. Dealtry, G. H. Kidd, J. Mortimer; 29, W. Newport, A. J. Twelvevrees; 30, D. Clement, J. W. Moore, J. Phelps; November 2, J. W. Moore, J. T. Inlich, Mrs. Bucklin; 3, J. Habgood, J. J. Andrew, F. R. Shuttleworth, D. Allen; 4, E. Turney, J. Grant, J. Phillips, P. Moss, P. Scrimshaw, J. Phelps; 5, T. Busher, J. Yule, J. T. Bell, W. D. Jardine; 6, J. Hawkins; 7, F. R. Shuttleworth, T. R. Simpson, R. Whitworth; 9, R. C. Bingley, W. D. Jardine, G. H. Kidd, Z. D. Bugbee, M. A. Hayes; 10, F. R. Shuttleworth, W. Osborne, B. Lowe, A. Pitt, T. Randles; 11, G. Lillie, H. Nichols; J. Coombe, F. R. Shuttleworth; 13, J. Mowatt, George Dick, J. Rhodes; 14, R. C. Bingley, J. Slack, J. J. Andrew, D. Brown, A. Eastman; 16, J. Pascoe, J. Hawkins, J. W. Clough, J. W. James; 17, J. W. Moore; 18, W. H. Hacking, W. Ellis; 19, J. Grant; 20, E. J. Lassius, J. Silman; 21, J. Phelps, A. Andrew, F. R. Shuttleworth, George Dick, Dr. Thomas; 23, G. H. Kidd, M. E. Chamberlain, H. Fish.

#### RECEIPTS FROM OCTOBER 24th TO NOVEMBER 23rd.

*Ambassador*—W. Graham, Leeds, 10 copies (3 months) and postage; J. Mortimer, Dundee, 1 copy (24 months) and postage; Mrs. Bucklin, Osh Kosh, Wis., U. S., 2 copies (12 months, 1869) and postage; F. R. Shuttleworth, Whitby, 14 copies (1 month) and postage, and 1 bound vol. for 1867; J. Phillips, Hull, 1 copy; J. T. Bell, Galashies, 9 copies (6 months) and postage; John Yule, Ayrton, 1 copy (12 months) and postage; R. Whitworth, Halifax, 23 copies (1 month) and postage; Z. D. Bugbee, Ashtabula, Ohio, 2 copies (12 months, 1869) & postage; A. Pitt, London, 1 copy (3 months) and postage; J. Coombe, Toronto, for P. Degeer, 1 copy (12 months) and postage; J. Rhodes, Huddersfield, 3 copies (3 months) and postage; J. Slack, Hindlow, 1 copy (9 months) and postage; W. H. Hacking, Listowell, C. W., (for Mrs. Sunrock, Mrs. Wade, and H. B. Vincent, of Osh Kosh) 3 copies (12 months, 1869) and postage; B. Malone, Va., U. S. [per sister Lassius] 1 copy (12 months, 1869) and postage; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 35 copies (1 month) and postage; Henry Fish, Beloit, Wis., U. S., for self, sister Barnes, and W. Conable, 3 copies (12 months, 1869) and postage.

*Lectures*—J. J. Andrew, London, 30 copies; W. Mowatt, Fraserburgh, 1 copy; J. W. Moore, Devonport, 1 copy; Mrs. Bucklin, Osh Kosh, U. S. 12 copies; W. D. Jardine, 2 copies; R. Whitworth, Halifax, 3 copies; G. H. Kidd, Scarborough, 6 copies; H. Nichols, Cheltenham, 1 copy; G. Dick, Glasgow, 17 copies; J. W. Moore, Devonport, 4 copies; J. Grant, Grantown, 1 copy.

*Defence*—J. J. Andrew, London, 14 copies; T. Moss, Earlstendale, 1 copy; Mrs. Bucklin, Osh Kosh, U. S., 12 copies; R. Whitworth, Halifax, 15 copies; G. Dick, Glasgow, 20 copies; J. Grant, Grantown, 1 copy.

*Declaration*—J. W. Moore, Devonport, 70 copies; Mrs. Bucklin, Osh Kosh, U. S., 12 copies; J. T. Bell, Galashies, 1 copy; R. Whitworth, Halifax, 12 copies; J. W. James, Tewkesbury, 4 copies; J. Grant, Grantown, 6 copies.

*MISCELLANEOUS*.—S. Skinner, London, 100 'Christadelphian Tracts'; J. J. Andrew, London, 1 'Anatolia'; H. Dyer, Bradford-on-Avon, 6 'One Baptism'; G. H. Kidd, Scarborough, 12 'Kingdom of God'; F. R. Shuttleworth, Whitby, 1 'Discussion'; 1 'Devil and Hell'; 100 'Christadelphian Tracts, No. 3'; 1 copy 'Eureka I.'; and 1 copy 'Eureka III.'; and postage on 'Advertising Cards'; a Sister, 300 'Christadelphian Tracts'; J. T. English, Stockton, 1 'Anatolia'; 1 'Anastasis'; 2 'Soul and the Kingdom'; Mrs. Bucklin, of Osh Kosh, U. S., 100 'Christadelphian Tracts'; 24 'One Baptism'; 12 'Kingdom of God'; 1 'Discussion'; 1 'God-manifestation'; J. Phelps, Nottingham, 3 copies 'Eureka III.'; W. D. Jardine, 1 'Contrast'; 1 'Devil and Hell'; 1 copy 'Eureka III.'; R. Whitworth, Halifax, 1 'Anatolia,' one 'Anastasis,' one 'Elpis Israel,' one copy 'Eureka vol. I.', one copy vol II, 6 copies vol. III; a Brother, £5 towards the expenses of Dr Thomas's coming visit; Brethren in Innerkip, C. W., £2 for the poor; J. Rhodes, Huddersfield, 6 'One Baptism.' Geo. Dick, Glasgow, one 'Elpis Israel'; D. Brown, London, 4 copies 'Eureka III.'; J. Pascoe, Plymouth, one 'Elpis Israel'; J. W. James, Tewkesbury, one 'Contrast,' one 'Devil and Hell'; J. W. Moore, Devonport, 50 'Tracts, No. 3, and 50 'Tracts, No. 4'; W. H. Hacking, Listowell, £1 to account; J. Grant, Grantown, 50 'Christadelphian Tracts,' one 'Anatolia,' one 'Anastasis,' one 'Discussion,' 3 'Kingdom of God'; W. L. Hipwell, Birmingham, one 'Elpis Israel'; R. H. Dean, Birmingham, one 'Eureka, vol. I.